



April 2019

Toorak Road, Kooyong Level Crossing Removal Project

Consultation Outcomes and Submissions Report



L\330257310.2

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
List of abbreviations.....	5
Defined terms	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
Introduction	6
Part A Consultation outcomes report.....	6
Part B Submission response report	6
PART A – CONSULTATION OUTCOMES REPORT	7
1. PROJECT BACKGROUND	8
1.1 Project overview	8
ENGAGEMENT APPROACH	8
1.2 Engagement overview	8
1.3 Engagement phases.....	8
1.4 Engagement channels.....	9
1.5 Phase one (December 2018 – February 2019)	9
1.6 Phase two (February 2019).....	10
1.8 Social media (Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram)	12
1.9 Snapshot of engagement activities.....	14
2. WHAT THE COMMUNITY TOLD US	15
2.1 Engagement and feedback themes (July/August 2018)	15
PART B – SUBMISSION RESPONSE REPORT	16
1. INTRODUCTION	17
1.1 Background	17
1.2 Purpose and scope.....	18
2. APPROACH	19
2.1 Consultation Program	19
2.2 Submissions	19
2.3 Summary of submissions	21
3. DESIGN	25
3.1 Option preference	25
3.2 Reference Design	29
3.3 Cost of design.....	30
3.4 Future proofing.....	31
3.5 Scope of works.....	33
4. COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND PUBLIC SPACE	35

4.1 Security in public spaces	35
4.2 Antisocial behaviour in public spaces	35
5. ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS	37
5.1 Removal of vegetation	37
6. AMENITY IMPACTS	39
6.1 Visual impacts	39
6.2 Overlooking / privacy and overshadowing	41
6.3 Permanent impact to business operations	42
6.4 Operational noise	42
6.5 Operational vibration	43
7. SAFETY	45
7.1 Operational safety	45
7.2 Pedestrian safety	46
8. URBAN DESIGN	48
8.1 Urban design	48
8.2 Landscaping / use of space	50
8.3 Reinstatement of public open space	52
8.4 Impact on heritage values	53
8.5 Loss of trees	54
9. TRAFFIC / TRANSPORT	55
9.1 Local (road) access	55
9.2 Traffic flow	56
9.3 Bicycle or pedestrian paths	57
9.4 Car parking	59
10. PROPERTY IMPACTS	61
10.1 Compensation	61
10.2 Reduction in property value	61
10.3 Associated developments	62
11. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	64
11.1 General construction concern	64
11.2 Noise and / or vibration	65
11.3 Disruption to public transport	66
11.4 Traffic and access disruption	67
11.5 Parking availability	68
11.6 Truck movements	69
11.7 Business impact	69
11.8 Project program / delays	70
11.9 Impact on services	70
11.10 Construction safety	71
11.11 Temporary disruption to public open space	71
12. CONSULTATION	73
12.1 Lack of consultation on design	73

12.2 Consultation Material and Approach.....	74
13. PLANNING AND APPROVAL PROCESS.....	76
13.1 Planning approval process	76
13.2 Positive comment on the project	76
13.3 Amendment Documentation	77
13.4 Other planning and approvals information	79

List of abbreviations

DDA – Disability Discrimination Act 1992

EPA – Environmental Protection Authority

LXRP – Level Crossing Removal Project

MTM – Metro Trains Melbourne

OVGA – Office of the Victorian Government Architect

PTV – Public Transport Victoria

TFV – Transport for Victoria

Defined terms

Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) – is a measure in LXRP’s Urban Design Framework to ensure that best practice environmentally sustainable design is achieved from design through to operation and includes aspects such as achieving an Infrastructure Sustainability Council of Australia rating, minimising water usage, using innovative technologies etc. The Urban Design Framework is available here: <https://levelcrossings.vic.gov.au/about/urban-design-framework>

Level Crossing Removal Project (LXRP) – the organisation that oversees the delivery of all level crossing removals, ensuring that they are removed in a coordinated and efficient manner. The LXRP is part of the Major Transport Infrastructure Authority (MTIA) and is responsible for all aspects of the Project including planning and development, stakeholder engagement, procurement, through to construction and delivery.

Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) – The multi-criteria analysis describes the performance of each project option against equally measured criteria, to help inform the selection of options.

Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy (PRINP) – The PRINP is a Victorian State Government document to guide transport bodies and planning authorities in their consideration of the impacts of rail noise from improved or new passenger rail infrastructure and from changes to land use near existing and planned rail corridors.

The Alliance/NEPA – The North Eastern Program Alliance (NEPA) includes Lang O’Rourke, Jacobs, the State of Victoria through the Level Crossing Removal Project, Metro Trains Melbourne Pty Ltd (each being a party under the head contract with LXRP).

The Project – The Toorak Road, Kooyong Level Crossing Removal Project

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In 2015, the Victorian Government established the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRP) to remove 50 dangerous and congested level crossings around Melbourne. In 2018 a further 25 level crossings were announced for removal, bringing the total to 75. The level crossing at Toorak Road, Kooyong is one of those to be removed.

This report forms part of the request to the Minister for Planning to exercise his powers under section 20(4) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (Vic).

This report describes how LXRP has engaged with key stakeholders and the community, and how the Project has taken into account the views of relevant parties during this process. The report has two parts:

- Part A summarises the overall program of engagement with the community and key stakeholders.
- Part B summarises responses to issues raised in written submissions in response to consultation on the Planning Scheme Amendment.

Part A Consultation outcomes report

LXRP undertook a phased approach to the consultation activities, beginning in late 2018. Consultation will continue through to completion of the Project.

LXRP's targeted engagement activities focused on reaching the following stakeholder groups using the indicated engagement methods:

- Community – community information sessions, train station and community pop-ups, market research, digital and social media campaigns, online consultation hub, mail-outs, LXRP website, advertising and communications materials including community updates and flyers.
- Businesses – visits and communications materials including community updates and flyers.
- Stakeholders – met with key stakeholders, including Stonnington and Boroondara City Councils, VicRoads, and PTV.

The community engagement activities resulted in extensive interaction with the local community, including over 230 attendees to information sessions and pop-ups and over 360 responses across two surveys.

Part B Submission response report

Part B of this report summarises and responds to the submissions made by the community and key stakeholders during the Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA) formal submission period between 18 February and 18 March 2019.

LXRP received 273 formal submissions on the proposed PSA for the Project.

LXRP examined key themes and considerations raised by the submissions, including how the Project has, or will, respond to particular issues or concerns either by reference to general policies and strategies or by specific particulars.

The most frequently raised issues were:

- A preference for the 'rail under road' design option with visual impacts and amenity being the most common reason (95 mentions)
- The exclusion of Glenferrie and Tooronga Road level crossing removals from the Project works
- Privacy and personal safety concerns
- Visual and noise impacts of final design
- Heritage impacts
- Public open space and landscaping
- Pedestrian and cycling paths
- Traffic movement

PART A – CONSULTATION OUTCOMES REPORT

1. Project background

1.1 Project overview

The Project proposes to remove the level crossing at Toorak Road in Kooyong, on the Glen Waverley line. The level crossing is located in Melbourne's inner-east and is located approximately 6.5km from the CBD.

Toorak Road is a declared arterial road and is a key east-west link within the inner south-eastern suburbs of Melbourne. It is also a key strategic traffic route for access to the Monash Freeway and CityLink.

The Project's construction will have limited impact on heritage, with the only heritage place along the corridor potentially impacted being the signal boxes at Kooyong Station (HO473 in Stonnington Planning Scheme). The extent of impact will be limited to signal upgrades required for the operation of trains along the line and will be negotiated with Heritage Victoria prior to any potentially impactful works.

The level crossing at Toorak Road is a major source of congestion in the area. Each day approximately 37,000 vehicles drive through the level crossing, and the boom gates are down for approximately 35 per cent of the 7-9am morning peak.

The frequency and length of closure of the boom gates at the level crossing is a significant source of frustration for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, which can lead to risk-taking behaviour by road users.

It is anticipated that the Toorak Road level crossing project will be completed by 2021.

Engagement approach

1.2 Engagement overview

Level crossing removals are complex projects with many environmental and technical challenges. While the Project will result in significant benefits and opportunities for local communities, LXRPN recognises the Project will also result in potential changes and impacts for those living and working close to the level crossing and surrounding areas.

Community input and feedback has been critical to informing the options for the negotiables on the project, such as open space, landscaping and urban design.

Community consultation for the Project began in late 2018, involving market research and project information through letter box drops. In February 2019 the Premier announced that the Toorak Road level crossing would be removed by constructing a rail bridge.

Following that announcement, LXRPN conducted a number of door knocks and letter drops and also held a series of pop-ups and drop-in sessions at Auburn South Primary School and Tooronga Stocklands shopping centre in February and March 2019. As a part of this process, LXRPN focussed on encouraging feedback on the Planning Scheme Amendment, which ran from 18 February to 18 March 2019. Further details are outlined in Part B of this report.

1.3 Engagement phases

After the announcement of the rail over road solution on 13 Feb 2019 by the Victorian Government, LXRPN has continued to maximise reach and to inform the community of the Project. LXRPN is undertaking a phased engagement approach, including over a period from late 2018, through to 2019 and will continue as design options are developed and finalised.

Phase 1 – Planning (December 2018 – February 2019): Introduce the project to the wider community, set out expectations and milestones, communicate benefits and promote ways to obtain information and contact LXRPN.

Phase 2 - Preferred design (February-March 2019): Confirm design solution. Stakeholder and community input on negotiable elements of design.

Phase 3 – Refine design elements (May 2019): Engage on defined, negotiable elements of the design.

Phase 4 – Updated design (June 2019): Present the updated design solution – show how community input has been reflected in the final design

Phase 5 – Delivery (June-July 2019): Transition to delivery, early works and contract award.

1.4 Engagement channels

LXRP has used a number of channels and methods to encourage engagement and feedback as part of the Project. These channels were identified as the most effective methods of engaging with the community and working with stakeholders and include:

- Direct mail-outs
- Local newspaper advertisements
- Email updates
- Digital and social media
 - Website
 - Facebook
- Distributions at train stations and around the local area
- Door-knocking
- Market research (focus groups and phone surveys)
- Stakeholder briefings
- Community information sessions
- Online engagement hub
- Community pop ups
- Community updates and relevant collateral

1.5 Phase one (December 2018 – February 2019)

LXRP commenced community engagement about the Project in late 2018.

The goal of phase one engagement activities was to raise awareness that LXRP would be removing the level crossings and to begin explaining to the community how it could engage with LXRP.

Key activities undertaken in this early phase included:

- Works alert notification – sent to local residents informing them of impending geotechnical investigations (Appendix A – Works Alert)
- Distribution of community newsletter in December 2018 (Appendix B - Community Update May 2018)
- Market research – included two focus groups and 400 phone surveys. (Appendix C - Market Research – Key findings)
- Establishing key contacts
- Council briefings

1.5.1 Market research

In January/February 2019, LXRP contracted QDOS Research to undertake market research. The objectives of the research were to:

- assess local residents' awareness and sentiment towards the removal of the Toorak Road level crossing;
- measure the importance of various factors associated with the level crossing removal such as improving congestion, impacts on residents and local businesses during construction and making it easier for people to move around the local area;
- investigate preferred methods of communication about the Project; and
- understand residents' level of support for various approaches to removing the level crossing.

Both quantitative and qualitative research was undertaken with residents living in a catchment area around the Toorak Road, Kooyong level crossing. Refer to Appendix C for the catchment area of this study.

Qualitative research

Two focus groups with residents were held on 24 January 2019 to explore key issues, the local community's perception about the level crossing removal and how residents' views were informed.

The focus groups consisted of one group of eight female residents and one group of eight male residents.

Quantitative research

A telephone survey of a random selection of 400 residents across the catchment area was conducted between 30 January 2019 and 4 February 2019.

Key findings

The key findings from the qualitative and quantitative research methods were:

- The level crossing is seen as the major cause of traffic congestion on Toorak Road, and its removal is strongly supported. 68 per cent of respondents said the level crossing removal was "very important" with a further 24 per cent saying it was "important"; and
- Issues rated as most important among respondents were ease of getting around and safety for pedestrians, the look, feel and useability of the area, and getting the level crossing removed as soon as possible.

1.5.2 Engagement with Stonnington City Council

Engagement with Stonnington City Council began in 2018 with a number of meetings to discuss technical investigations and urban design inputs.

Council provided a submission to the PSA consultation which is outlined in the accompanying Planning Report to this PSA Application.

While this submission represents the adopted position of Stonnington City Council, consultation and collaboration remains ongoing as the Project develops. LXP is currently working to address Council concerns and suggestions on a number of aspects within the project scope and is continuing to identify positive outcomes for the community.

Communication and consultation with Council will continue on a regular basis.

1.6 Phase two (February - March 2019)

Following extensive technical investigations, rail over road was identified as being the clear best option due to technical issues with ground water, storm water and utility services and an ability to minimise disruption. As such, there was no community consultation on the design solution – a rail bridge was announced by the Premier and the Minister for Transport Infrastructure on 13 February 2019.

1.6.1 Engagement activities

Following the announcement of the design solution, further community and stakeholder consultation was sought on refining design elements, including landscaping, use of open spaces and pedestrian and cycling connections.

Type	Activity
Promotion of information sessions and online engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pop-ups. • Advertising in local newspaper (Stonnington Leader, Progress leader, Chinese United Times, Neos Kosmos)) (Appendix E & F Community Information session newspaper advertisement). • LXRП website and social media. • ‘Your Level Crossing’ online consultation hub. • Project email updates. • Engagement with key stakeholders. • Letter box drop (Appendix I Flier dropped in approximately 120 mailboxes in Kooyong and Malvern).
Face to Face Engagement	<p>Two pop-up information stalls were held at Stocklands Tooronga shopping centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday 23 February 2019 from 10am until 12noon. • Tuesday 26 February 2019 from 10am until 12noon. <p>A further pop-up information stall was held at Kooyong Station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Friday 1 March from 7am until 9am. <p>Two community information sessions were held at Auburn South Primary School:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday 2 March from 10am until 12noon. • Tuesday 5 March from 6pm until 8pm. <p>A range of information was made available to the community, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update sign-up sheets. • Corflutes displaying Project information. • Roll plots. • Concept images. • Community update. • Feedback forms. • PSA submission forms. <p>These information sessions and pop-ups were attended by a total of 230 people.</p>
Local Business/Trader Engagement	<p>Approximately 80 business located at the business park on Milton Parade, Malvern, were provided with a survey where they could provide information about their business, their communication preferences and request a meeting. Five surveys were returned. (Appendix G – Business survey)</p>
Impacted residents along the rail corridor	<p>Approximately 80 residents whose homes will be most affected by the project were doorknocked immediately after the design solution announcement on 13 February 2019. Approximately 12 conversations were held, with all residents being provided a letter inviting them to contact LXRП to arrange a meeting. (Appendix H - Letter to residents). One on one meetings with residents have also been offered and the project team are</p>

Type	Activity
	<p>currently working through appointments and discussions.</p> <p>Residents across Kooyong, Malvern, Toorak and sections of Armadale, Glen Iris, Hawthorn and Hawthorn East received a project community update outlining the design solution and the reasons for it were distributed in the 10 days after the 13 February announcement. (Appendix D – Toorak Road Community Update dropped to approximately 18,000 households in Kooyong and parts of Hawthorn, Hawthorn East, Camberwell, Glen Iris, Malvern and Toorak.)</p> <p>Residents in Kooyong and Malvern received a flier advertising the community drop-in sessions in the week before they commenced. (Appendix I Flier dropped in approximately 120 mailboxes)</p>
Government briefings	The Minister for Transport Infrastructure was briefed on the project prior to the information sessions.
Stonnington and Boroondara City Councils	<p>Boroondara City Council reviewed the draft project area and provided input into the distribution area for the PSA consultation. They also managed distribution to residents and businesses in Boroondara.</p> <p>Stonnington City Council has submitted its position to the LXP during the PSA consultation process.</p> <p>Refer to the Planning Report prepared for Planning Scheme Amendment GC126.</p>
Feedback mechanism	<p>Your Level Crossing online consultation hub – Toorak Road feedback form</p> <p>In addition to providing an opportunity to complete a PSA submission online, the community was also encouraged to complete a Project design engagement. Details include as following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback could be submitted online between 18 February and 18 March 2019. • Anyone with an interest in the Project could provide feedback on the project and the negotiable elements of the design. • This was promoted on social media, at information sessions, and during conversations with stakeholders who wanted to provide ideas during telephone and face-to-face conversations. • Visitors were required to register and create an account before they could submit feedback. • 93 online submissions were received. <p>The LXP contact phone number and email address were widely publicised, which provided the community an avenue to contact the Project team with questions or queries at any time.</p>

1.8 Social media (Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram)

LXP's social media channels have been key communication tools. The Project has its own page on the LXP website, which is used to provide project updates, including diagrams, timelines, frequently asked questions (FAQs) and publications. LXP Facebook and Twitter pages are regularly used to make announcements, promote engagement opportunities and start conversations. LXP currently has:

- 30,074 Facebook followers
- 5,526 Twitter followers
- 3,607 Instagram followers
- 10,808 LinkedIn followers

Facebook posts relating to the Project have been engaged with by over 5,000 people. (See figures 1, 2 & 3)

Figure 1, 2 & 3: Social Media postings

1.9 Snapshot of engagement activities

Between the end of February and early March 2019, LXR:

- Distributed over 18,000 community newsletters to residents and businesses.
- Distributed over 5,000 letters to residents and property owners regarding the PSA.
- Distributed 100 letters and a survey form to adjacent businesses.
- Held three pop-up sessions at Tooronga Shopping Centre and Kooyong Station.
- Held two community information drop-in sessions at Auburn South Primary School with a total of 230 direct face-to face interactions.
- Held 21 face-to-face meetings with residents to go through detailed roll plots and cross-sections with the assistance of an engineer.

2. What the community told us

2.1 Engagement and feedback themes

From reviewing the feedback provided through conversations and feedback submissions, the following key themes have been identified:

Design solution concerns

- Noise concerns of elevated rail – a perception that an elevated rail structure will be far noisier than trains travelling at their current grade. With modern construction techniques and improved rail infrastructure, such as a u-trough design, it is anticipated that operational rail noise will be reduced and in compliance with the Victorian Government’s Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy 2013 (PRINP).
- Loss of visual amenity – concerns with the elevated rail structure impacting their vistas and visual amenity. The project is investigating a potential fencing and landscaping program for eligible residents abutting the rail structure, which may assist with improved screening.
- Use a trench or road over rail solutions to remove level crossing – with a preference for a rail under solution (rail trench) However, given the technical and engineering constraints, a rail over road solution is deemed to be the best option for this location.

Safety

- Comments related mainly to concerns with the pedestrian and cyclist crossing on the concept image – the future pedestrian and cycling crossing is now being proposed to move further west of the current location shown on the concept image. This is an improvement in terms of accessibility and safety and is a direct result of community feedback and consultations with VicRoads and the City of Stonnington.

Use of open space

- New open space to be green and planted – a number of options will be taken to the community for further feedback, with appropriate suggestions incorporated into the final designs

Connectivity

- Concerns about access and egress into local streets once the level crossing is removed – further discussions and investigations will take place with VicRoads and the City of Stonnington to resolve these concerns.

Project scope

- A desire for LXRP to also remove Tooronga Road and Glenferrie Road level crossings – although this is out of the Project scope, the Toorak Road level crossing design will not preclude future level crossing removals at those locations.

PART B – SUBMISSION RESPONSE REPORT

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

LXRP is responsible for delivering a program of 75 level crossing removals on behalf of the Victorian State Government. As part of the program, the level crossing at Toorak Road, Kooyong will be removed.

Six potential options were initially considered for removal of the level crossing:

- Rail under road: lowering the rail line under Toorak Road into an open trench
- Rail over road: raising the rail line over Toorak Road onto an elevated rail line
- Road over rail: raising Toorak Road over the rail line
- Road under rail: lowering Toorak Road under the rail line
- Road closure: closing Toorak Road
- Hybrid (road over rail hybrid with rail lowered to minimise elevation of the road over the bridge)

Three of these options were set aside at the initial options assessment stage. The road over rail and road under rail options were set aside due to the position of the Monash Freeway, Talbot Crescent and Milton Parade and the need for private property acquisition. The road closure option was set aside due to the significance of Toorak Road and the flow on impacts of closure on the arterial road network.

The remaining three options (rail under road, rail over road and hybrid) were taken forward into further site investigations and a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) which indicated that a rail over road solution represented the best outcome for the Project. This design solution provides:

- The least overall disruption to road and rail users. The elevated rail would be located predominantly alongside the existing tracks and significant excavation would not be required. Elevating the rail line enables the Project to be delivered with minimal disruption to rail services and minimal impact to road users.
- The shortest delivery duration and earliest completion date, with least program risk (can be completed around 12 months earlier than the rail under road option and 2 months earlier than the hybrid option).
- The least disruption to services with limited services relocations being required.
- No need for private land acquisition.
- Significant financial savings over alternative options.

The rail over road solution would result in some loss of visual amenity for residential and commercial properties fronting Milton Parade, Elizabeth Street and Talbot Crescent. The hybrid option also results in loss of visual amenity due to the high retaining walls around Toorak Road.

All options result in removal of a large number of established trees adjacent to the current rail alignment. However, the rail over road provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in these areas given the embankments created and the area under the elevated structure.

Constructing the rail under road would present significant problems due to the trench base being below the ground water table and near the rail corridor to Gardiners Creek floodplain, increasing the risk of flooding in the trench.

The consultation on the design was clear that rail over road had been selected as the design solution as it was the superior overall solution for the project. Given the clear advantages of a rail over solution there was no consultation on other potential options. It was ensured that consultation with the community was clear and did not mislead the community on what solutions were being considered. The Premier of Victoria formally announced on the 13 February 2019 that the Project will be a rail over road solution. Community consultation followed the Premier's announcement to commence engagement on detailed design for the rail over road solution.

During this consultation phase and as part of the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA) request, LXRP sought public submissions between 18 February and 18 March 2019 from residents and land owners/occupiers who may be affected by the Toorak Road level crossing removal works and the associated PSA. A total of 273 submissions were received.

A summary of these submissions, together with a response to the matters raised, are outlined in the following report. More detail about the full program of community consultation undertaken for the Project, including consultation on the PSA, is set out in Part A of this report. Consultation with the community, traders and key stakeholders will continue throughout the detailed design and delivery phases of the Project.

The 273 submissions conveyed an extensive range of responses which were analysed and categorised to assist with understanding of the concerns of the community. This categorisation is shown in Table 1 below.

This report supports LXP's request to the Minister for Planning to approve the PSA under section 20(4) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (Vic).

1.2 Purpose and scope

This report presents the outcome of the written submission process.

The purpose of inviting and considering written submissions was to ensure that the views of potentially affected land owners and occupiers, key stakeholders and the wider community were sought, known, considered and where possible, taken into account by the Project in the preparation of the PSA. This process:

- Allowed any person interested in the Project to make a submission;
- Sought to formally enquire about the views of potentially affected land owners and occupiers, key stakeholders and the wider community;
- Informed potentially affected land owners and occupiers of LXP's intention to make an application to the Minister for Planning to exercise his discretion under section 20(4) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (Vic) to approve a PSA to apply an incorporated document with specified conditions to enable the Project to proceed without the need for planning permits; and
- Ensured community feedback was effectively and efficiently addressed in LXP's request to the Minister for Planning for the PSA (Amendment GC126).

The formal submissions process was not a mechanism for community members to select a design solution, but to ensure potentially impacted people had an opportunity to make their views known so LXP can consider how issues and concerns might be addressed.

This part of the report sets out the views of potentially affected land owners and occupiers, key stakeholders and the wider community that were received during the submissions process and explains how these views have been considered and taken into account by the Project.

In responding to the key issues raised in the written submissions, this report:

- Identifies themes and issues raised in the written submissions;
- Shows how often particular issues were raised;
- Explains the general strategies adopted by the Project to manage issues raised; and
- Provides responses to specific concerns not addressed by the general strategies.

The scope of this part of the report is limited to the responses to written submissions as defined in Section 2.2.2 below.

2. Approach

2.1 Consultation Program

The wider consultation program has involved engagement with key stakeholder organisations such as State government agencies, the City of Boroondara and the City of Stonnington as well as landowners, community interest groups and the wider community. An outline of consultation activities relevant to the PSA is provided below.

Planning Scheme Amendment feedback forms – 18 February – 18 March 2019 (Appendix J - Toorak Road Planning Scheme Amendment feedback form and Appendix K - distribution area – within 250m of the Investigation area)

- Approximately 3,500 PSA letters and forms sent to residents within 250m of the Investigation area in Stonnington City Council municipality (Appendix L - Toorak Road Planning Scheme Amendment letter – sent to residents within Investigation area), (Appendix M - Toorak Road Planning Scheme Amendment Q&A – sent to residents within the Investigation area).
- Approximately 1,454 PSA letters and forms sent to absentee owners of properties within 250m of the Investigation area in Stonnington City Council municipality.
- Approximately 269 PSA letters and forms sent to Boroondara City Council to distribute to residents, businesses and absentee landowners within 250m of the Investigation area in Boroondara City Council municipality.
- Dedicated website for electronic submissions to be lodged (Appendix N - Toorak Road Planning Scheme Amendment online submission page).
- Attendance at two community drop-in sessions (2 and 5 March 2019) for answering direct questions and explaining PSA submission process.
- PSA feedback was captured between 18 February – 18 March 2019.
- 273 hardcopy and electronic submissions were received.

2.2 Submissions

2.2.1 Source of submissions

Between 18 February – 18 March 2019, stakeholders were invited to make written submissions regarding their views on the proposed PSA application.

Methods for making submissions included:

- Submission forms, which were mailed out with reply paid envelopes to owner/occupiers of properties within 250 metres of the Project Area or collected at Community Drop-in sessions.
- Online submissions using the form on the LXP website.
- Written submissions from affected land-owners/occupiers approached individually by the Project.
- Written submissions from Council and other key stakeholders.
- Emails to the general project communications email address requesting to be considered as a written submission.

Approximately 5,223 letters and submission forms were sent out to residents, businesses and absentee owners within 250 metres of the Investigation area (see Appendix K for the distribution area and appendices J, L and M for all mail out material). Submissions on the PSA were also captured through the LXP website online submission portal (Appendix O Toorak Road Planning Scheme Amendment online submission form) and through email. The feedback form posed the following two questions:

- "What are the top three things you would like LXP to consider when removing the level crossing at Toorak Road by elevating the rail over the road?"
- "Are there any other comments you would like to make?"

2.2.2 Receipt and categorisation of submission

A total of 273 submissions, both hard copy and through online, were received by 18 March 2019 from a variety of sources including residents, owners, businesses, community groups and interest groups.

The Project has developed a process to receive, categorise and respond to the submissions. Submissions were logged, numbered and recorded in a Submissions Register on a daily basis throughout the submission period. All submissions were scanned and saved on a secure network drive, with hard copies stored in a locked cabinet with access limited only to officers responsible for logging submissions. The following protocols were applied:

- Submissions that provided an address with no comment were not accepted.
- Submissions that provided comments with no address were accepted.
- Repeated submitters were only accepted for differing addresses.
- Differing submitters from the same address were accepted.
- Illegible submissions were not accepted.
- Online submissions would be closed at 5pm on 18 March 2019.
- Hardcopy submissions received in the post after the 18 March 2019 were accepted for the following week to allow for postal delays.

In total, 7 submissions were not accepted for the following reasons:

- 6 submissions made no comment on the project or amendment but only provided contact details.
- 1 duplicate submission was received.

2.2.3 Themes and issues

Each submission was reviewed by project officers and technical specialists to determine the issues it raised, which were recorded on the register. The matters raised by the submissions were analysed and categorised and grouped into broad themes and issues which are listed in Table 1.

2.2.4 Responding to submissions

Many of the submissions were general in nature and have been responded to by reference to general strategies or performance requirements for management and mitigation. Issues that could not be wholly addressed by the general strategies were addressed individually, often with the assistance of subject matter experts.

Each **section** provides a general approach to managing issues for a given theme, as well as a table summarising the responses to more specific points raised.

2.3 Summary of submissions

Table 1 lists the themes and issues used in the categorisation of the submissions and summarises the number of times issues were raised as a real number and as a percentage.

Table 1 Summary of total submissions received

Theme	Issue	Number of submissions on this issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Design	Option preference:	115	42%
	- Rail under road	95	35%
	- Rail over road	5	2%
	- Other	18	7%
	Reference Design	13	5%
	Cost of design	21	8%
	Future proofing	28	10%
	Scope of Works	72	26%
Community Facilities and Public Space	Security in public spaces	3	1%
	Antisocial behaviour in public spaces	22	8%
Ecological Impacts	Removal of vegetation	9	3%
Operational Amenity Impacts	Visual Impacts	81	30%
	Overlooking / privacy and overshadowing	15	5%
	Permanent impact to business operation	1	0.5%
	Operational noise	73	27%
	Operational vibration	2	1%
Safety	Operational safety	30	11%
	Pedestrian safety	50	18%
Urban Design	Urban design	35	13%
	Landscaping / use of space	60	22%
	Re-instatement of public open space	10	4%
	Impact on heritage values	28	10%
	Loss of trees	20	7%

Theme	Issue	Number of submissions on this issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Operational Traffic / Transport Impacts	Local (road) access	30	11%
	Traffic flow	64	23%
	Operation of public transport after construction	3	1%
	Bicycle or pedestrian paths	69	25%
	Car parking	3	1%
Property impacts	Compensation	5	2%
	Reduction in property value	17	6%
	Associated developments	4	1%
Construction impacts	General construction concern	17	6%
	Noise and / or vibration	19	7%
	Disruption to public transport	5	2%
	Traffic and access disruptions	24	9%
	Parking availability	4	1%
	Truck movements	1	0.5%
	Business impact	1	0.5%
	Project programme / delays	5	2%
	Impact on services	1	0.5%
	Construction safety	4	1%
	Temporary disruption to public open space	5	2%
Consultation	Lack of consultation on design	41	15%
	Consultation material and approach	23	8%
Planning and approval process	Planning and approval process	3	1%
	Positive comment on the project	13	5%
	Amendment documentation	5	2%
	Other planning and approvals issues	3	1%

2.3.1 Key stakeholders and affected landowners

LXRP has consulted nearby landowners and occupiers, directly affected landowners, Stonnington and Boroondara City Councils and key State Government agencies about the proposed PSA. This direct consultation typically generates written correspondence raising issues similar to those in other feedback entered on the submissions register. LXRP recognises that consultation with relevant agencies is ongoing and will respond to any further concerns raised in due course.

LXRP has also consulted directly with Stonnington and Boroondara Council officers in relation to the PSA and they have been involved in the drafting and editing process of the prepared documentation.

The project area has been designed so no privately owned land is required for the purposes of the final design or construction of the Project.

2.3.2 Key stakeholder engagement

LXRP has endeavoured to establish positive and productive relationships with key stakeholders. These stakeholders were identified during the early investigation process, and have received ongoing communications, briefings and updates as summarised in the Table 2 below.

Table 2 Key PSA Stakeholders

Category	Organisation	Relationship to/key interest in the Project
Local Government	Stonnington City Council	Significant landowner and responsible planning authority.
	Boroondara City Council	Significant landowner and responsible planning authority. (Refer to planning report for full response to PSA documentation).
Relevant agencies	Public Transport Victoria (PTV)	Disruptions and integration with future plans on Glen Waverley line
	Melbourne Water	Relevant floodplain management authority.
	Metro Trains Melbourne (MTM)	Passenger train disruptions and future plans on Glen Waverley line.
	VicRoads	Manager of roads including Toorak Road, on which the level crossing works will directly impact.
	VicTrack	Owner of the State's rail assets.
	Environment Protection Authority	Environmental compliance relating to areas such as noise and air quality.
	Heritage Victoria	Manages the Victorian Heritage Register, Victorian Heritage Inventory and is responsible for

Category	Organisation	Relationship to/key interest in the Project
		approvals under the <i>Heritage Act 2017</i> (Vic).
	Aboriginal Victoria	Manages areas of indigenous sensitivity.
Landowners and occupiers affected by temporary land use	Melbourne Water	Potential land lessor for purposes such as site access, construction laydown or car parking.
	Stonnington City Council	Potential land lessor for purposes such as site access, construction laydown or car parking.
	Boroondara City Council	Potential land lessor for purposes such as site access, construction laydown or car parking.
	Toorong Park (City of Stonnington)	Potential for the temporary acquisition of the Reserve during the construction period as equipment and material laydown areas.
	Ferrie Oval (City of Stonnington)	Potential for the temporary acquisition of the Reserve during the construction period as equipment and material laydown areas.
	Paterson Reserve (City of Boroondara)	Potential for the temporary acquisition of the Reserve during the construction period as equipment and material laydown areas.
	The reserve on the corner of Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road (City of Stonnington)	Potential for the temporary acquisition of the Reserve during the construction period as equipment and material laydown areas.
Businesses and residents	Nearby residents and businesses (not subject to potential land acquisition)	Potential impacts due to proximity to the Project.

3. Design

3.1 Option preference

3.1.1 Description of issue raised

While the PSA consultation program was primarily designed to gather feedback and comments on the proposed PSA, 42 per cent of respondents (115 submissions) commented on the design option for the project.

Although the media release stated that the design solution for this Project was a rail over road design, some submitters stated their preference on the option of raising the rail onto an elevated railway line, lowering of the railway line into a trench or other options. As demonstrated in Table 3, a significant proportion of respondents preferred a rail under road design. Road over or road under solutions are unsuitable for the Project due to the topography, property access to Toorak Road and position of the Monash Freeway.

Many submitters had a strong response to design preference, specifically preferring the rail under road option as outlined in Table 3.

The submissions that favoured a rail-under solution outlined reasons including:

- A trenched solution would have a reduced visual impact and fit the surrounding environment.
- A rail-over solution would be untidy and lead to graffiti on the elevated structures.
- There would be increased noise with a rail-over approach.
- A 'capped or covered' trench or a tunnel would provide usable open space.
- Concerns a rail-over approach would impact future level crossing removals at Glenferrie and Tooronga Roads.
- Concerns about privacy, with passengers on elevated rail able to see into backyards and houses.
- Concerns a rail-over design would be distracting to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Toorak Road.
- Concerns a rail-over design would decrease property value due to impacts on amenity and privacy.
- Residents were not properly consulted on the preferred design option.

Submitters who favoured a rail-over solution generally did so because:

- It would provide increased connectivity across the rail line.
- More space would be made available for public use.
- It would provide better transport connection across the corridor (east-west).

Table 3 summarises submissions received for this theme.

Table 3 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Option preference (if stated)	115	42%
Rail under road	95	35%
Rail over road	5	2%
Other	18	7%

3.1.2 Response

The following criteria were used as part of the MCA to evaluate the options for removing the level crossings as part of the Project:

- Project program delivery timeframe.
- Delivery risk.
- Technical feasibility and compliance with design standards and best practice.
- Ability to provide a reliable and efficient transport network.
- Ability to create better connected, liveable and thriving communities, including the urban setting and existing land uses and opportunities to revitalise areas through improved urban design.
- Construction and operational safety.
- Impacts on local residents.
- Environmental impacts.
- Compatibility with future infrastructure development.
- Requirement for land acquisition.
- Impacts on surrounding land uses.
- Capital cost, whole of life cost and opportunities for 'value capture'.
- Minimising construction impacts and disruptions.

The Project's preferred solution is an elevated rail bridge. This solution is based on the following specific considerations:

- The least overall disruption to road and rail users. The elevated rail would be predominantly alongside the existing tracks and significant excavation would not be required. Elevating the rail line enables the project to be delivered with minimal disruption to rail services and minimal impact to road users.
- The shortest delivery duration and earliest completion date, with least program risk (can be completed around 12 months earlier than the rail under road option and 2 months earlier than the hybrid option).
- The least disruption to services with limited services relocations being required.
- No need for private land acquisition.
- Significant financial savings over alternative options.
- Opportunity to develop public and/or green spaces below and beside a rail bridge, including walking and cycling paths, parking, landscaping and tree planting and recreational areas. These strengthen pedestrian and cyclist links across and next to the rail corridor.
- Impact to underground utility services is reduced and rail over road provides the greatest flexibility to utility authorities for future crossings of the rail line under the elevated structure.
- Avoids the significant multiple technical challenges of the rail under Toorak Road option due to groundwater around 3 – 4 metres below ground level over most of the alignment, variable ground conditions and potential flooding from Gardiners Creek and nearby drains.

The rail over road solution creates some loss of visual amenity for residential and commercial properties fronting Milton Parade, Elizabeth Street and Talbot Crescent. However, the hybrid option also results in loss of visual amenity due to the high retaining walls around Toorak Road.

The urban amenity advantages of a rail bridge include:

- Provision of space (under the structure) that can be activated for future uses such as pedestrian access across the corridor, car parks or public open space.
- Provision of better connectivity at ground level (above or below ground level is therefore reserved for infrastructure use) so as to improve links between the two sides of the Glen Waverley Rail Corridor.

All options would result in removal of a large number of established trees adjacent to the current rail alignment. However, the rail over road provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in these areas given the embankments created and the area under the elevated structure.

Table 4 lists and responds to major issues commonly linked with option preferences raised in submissions.

Table 4 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Many submissions were opposed to an elevated rail solution due to visual impact.</p>	<p>The visual impact was carefully considered as part of integration with the precinct. While the aesthetic attributes of design solutions are subjective, the Project’s preferred solution will be to deliver a high-quality design that engages positively with local neighbourhood character and will provide greatly improved amenity for residents. The design will consider the impacts on existing properties that are immediately adjacent to the works.</p> <p>The preferred solution will deliver a high-quality rail bridge that meets the requirements and benchmark expectations of the LXP Urban Design Framework. The Urban Design Framework outlines the expectations for achieving high-quality, context sensitive urban design outcomes at each level crossing removal site.</p> <p>The Urban Design Advisory Panel (UDAP) has been engaged throughout the design process to ensure that the design outcome is consistent with the expectations of the State Government. Engagement on design matters has also been carried out with Stonnington and Boroondara Councils. Further information relating to visual impact concerns can be found in section 6.1</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were opposed to an elevated rail solution because of concerns about graffiti and/or anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Graffiti impacts have not been observed to be different in above and below ground solutions. The passive surveillance possible with above ground structures is considered an active deterrent.</p> <p>The final design will incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles to discourage anti-social behaviour and to maintain a high level of personal safety for those moving through the area.</p> <p>Further information relating to anti-social behaviour can be found in section 7.1 Operational safety</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were opposed to the rail over road design solution due to the perception of increased noise.</p>	<p>The Project’s current preferred design solution uses two U-trough elevated structures, which are designed for trains to sit lower (within the structure) than standard rail bridges. As a result of using a U-trough design, projected noise levels are lower than alternative elevated structures. Further investigation into noise mitigation measures will be conducted during detailed design when the noise impacts can be accurately measured and predicted.</p> <p>The potential operational noise associated with the Project’s preferred design solution will be assessed</p>

against the criteria set out in the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy (PRINP).

Under this policy:

- Existing noise levels are required to be measured.
- Noise modelling is undertaken to predict operational noise levels for completed works.
- If the noise levels exceed the specified thresholds in PRINP, then consideration is given to mitigation of the noise impacts.

Multiple submissions requested a rail tunnel or capped trench design solution.

While tunnels or capped trench design options have benefits, neither option is feasible for the Project due to groundwater around 3 – 4 metres below ground level over most of the alignment, variable ground conditions and potential flooding from Gardiners Creek and nearby drains.

LXRP to date has not removed any of the level crossings with a tunnel as these are prohibitively expensive (generally around \$1 billion per km). The cost of a tunnel at Toorak Road would be increased by the need for tanking (waterproofing) to avoid groundwater ingress. In addition, a long tunnel entrance would be required, resulting in potential property acquisition at both the tunnel entrance and exit. Ventilation requirements along a tunnel can also be intrusive in residential areas.

Multiple submissions were concerned that a rail bridge would impact future level crossing development along the Glen Waverley line, in particular Glenferrie and Tooronga Roads.

Based upon work to date, no options for the Toorak Road level crossing removal would preclude the removal of these level crossings in the future. The Glenferrie Road and Tooronga Road level crossings may be removed in the future but are not amongst the 75 level crossings to be removed by 2025.

LXRP is committed to removing 75 dangerous and congested level crossings across Melbourne by 2025. These sites have been prioritised and selected based on four key principles including safety, movement, division of place and disruption during delivery.

Multiple submissions were opposed to an elevated rail solution due to privacy concerns and potential overlooking from rail passengers into private open space.

The Project has undertaken an analysis of the preferred design solution using the LXRP Privacy Screening Policy. This policy uses the principles embedded within ResCode (the residential development provisions found in all Victorian planning schemes) to determine where screening is required to protect sensitive private areas on adjoining sites. Once design details are known further assessment of a privacy screening strategy will be explored.

Further information relating to overlooking can be found in section 6.2 Overlooking / privacy and overshadowing.

Multiple submissions were opposed to an elevated rail solution due to the impacts on property value.

Property values are affected by prevailing market conditions and influenced by many factors other than infrastructure development. Given the many different factors that influence property values generally, speculation about long-term impacts on property prices, whether positive or negative, is conjecture.

The Project works will benefit the local community by:

- Providing safer road and rail around Toorak Road, Kooyong.
- Reducing congestion on local roads and decreasing travel times.
- Allowing the potential for a greater number of rail services be provided to the area.
- Providing safer pedestrian connections and improving pedestrian and cyclist amenities.
- Improving urban amenity through provision of open space under the elevated rail and consideration of urban design treatments.
- Stimulating the local economy with a temporary increase in labour to the area.

Further information relating to impacts on property value can be found in section 10. Property Impacts.

One submission supports the rail-over design option however suggested moving the proposed alignment closer to the current rail line to avoid tree removal.

The alignment of the new rail lines is off-line from the existing tracks as this solution enables the project to be delivered with minimal disruption to rail services and minimal impact to road users. It also enables the shortest delivery duration and earliest completion date, with least program risk (can be completed around 12 months earlier than the rail under road option and 2 months earlier than the hybrid option). The proposed rail over road solution allows for space for replacement trees and landscaping.

3.2 Reference Design

3.2.1 Description of issue raised

Most submitters who raised concern about the reference design of the Project referred to the bridge location and attachments. Table 5 summarises submission comments about the reference design.

Table 5 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Reference Design	13	5%

3.2.3 Response

Table 6 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>One submission requested that a Shared User Path be added to the side of the rail bridge.</p>	<p>The Project scope does not include any shared user paths on the structures of the elevated rail line due to safety issues and cost. Pedestrian, cycling and shared user paths will be designed and developed to provide the safe, easy and convenient connection across roads. The final design of all paths will be determined in the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>
<p>One submission questioned why the bridge design was closer to Talbot Crescent and not directly over the current rail corridor, referring to the effect this has on removing trees along Talbot Crescent.</p> <p>One submission was concerned that a rail-over design may not be the best design option in terms of time and impact.</p>	<p>The alignment of the new rail lines is deliberately off-line from the existing tracks as this solution enables the project to be delivered with minimal disruption to rail services and minimal impact to road users. It also has the shortest delivery duration and earliest completion date, with least program risk (can be completed around 12 months earlier than the rail under road option and 2 months earlier than the hybrid option).</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested the train line be enclosed in a circular-like structure as a means of minimising noise and maintaining visual amenity.</p>	<p>Noise from the operating rail line must comply with the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy (PRINP), irrespective of what design solution is adopted. The Project's current preferred design solution uses two U-trough elevated structures, which are designed for trains to sit lower (within the structure) than standard rail bridges. As a result of using a U-trough design, projected noise levels are lower than alternative elevated structures.</p> <p>Having a structure over the bridge would make it visually larger when no train is running over the bridge. The final design of rail bridge will be determined in the detailed design stage of the Project.</p>

3.3 Cost of design

3.3.1 Description of issue raised

Although one important reason why a rail over option was presented as the preferred option for the project is that it is the most cost-effective option, multiple submissions were interested in understanding the costs associated with both the rail over and under options.

Table 7 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Cost of design	21	8%

3.3.2 Response

The MCA was undertaken to determine the Project’s preferred design solution. Cost effectiveness was one of many considerations. Other considerations included connectivity and the complexity of the existing traffic flow at the site.

Table 8 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions would like disclosure of cost options</p>	<p>The detailed MCA that was undertaken to ensure that a preferred design solution considers a variety of criteria in the decision-making process, such as impacts to the environment, construction impacts and connectivity. Cost is only one of the criteria. All criteria are weighted evenly.</p> <p>The MCA indicated that the relative capital cost is lower for a rail bridge solution. Cost was only one criterion in the assessment which showed that either a rail trench or a hybrid option would not be the best design solution at this location.</p> <p>Costs estimates indicate that the works associated with a rail over road option would be more cost effective than a rail under road solution.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised concern that the rail over option is the ‘cheap’ design option.</p>	<p>The MCA analysis undertaken ensures that the Project will provide significant amenity improvements to the community and improve access through a cost-effective design.</p> <p>The Project aims to deliver significant improvements to amenity within the existing urban environment through cost effective design interventions.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern that the Project is a poor utilisation of public funds.</p>	<p>The MCA examined the whole of life cost of the rail over, rail under and hybrid solutions. The whole of life cost review assessed components including but not limited to ongoing maintenance, construction cost, power usage, access, utility upgrades and lifespan.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised that a rail-under road design could provide additional land for development which could be sold to offset the cost of construction.</p>	<p>To generate a parcel of land of sufficient size for development would require a structure to be provided over the rail line, which also leads to an increase in the length of the level crossing removal and likely impact to both Kooyong and Tooronga Stations.</p>

3.4 Future proofing

3.4.1 Description of issue raised

Most submissions who raised concern about future proofing the Project referred to the design preference. Table 10 summarises submission comments about future proofing.

Table 9 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Future proofing	28	10%

3.4.2 Response

Multiple submissions raised concerns that the Project is only considering the short term with many comments related to the removal of additional level crossings in the future, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions raised concerns that elevated rail is not a future proofed design solution.</p> <p>Multiple submissions also referred to the previously removed level crossing at Burke Road (rail-under) as a future proofed solution.</p>	<p>An element of the MCA examined the whole of life cost and opportunities for ‘compatibility with future infrastructure development’.</p> <p>Through the Integrated Transport Working Group, the design of the elevated rail bridge has been tested to ensure the design allows for planned and envisioned transport projects in the area, including other potential level crossing removals on the Glen Waverley Line.</p> <p>Analysis has been undertaken of the entire Glen Waverley rail corridor to ensure that future opportunities for level crossing removals have not been compromised through the preferred rail bridge design.</p> <p>The Glenferrie Road and Tooronga Road level crossings may be removed in the future but are not among the 75 level crossings to be removed by 2025. Based upon work to date, no options for the Toorak Road level crossing removal would preclude the removal of these level crossings in the future.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions would like the Project to include the removal of additional level crossings on the Glen Waverley Line</p>	<p>LXRP is currently committed to the elimination of 75 dangerous and congested level crossings across metropolitan Melbourne by 2025.</p> <p>The Toorak Road, Kooyong level crossing removal project has been designed to ensure that future level crossing removals along the Glen Waverley rail corridor are not compromised through the preferred rail bridge option.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions believe that a capped trench solution presents a future proofed design option, allowing land for future developments and open space above the railway line.</p>	<p>The aim of the Level Crossing Removal Project is to remove dangerous and congested level crossings, making it easier for people to live, work and travel across Melbourne. This aim will be achieved by either design solution.</p> <p>A covered trench has not been considered due to the</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
	<p>complexity and cost prohibitive nature of this design.</p> <p>The covering of the trench would increase the length of the trench, the duration of disruptions and the cost of the Project. This is due to the increased space required in depth and length to provide sufficient clearances for trains and supporting infrastructure inside the covered trench, and at the end of the covered sections.</p>
<p>One submission questioned if the newly installed higher power frames at Kooyong Station were installed to assist the chosen design.</p>	<p>The works at Kooyong Station were part of business as usual upgrades to the network and are separate to the Toorak Road, Kooyong Level Crossing Removal Project.</p>

3.5 Scope of works

3.5.1 Description of issue raised

Most submissions who referred to scope of works raised issues which are not outlined within the Project scope for Toorak Road, Kooyong level crossing removal.

Table 11 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Scope of works	72	26%

3.5.3 Response

Multiple submissions suggested that the project scope should include removing Glenferrie Road and Tooronga Road level crossings at the same time as Toorak Road, as shown in Table 12 below.

Table 12 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions would like the Project to include the removal of additional level crossings on the Glen Waverley Line, including the Glenferrie Road, Kooyong, Tooronga Road, Malvern and High Street, Glen Iris level crossings.</p>	<p>LXRP is currently committed to the elimination of 75 dangerous and congested level crossings across metropolitan Melbourne by 2025. These short-listed level crossings do not include the Glenferrie Road, Tooronga Road or High Street crossings on the Glen Waverley line.</p>
<p>One submission raised that if the Glenferrie Road level crossing was removed and made into rail over, there could be additional space under the rail line for parking to service the Kooyong shopping strip.</p>	<p>The Toorak Road, Kooyong level crossing removal project has been designed to ensure that future level crossing removals along the Glen Waverley rail corridor are not compromised through the preferred rail bridge option.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested additional bike and pedestrian paths linking Heyington and Gardiner</p>	<p>The addition of shared user paths from Heyington to</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Stations	Gardiner stations is outside of the Project scope.
One submission requested that the project include altering the design to address issues at Talbot Crescent being used as a 'rat run' of traffic from Glenferrie Road to access the Monash Freeway via Toorak Road	The rail over road solution can address the existing undesirable movements around the intersection of Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road. Under existing conditions, vehicles are required to cross two through lanes concurrently with manoeuvring directly into often heavily congested double right turn lanes onto the Monash Freeway (M1) entry ramp. The rail over road solution enables adjustment to Talbot Crescent to relocate its intersection with Toorak Road further to the west which will increase separation distance from the M1 interchange and allow a safer and more convenient movement.

4. Community Facilities and Public Space

4.1 Security in public spaces

4.1.1 Description of issue raised

Several submissions raised concerns that the Project would create spaces that are unfriendly and lack passive or active surveillance, encouraging anti-social behaviour and safety concerns.

Table 13 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Security in public spaces	3	1%

4.1.2 Response

Creating safe and secure public spaces is a key design consideration for LXP. The Project's preferred design solution takes into account the need for good lighting and passive surveillance in publicly accessible areas.

Spaces beneath the elevated structures will be designed carefully to avoid creating concealed areas or opportunities for anti-social behaviour.

4.2 Antisocial behaviour in public spaces

4.2.1 Description of issue raised

Concern that the rail bridge could be targeted by graffiti was raised in multiple submissions. There was concern that graffiti would impact the visual amenity of the area and make it less hospitable, and in turn negatively impact perceptions of personal security and vulnerability to crime.

Table 14 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Antisocial behaviour in public spaces	22	8%

4.2.2 Response

LXP's Urban Design Framework includes guidelines for improving safety and reducing potential for vandalism, which will translate into site specific strategies for the Project. In particular, the Project will apply Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, which includes material selection, design and maintenance.

Table 15 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
--------------------------	----------

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple responses raised concern that an elevated rail structure will result in increased graffiti and vandalism</p>	<p>Grffiti is an issue for both elevated rail and for lowered (trenched) rail. The space beneath the rail bridge will be designed carefully to avoid creating concealed areas or opportunities for anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Regardless of which option is chosen, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will be used to develop methods to discourage vandalism and graffiti including employing passive surveillance and engineering solutions.</p> <p>LXRP Urban Design framework sets out guidelines for public art to be considered in key locations as it helps to build attractive engaging public spaces and is recognised as a deterrent to vandalism.</p>

5. Ecological Impacts

5.1 Removal of vegetation

5.1.1 Description of issue raised

Submissions raised concerns regarding the removal of existing vegetation as part of the Project, in particular the removal of existing vegetation along the rail corridor.

Table 16 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Removal of vegetation	9	3%

5.1.2 Response

All level crossing removal options for Toorak Road, Kooyong result in the removal of a large number of predominantly non-native trees within and adjacent to the current rail reserve. However, the rail over road option provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in these areas given the embankments created and the area under the elevated structures.

The Project is committed to best practice vegetation management. An ecologist and arborist have been engaged to assess existing ecological and tree health values.

Removal of trees will be minimised through design and construction methodology, with the over-arching objective of retaining trees. Where trees are to be retained, Tree Protection Zones (TPZs) will be established. TPZs protect the above and below ground parts of a tree during construction activities.

All native vegetation and trees to be removed will be offset, in compliance with the *Guidelines for the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation* (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, 2017).

Vegetation will be planted to maintain biodiversity within the Project area.

Environmental management measures will be implemented to monitor, control and offset impacts to vegetation.

Table 17 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission was that a trenched design solution would be better for the environment than a rail over solution.	All level crossing removal options for Toorak Road, Kooyong result in the removal of a large number of predominantly non-native trees within and adjacent to the current rail reserve. However, the rail over road option provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in these areas given the embankments created and the area under the elevated structures.
Multiple submissions would like the existing planting and vegetation in the project area to be retained, particularly mature, established trees.	Where possible, all vegetation other than pest plant species will be retained within the Project area. The Glen Waverley rail corridor presents a narrow area for construction, meaning vegetation is likely to be impacted. Where vegetation removal cannot be avoided, LXR will comply with all vegetation and
Multiple submissions requested the removal of	

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>vegetation to be controlled and justified.</p>	<p>offset controls as specified in conditions 4.2.2 & 4.2.3 in the Toorak Road, Kooyong Level Crossing Removal Project Incorporated Document.</p> <p>The Project will provide offsets to native vegetation consistent with the <i>Guidelines for the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation</i> (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, 2017).</p>

6. Amenity Impacts

6.1 Visual impacts

6.1.1 Description of issue raised

The visual impact of the level crossing removal was recorded in a significant amount of comments relating to an elevated rail solution. Many submissions outline their option preference for rail under road or for a road bridge and followed this with concerns relating to negative visual impacts of an elevated structure in the Glen Waverley rail corridor.

Table 18 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Visual impacts	81	30%

6.1.2 Response

LXRP has developed an Urban Design Framework for level crossing removals which outlines the expectations for achieving high quality, context sensitive urban design outcomes at each level crossing removal site. The Project's preferred solution will deliver a high-quality design that engages positively with local neighbourhood character and will provide improved amenity for the community. The design will consider the physical impacts on existing properties which are immediately adjacent to the works.

Table 19 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned that the new rail bridge will become closer to properties in Talbot Crescent and remove the tree screening between Talbot Crescent and the rail corridor.</p> <p>Multiple submissions were concerned with the amenity impacts to properties in Talbot Crescent of moving the railway closer to the properties.</p> <p>One submission requested clarification that a rail-over option was the best design option in terms of amenity impact</p>	<p>The proposed off-line alignment (from existing rail tracks) of the new rail enables the project to be delivered with minimal disruption to rail services and minimal impact to road users. It also has the shortest delivery duration and earliest completion date, with least program risk. However, the off-line alignment will bring the elevated rail closer to several properties fronting the opposite (north east) side of Talbot Crescent between Elizabeth Street and Toorak Road. This will also involve the removal of the trees and shrubs between the existing rail line and Talbot Crescent. The rail under road option would also bring the rail lines closer to the properties fronting Talbot Crescent south of Elizabeth Street and removal of the vegetation between Talbot Crescent and the new rail alignment. However, as stated in 5.1.2, the rail over road option provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in this area given the embankment created and area under the rail bridge.</p> <p>The proposed off-line alignment of the new rail will take the new rail alignment further from properties on the south west side of the rail line in Milton Parade and Elizabeth Street and allow for additional tree planting</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>A majority of submissions mentioning visual impact were concerned at the negative aesthetic impact of elevated rail</p>	<p>in these areas.</p> <p>The visual impact is carefully considered as part of integration of the rail corridor with the surrounding environment. While the aesthetic attributes of design solutions are subjective, the Project's preferred solution for the Toorak Road Project will deliver a high-quality design that engages positively with local neighbourhood character, including having regard to impacts on surrounding roads, and will provide greatly improved amenity for pedestrians and cyclists. The design will consider the physical impacts on existing properties which are immediately adjacent to the works.</p> <p>Any screening will be assessed and provided in accordance with the LXP visual screening guideline.</p> <p>The preferred solution will deliver a high quality design that meets the requirements and benchmark expectations of LXP Urban Design Framework, which outlines the expectations for achieving high quality, context sensitive urban design outcomes at each level crossing removal site. Throughout the design process the Project has engaged productively with the Urban Design Advisory Panel (UDAP) to ensure that the design outcome is consistent with the high expectations of the State Government and the Cities of Stonnington and Boroondara.</p>
<p>One submission requested replacing the fence on their property to screen the rail bridge.</p>	<p>The Level Crossing Removal Project is considering a fencing program for residents who share a boundary with the rail corridor where the new elevated structure will be built.</p>
<p>One submission requested that the design outcome not look like the Caulfield to Dandenong rail bridge design.</p>	<p>The design has adopted a different design where the elevated structures over Toorak Road is more slender compared to the Caulfield to Dandenong elevated rail.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with amenity impacts to Kooyong Tennis Club if a rail-over design is adopted for future level crossing removal developments at Glenferrie Road.</p>	<p>The Toorak Road, Kooyong level crossing removal project has been designed to ensure that future level crossings along the Glen Waverley rail corridor are not compromised through the preferred rail bridge option, however the Glenferrie Road level crossing has not been identified for removal within this Project's scope.</p>

6.2 Overlooking / privacy and overshadowing

6.2.1 Description of issue raised

All comments in submissions that related to amenity impacts from overlooking, privacy and overshadowing were associated with a rail bridge design solution.

Table 20 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Overlooking / privacy and overshadowing	15	5%

6.2.2 Response

Residential amenity and privacy are an important consideration for the Project. The Project's preferred solution of a rail bridge will raise rail passengers above the current level. During detailed design, further analysis will be conducted into the extent of privacy screening to be applied and privacy screens will be applied beside the elevated rail track where required. The screening solution will be consistent with the LXP screening strategy, which uses the principles embedded within ResCode (the residential development provisions found in all Victorian planning schemes) to determine where screening is required to protect sensitive private areas on adjoining sites.

As plans for the project are progressed through to detailed design, privacy and overlooking will continue to be developed and will be determined based on surrounding land uses, sight lines and relevant physical conditions.

Table 21 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Most submissions relating to overshadowing and overlooking raised concern that elevated rail will overshadow and overlook properties along the rail corridor.	<p>While there are no detailed designs yet, an elevated rail solution will incorporate some level of privacy screen as well as re-establishment of vegetation where needed to limit the potential for overlooking.</p> <p>As noted in response 6.1.2, the proposed off-line alignment of the new rail will take the new rail alignment further from properties on the south west side of the rail line in Milton Parade and Elizabeth Street and allow for additional tree planning in these areas.</p> <p>The proposed off-line alignment of the new rail will bring the elevated rail closer to several properties fronting the opposite (north east) side of Talbot Crescent between Elizabeth Street and the reserve on the corner of Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road. This will also involve the removal of the trees and shrubs between the existing rail line and Talbot Crescent. The rail under road option would also bring the rail lines closer to the properties fronting Talbot Crescent south of Elizabeth Street and removal of the vegetation between Talbot Crescent and the new rail alignment. However, as stated in 5.1.2, the rail over road option provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in this area given the embankment created.</p> <p>The rail over bridge will have shadowing in the rail under-croft space. This is not anticipated to extend to neighbouring properties which will be confirmed by detailed design.</p>

6.3 Permanent impact to business operations

6.3.1 Description of issue raised

There are several offices and a yoga centre adjacent to the rail line in Milton Parade. Other businesses in the vicinity of the level crossing removal works include the City of Stonnington depot and pound on the west side of Tooronga Road, several commercial premises in the Industrial zone in Weir Street (west of Tooronga Road), businesses in the small strip shopping centre in Glenferrie Road opposite the Kooyong Station and businesses on the east of Auburn Road in the City of Boroondara. During the level crossing removal, there is potential for the Project to impact on local businesses due to noise from construction works and noise and potential traffic delays due to construction vehicles accessing the works site and laydown areas. Potential construction impacts are addressed in section 11. However, there is unlikely to be any permanent impact to business operations due to the level crossing removal. LXRP will undertake a significant process of consultation with business owners in the vicinity of the level crossing removal to inform them of the likely extent of any potential impacts and to understand the concerns of business owners and how they can be supported through this process.

Table 22 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Permanent impact to business operations	1	0.5%

6.3.2 Response

LXRP will engage with local businesses to understand their needs and concerns and implement measures to minimise disruption to local businesses during construction.

Table 23 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised concern of noise impacting their Yoga business both during construction and operation	Potential impacts from construction works is addressed in section 11. There is unlikely to be any permanent impact to this business once the level crossing is removed. Noise from the trains must comply with the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy (PRINP) as discussed in section 6.5. Although the rail lines adjacent to this business will be elevated, they are proposed to be within a U-trough structure within which trains sit lower (within the structure) than standard rail bridges. As a result of using a U-trough design, projected noise levels are lower. The rail lines will be located several metres further from the building, allowing room for landscaping works.

6.4 Operational noise

6.4.1 Description of issue raised

A number of submissions expressed a desire that operational noise from the rail line be minimised. The removal of the level crossing will eliminate several noise sources associated with the level crossing (boom gates and warning bells).

Table 24 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Operational noise	73	27%

6.4.2 Response

A number of submissions raised a general concern for operational noise to adjacent businesses and properties and were interested in mitigation measures as outlined in Table 25.

Table 25 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Most submissions relating to noise raised concern at an elevated rail solution producing more operational noise than the present level rail or a trench solution.</p> <p>Multiple submissions associate a rail under road solution with low levels of operational noise.</p> <p>Multiple submissions requested noise mitigation strategies to be applied to the rail bridge.</p>	<p>The potential operational noise associated with the Project's preferred design solution will be assessed against the criteria set out in the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy (PRINP).</p> <p>Under this policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing noise levels are required to be measured. Noise modelling is undertaken to predict operational noise levels for completed works. If the noise levels exceed the specified thresholds in PRINP, then consideration is given to mitigation of the noise impacts. <p>The Project's proposed design solution uses U-trough elevated structures, which are designed for trains to sit lower (within the structure) than standard rail bridges. As a result of using a U-trough design, projected noise levels are lower.</p> <p>Further investigation into noise mitigation measures will be conducted once detailed design enables noise impacts to be accurately measured and predicted.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern that the rail over design will increase noise and exceed the EPA maximum due to the freeway in the area.</p>	<p>The Project has completed a Background Noise Study. An assessment of the predicted and actual noise resulting from the level crossing removal will be assessed and mitigation measures implemented in accordance with the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy.</p>

6.5 Operational vibration

6.6.1 Description of issue raised

Concern about the vibration impact of trains on neighbouring properties was also identified.

Table 26 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Operational vibration	2	1%

6.5.2 Response

The design solution will consider the impacts of operational vibration and will comply with all Australian standards. It is not expected vibration levels from the construction of the works and operation of the Glen Waverley railway line will increase as a result of the Project.

7. Safety

The Project will provide for a safer transport environment, for both the road and rail network, by removing the level crossing. Ensuring safe construction and operation of the Project is central to the design process. This will be achieved through risk identification, a Safety in Design assessment and the implementation of other safety principles through urban design, such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, which are embedded in LXP’s Urban Design Framework.

7.1 Operational safety

7.1.1 Description of issue raised

30 submissions raised concerns about operational safety for road users, pedestrians and cyclists at interfaces with Toorak Road and the rail corridor.

Table 27 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Operational safety	30	11%

9.1.2 Response

A large number of submissions raised safety concerns relating to some aspects of the Project. A key driving factor for completing the grade separation of level crossings is to address the safety concerns associated with the interaction between trains and road users such as cars, buses, pedestrians and cyclists. The Project will be designed to mitigate potential risks associated with a live rail corridor to ensure the safety of the community.

Table 28 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions raise concerns about the safety of public spaces under an elevated railway solution.	<p>The Project’s preferred design solution addresses improved safety in a number of ways.</p> <p>The space beneath the rail bridge will be designed carefully to avoid creating concealed areas or opportunities for anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will be used to prevent anti-social behaviour and criminal activity.</p>
Multiple submissions raised that a rail-over design solution would be distracting for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians, causing safety issues.	<p>The bridge will be designed in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines.</p>
One submission specifically stated the bridge would obstruct visibility of road users heading east on Toorak Road.	<p>Rail over and road over design solutions are common throughout the urban environment. For example, at many locations across the Monash Freeway and other roads.</p>
Multiple submissions raised that the design outcome	<p>The proposed rail over road solution can address the</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
needs to be safe for local traffic to turn right onto Toorak Road from Talbot Crescent	existing undesirable movements around the intersection of Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road. Under existing conditions, vehicles are required to cross two through lanes concurrently with manoeuvring directly into often heavily congested double right turn lanes onto the Monash Freeway (M1) entry ramp. The rail over road solution enables adjustment to Talbot Crescent beneath the rail bridge which will increase separation from the M1 interchange and allow a safer and more convenient movement.
One submission raised concern with the safety of Gardiners Creek Trail underpass.	The Project scope does not include Gardiners Creek Trail.
One submission suggested a 40km/h speed limit be implemented along Toorak Road post construction.	Speed limits along the road will be determined by VicRoads and/or Council in accordance with relevant guidelines.
One submission requested that signs are clearly placed well before the rail bridge.	The road design and signage will comply with relevant Austroads and VicRoads standards.
One submission raises concern at the safety of train travel on an elevated structure, specifically relating to train derailment.	The Project's preferred design solution is focussed on delivering safe construction and operation of the Project through a Safety in Design assessment and risk identification that is central to the design process. At present the design proposes the use of U-trough structures which have been extensively tested internationally and have been applied to other level crossing removal projects in metropolitan Melbourne including Skye Road, Frankston and the Mernda Rail extension. The current safe operation of the U-trough structures in Australia and internationally provides assurance that the elevated structure will not pose a safety risk to the community.

7.2 Pedestrian safety

7.2.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions raised general pedestrian safety issues, particularly when manoeuvring across Toorak Road and the Monash Freeway.

Table 29 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Pedestrian Safety	50	18%

7.2.2 Response

Table 30 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>One submission raised that including Tooronga and Glenferrie Road level crossing removals in the Project scope will increase overall road and pedestrian safety for users.</p> <p>One submission also raised that the traffic flow around the Tooronga Road level crossing is unsafe to pedestrians</p>	<p>The Project has been designed to ensure that future level crossings along the Glen Waverley rail corridor are not compromised through the preferred rail bridge option, however the Glenferrie and Tooronga Road level crossings have not been identified for removal within this Project's scope.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern over traffic lights activated by pedestrians causing travel delays for road travellers.</p>	<p>The Project will work with VicRoads to implement efficient and safe traffic signal operation which provides an appropriate balance of movement for arterial road traffic, local roads and pedestrian and bicycle movements.</p>
<p>One submission would like lighting placed in Tooronga Park.</p>	<p>The Project scope does not include any addition lighting in Tooronga Park.</p>
<p>One submission requested a fence is erected between 8-14 Norford Grove for pedestrian safety during construction of the bridge.</p>	<p>The worksite will be made safe by excluding public access during the works.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised concern over the potential design of the pedestrian crossing on Toorak Road, suggesting the concept design showed unsafe pedestrian crossings at the Monash Freeway exit lanes.</p>	<p>The location of the pedestrian crossing is subject to further design and investigation with the road authority to achieve a safe crossing point on Toorak Road.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern that the rail-over design option will not adequately improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.</p>	<p>The Project's preferred design solution improves safety in of the following ways.</p> <p>The space beneath a rail bridge would be designed carefully to avoid creating concealed areas or opportunities for anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will be used to prevent anti-social behaviour and criminal activity.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised concern for pedestrians, particularly vision impaired pedestrians using the pedestrian crossing.</p>	<p>The Project will work with VicRoads to implement efficient and safe traffic signal operation which provides an appropriate balance of movement for arterial road traffic, local roads and pedestrian and bicycle movements.</p> <p>As the project is near Blind Sports Victoria (Glenferrie Rd), it is understood the area is well used by people with varying degrees of vision impairment. The final design is being reviewed against relevant standards to ensure compliance and the area is safe for these pedestrians.</p>

8. Urban Design

8.1 Urban design

8.1.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions expressed views about the architecture, urban design and place making elements of the Project. Submitters raised a range of issues relating to urban design such as materials, development of open space and future landscaping opportunities.

Table 31 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Urban design	35	13%

8.1.2 Response

LXRP has developed an Urban Design Framework for level crossing removals which outlines the expectations for achieving high quality, context sensitive urban design outcomes at each level crossing removal site. The framework identifies eight key principles inherent in a successful level crossing removal project - identity, connectivity and wayfinding, urban integration, resilience and sustainability, amenity, vibrancy, safety and accessibility. Additionally, each level crossing has a site specific Urban Design Guideline which outlines the local policy framework and principles to be responded to that reflect the unique nature of each site.

Table 32 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions would like community infrastructure (such as gym equipment, basketball rings, tennis hitting wall and rock climbing walls) to be placed under the elevated rail.	Any community infrastructure in the areas created by the Project will be determined in consultation with the relevant key stakeholders (including Local Councils, VicTrack, VicRoads etc.). The suggested options provided in these submissions will be discussed and negotiated to determine the end design of the new open spaces.
Multiple submissions raised concern over the design of the project.	The detailed design stage of the Project will use the information captured in the submissions along with information from future stakeholder consultation to determine the final design.
One submission would like the design of the Project to draw on local modern architecture.	The rail over bridge will have shadowing in the rail undercroft space. This is not anticipated to extend to neighbouring properties and will be confirmed during detailed design.
One submission raised concern over the rail bridge blocking out the sun.	The north-west to south-east orientation of the rail corridor means that should there be overshadowing impacts to adjoining residential properties, the impacts will be temporary and limited to early morning or late afternoon. The Project's preferred design solution includes split rail 'U-trough' bridges and vertical clearance heights that will reduce the impact of overshadowing to areas
One submission would like shared user paths to be included in the design of the rail bridge.	

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
	<p>underneath and adjacent to the rail bridge.</p> <p>Further assessment of the overshadowing caused by an elevated rail structure will be determined once a detailed design is completed and the dimensions are established.</p> <p>The Project scope does not include any shared user paths on the structures of the elevated rail line. Pedestrian, cycling and shared user paths will be designed and developed to provide the safe, easy and convenient connection across roads at ground level. The final design of all paths will be determined in the detailed design stage of the Project once the design solution is confirmed.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested the incorporation of public art into the Project.</p> <p>One submission would like the inclusion of vertical gardens on the rail bridge.</p>	<p>The design will incorporate attractive and engaging public spaces in consultation with relevant stakeholders and immediate community.</p> <p>Landscaping and planting will be undertaken as part of the project works.</p> <p>LXRP’s Urban Design Framework sets out guidelines for public art to be considered in key locations as it helps to build attractive engaging public spaces and is recognised as a deterrent to vandalism.</p> <p>Where public artworks are proposed, the Project will employ a process for selection, commissioning, implementation and on-going maintenance that ensures the works are of a high quality, responsive to the character of the urban setting, and will endure conceptually and physically.</p>
<p>One submission requested the area under an elevated rail line to be open, welcoming and ensure a high level of public amenity.</p>	<p>A key principle within the LXRP Urban Design Framework for the Project relates to increasing opportunities that create high quality urban amenity. The Project will deliver a high level of public amenity through improved access to services through the development of a great place that will contribute to a successful, equitable and prosperous community.</p> <p>The Framework outlines the following objectives to achieve positive amenity outcomes through urban design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve urban amenity with a design that facilitates a range of activities and a mix of uses. - Design for the physical comfort and psychological wellbeing of users of all physical capabilities. - Provide a high-quality design outcome that makes a positive contribution to the local area, through a well-considered concept, design resolution, construction detail and finished product. - Minimise the negative impacts of noise, light spill, overshadowing and visual pollution.

8.2 Landscaping / use of space

8.2.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions expressed views about the architecture, urban design and place making elements of the Project. Submitters raised a range of issues relating to urban design such as materials, development of open space and future landscaping opportunities.

Table 33 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Landscaping / use of space	60	22%

8.2.2 Response

The design solution will enable the opportunity to develop public and/or green spaces below and beside a rail bridge, including walking and cycling paths, landscaping and tree planting and recreational areas for the community.

Table 34 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions would like the inclusion of pedestrian and cycling paths which connect to open spaces.</p>	<p>The rail bridge solution provides the opportunity to increase pedestrian connectivity and safety by developing open spaces below and alongside the rail bridge, as well as delivering cycle and pedestrian path connections.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions support the rail over road design due to the parkland that can be provided under the elevated rail.</p>	<p>The preferred design proposes a high quality publicly accessible space. This will provide an opportunity for more greenery along the Glen Waverley rail corridor.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern over the open space under the rail bridge being 'abandoned' and used the space under the Monash Freeway near Glenferrie Road as an example.</p>	<p>The Project's proposed design solution provides an opportunity for a range of different planting areas including additional trees integrated into the corridor. The rail bridge solution allows for an increased area of planting since the design allows for planting closer to the rail line.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern that the new open space created will not be meaningful.</p>	<p>The space beneath the rail bridge will be designed carefully to avoid creating concealed areas or opportunities for anti-social behaviour.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern over user safety and lighting in open spaces design.</p>	<p>Lighting will be provided. LXP's Urban Design Framework outlines the requirement for lighting to be integrated into the design of the rail bridge and for lighting within the design to contribute positively to identify, vibrancy and visual and spatial amenity. Design details such as lighting will be addressed in the</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions supported a capped trench solution for the availability of land for parks above the rail.</p>	<p>detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>A covered trench has not been considered due to the complexity and cost prohibitive nature of this design.</p> <p>The covering of the trench would increase the length of the trench, the duration of disruptions and cost of the Project. This is due to the increased space required in depth and length, to provide sufficient clearances for the train and supporting infrastructure inside the covered trench and at the end of the covered over sections. Significant areas of land would be required for portals which ultimately limits the amount of usable deck space. The cost of a tunnel at Toorak Road would also be increased by the need for tanking (waterproofing) to avoid groundwater ingress.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with the rail bridge accumulating rubbish and making the area look untidy.</p>	<p>The deck of the rail bridge will not be accessible to pedestrians or cyclists so rubbish is unlikely to accumulate. Rubbish is regularly cleared from rail lines.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions would like landscaping to be reinstated and/or improved throughout the crossing removal.</p> <p>Multiple submissions stated their preference on green, natural open space under the rail bridge instead of further structures or car parking.</p> <p>One submission would like landscaping to follow the Murrumbeena, Carnegie and Caulfield to Dandenong level crossing removal project's precedent.</p>	<p>Tree plantings and landscaping will be incorporated in the design solution. Landscaping adjacent to the rail corridor will be developed consistent with LXRP's UDF and the site specific UDGs which outline the expectations for achieving high quality context sensitive urban design outcomes.</p> <p>Landscaping plans will be developed and then reviewed by the Urban Design Advisory Panel to ensure the requirement for consistency is met.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions would like more high-quality open spaces for community facilities and activities.</p>	<p>As part of the preferred design, a high quality publicly accessible space is proposed. This will provide an opportunity for greenery beneath and beside the bridge structures as well as a potential space for the community in the future.</p>
<p>One submission would like the inclusion of native plant species under the rail bridge.</p> <p>One submission stated it would not be possible to provide green space below the rail bridge due to overshadowing.</p>	<p>A range of plant species will be used in support of the Project's landscaping. These will include plants that can tolerate overshadowing. The relevant Local Council, VicRoads and relevant community groups will be consulted on the landscaping plans. The choice of landscape species will also take into account maintenance, access to sunlight and safety considerations. This has been successfully achieved in other rail bridge level crossing removal projects.</p> <p>The Urban Design Guidelines call for use of "existing species or species that are appropriate and complementary to the local environment and climactic conditions of the area". This is likely to include native</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
	species.
Multiple submissions would like the use of vegetation as a means of screening the rail bridge.	A range of plant species will be used in support of the Project's screening. Landscaping details will be determined during the detailed design process once a design solution is chosen. The proposed design solution provides additional land for landscaping and green open space, allowing the opportunity for improved landscaping outcomes.

8.3 Reinstatement of public open space

8.3.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions expressed views about the architecture, urban design and place making elements of the Project. Submitters raised a range of issues relating to urban design such as materials, architectural style, passive surveillance and future development opportunities.

Table 35 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Reinstatement of public open space	10	4%

8.3.2 Response

The design solution will enable the opportunity to develop public and/or green spaces below and beside a rail bridge, including walking and cycling paths, landscaping and tree planting and recreational areas for the community.

Table 36 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions requested rehabilitating the nearby Gardiners Creek.	<p>The Project is located on the opposite side of the Monash Freeway from Gardiners Creek and the Environmental Management Strategy (required under clause 4.2.1 of the Incorporated Document) will incorporate common environmental management measures to ensure that the Project will not impact upon Gardiners Creek.</p> <p>Active rehabilitation of Gardiners Creek is outside the scope of the project.</p>
One submission would like the new open space to be family friendly.	As part of the preferred design, a high quality publicly accessible space is proposed beneath and adjacent to the rail bridge structures. The design of the structures will improve visibility and sight lines across the railway reserve. Detailed design will further refine the
Multiple submissions would like Tooronga Park to be expanded to include the area under the rail bridge	

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
and to continue to act as an off-lead dog park.	architectural response with feedback from UDAP. The continued use of Toorong Park as an off-lead dog park is a matter for Stonnington City Council. The Project will not affect continued use post-construction.

8.4 Impact on heritage values

8.4.1 Description of issue raised

Heritage was raised in multiple submissions relating to concerns of the rail over design option not aligning with the local character and heritage values of the area.

Table 37 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Impact on Heritage values	28	10%

8.4.2 Response

The Project will consult both Heritage Victoria and Stonnington City Council to ensure all requirements are met and the heritage of the Glen Waverley line and surrounding Kooyong area is retained where possible.

Table 38 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>One submission was concerned that the rail bridge would detrimentally affect the heritage overlay in the area.</p> <p>Multiple submissions were concerned that the Project size, including operational noise and visual effect, is not in line the existing heritage nature of the area.</p> <p>One submission raised concern that the rail bridge will affect the heritage streetscape character along Talbot Crescent.</p> <p>One submission requested an old-fashioned bridge to compliment the heritage neighbourhood character.</p>	<p>Project works in the Heritage Overlay precincts are limited to minor roadworks. The precinct Heritage Overlays do not include the railway reserve where the elevated rail is proposed. The elevated rail structures will be designed, and landscaping will be provided, to create negligible impacts to the significance of the precinct Heritage Overlay.</p>
<p>One submission raised that any works on Glenferrie Road need to retain the signal box.</p>	<p>The Project will endeavour to avoid any heritage impact to the heritage listed Kooyong railway signal box and switch house within the rail reserve (HO473) where possible. Specific conditions in the Incorporated Document impose obligations if any heritage listed building is impacted.</p>

8.5 Loss of trees

8.5.1 Description of issue raised

Submissions raised concerns regarding the removal of existing vegetation as part of the Project in particular, the removal of existing vegetation along the rail corridor.

Table 39 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Loss of trees	20	7%

8.5.2 Response

All level crossing removal options would result in the removal of a large number of predominantly non-native trees within and adjacent to the existing rail reserve. However, the rail over road option provides the best opportunity to re-establish vegetation in these areas given the embankments created and the area under the elevated structures. This extent of replacement planting would not be possible with other level crossing removal solutions.

The Project is committed to best practice vegetation management. An ecologist and arborist have been engaged to assess existing ecological and tree health values.

Removal of trees will be minimised through design and construction methodology, with the overarching objective of retaining trees where possible. Where trees are to be retained, Tree Protection Zones (TPZs) will be established. TPZs protect the above and below ground parts of a tree during construction activities.

All native vegetation and trees to be removed will be offset, in compliance with the *Guidelines for the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation* (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, 2017).

Vegetation will be planted to maintain biodiversity within the Project area.

Environmental management measures will be implemented to monitor, control and offset impacts to vegetation.

Table 40 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions would like the existing vegetation in the project area to be retained or replanted.	The Glen Waverley rail corridor presents a narrow area for construction, meaning vegetation and tree removal will be required. Where vegetation removal cannot be avoided, LXP will comply with all vegetation and offset controls as specified in conditions 4.2.2 & 4.2.3 in the Toorak Road, Kooyong Level Crossing Removal Project Incorporated Document. The proposed rail over road off-line solution allows for space for replacement planting, which would not have been available for other options given the narrow width of the rail corridor.

9. Traffic / Transport

9.1 Local (road) access

9.1.1 Description of issue raised

While many residents raised concern about local road access during construction, multiple submissions raised concern for operational road access outside of construction times. This suggests that residents consider that local roads will return to normal operation once the Project has reached completion.

Table 41 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Local (road) access	30	11%

9.1.2 Response

The Project will assess the impact of the level crossing removal on local roads and ensure local roads will be unaffected or reinstated should they be physically impacted by the Project.

Table 42 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Most submissions raised concern for the current traffic congestion on local roads and would like improved traffic conditions.</p> <p>Multiple submissions raised concern over controlling the traffic from Talbot Crescent turning on the Monash Freeway.</p> <p>Multiple submissions raised concern for local residents to safely make right hand turns onto Toorak Road (from Talbot Crescent and Elizabeth Street).</p> <p>One submission requested the left-out access of Talbot Crescent to Toorak Road be removed.</p>	<p>The Project will result in alteration of the design of Talbot Crescent’s intersection with Toorak Road. The final design of this intersection is currently under detailed design investigation with relevant stakeholders to ensure the new design is safe and functional.</p> <p>The Project scope does not include changes to the Elizabeth Street intersection or other local roads along Toorak Road. These intersections can be reviewed by VicRoads and Stonnington City Council, separate to the Project.</p>
<p>One submission would like the addition of traffic lights to optimise traffic flow from Toorak Road to local roads.</p>	<p>The Project will work with VicRoads to implement efficient and safe traffic signal operation which provides an appropriate balance of movement for arterial road traffic, local roads and pedestrian and bicycle movements.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested a traffic strategy that reduces the amount of through traffic on local roads (rat running), with particular regard to Talbot Crescent.</p>	<p>The arrangement of the Talbot Crescent intersection is currently under design and investigation with relevant stakeholders.</p>

9.2 Traffic flow

9.2.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submission raised general concerns about the flow of traffic, raising issues relating to traffic flow to and from Toorak Road and surrounding local streets. Many submissions requested the addition of extra lanes, road widening, reduced speed limits, traffic calming measures and general road alterations.

Table 43 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Traffic flow	64	23%

9.2.2 Response

Table 44 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with the flow of traffic in either direction on Toorak Road, particularly entering and exiting the Monash Freeway.</p> <p>Multiple submissions were concerned with how LXP will handle the bottleneck at Glenferrie and Toorak Roads.</p> <p>One submission raised that more cars may start using local streets as a result of the Project.</p> <p>One submission requested widening Toorak Road to allow for increased vehicle volumes.</p> <p>One submission requested aligning Elizabeth Street on the north and south side of Toorak Road so traffic and pedestrians can cross Toorak Road safely.</p>	<p>Removal of the level crossing will improve the traffic movement to and from the Monash Freeway as it relieves a significant congestion point in close proximity to the on and off ramps of the freeway.</p> <p>With the removal of the congestion point at Toorak Road, there will be a flow on effect to ease the congestion at the intersection of Toorak and Glenferrie Roads. As the Project is limited to the removal of the level crossing, there are no works proposed at the corner of Toorak and Glenferrie Roads by LXP.</p> <p>The Project is not widening the current cross section of Toorak Road as part of the current scope of works. It is understood VicRoads are constantly reviewing traffic flow through this area of Toorak Road.</p> <p>There are no current plans to adjust the local access other than required adjustments to the Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road intersection as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Management of broader existing traffic issues and concerns are beyond the scope of the Project.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested traffic calming measures be implemented in local streets to stop speeding motorists and increase safety for pedestrians.</p>	<p>The installation of traffic calming measures in local streets is the responsibility of the City of Stonnington or City of Boroondara respectively and is outside the scope of the Project</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with traffic flow turning from Talbot Crescent, Elizabeth Street and Avenel Road onto Toorak Road, requesting traffic lights or roundabouts be added as the removal of the boom</p>	<p>There are no current plans to adjust the local access other than required adjustments to the Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road intersection. There are ongoing discussions with VicRoads and the local</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
gates will make it more difficult to turn onto Toorak Road.	council in relation to the final design of this intersection. Management of broader existing traffic issues and concerns are beyond the scope of the Project.
One submission raised concern over the function of the Toorak Road intersection after removal of the level crossing.	Presumably, this is referring to the intersection of the road and rail (the level crossing). The level crossing will be completely removed by the Project, thereby enabling a significant improvement in traffic flow.
One submission requested upgrading the traffic lights at Toorong Road to improve traffic flow.	Upgrading of traffic lights at Toorong Road is beyond the scope of this Project.

9.3 Bicycle or pedestrian paths

9.3.1 Description of issue raised

Connectivity and safe pedestrian access was frequently raised in submissions. Many of the submissions referred to existing challenges for pedestrians, particularly when crossing Toorak Road. Multiple submissions raised the opportunity to connect or link nearby parklands through the use of public open space under the rail bridge. A number of submissions expressed a desire for pedestrian access to consider people of all abilities and those with mobility issues.

Improvements to access and connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians moving through the area was a concern for 25 per cent of submitters.

Table 45 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Bicycle or pedestrian paths	69	25%

9.3.2 Response

The Project's proposed solution provides the opportunity to increase pedestrian connectivity by developing open spaces alongside the rail corridor and under the rail bridges, as well as improving a shared cycle and pedestrian connections.

Responses to the specific issues relating to cycling and pedestrian connections are listed in Table 46.

Table 46 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions were concerned for the safety of pedestrians, particularly safety at pedestrian crossings.	The Project's preferred solution for a rail bridge will allow for better cross-corridor connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists since connections can be made

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with the proposed design on pedestrian crossings at the intersection of Toorak Road and the Monash Freeway, requesting a pedestrian crossing connect the north and south sides of Toorak Road west of the rail bridge.</p>	<p>along the entire length of the rail bridge instead of restricted to a limited number of bridges across a trench. The rail bridge will support pedestrian and cyclist accessibility through increased connectivity and opportunities for activation that encourage walkability.</p> <p>The Project will, where possible, include improvements to surrounding bicycle paths to facilitate a safer and more enjoyable cycling and pedestrian experience. The detailed design stage of the Project will use the information captured in the submissions along with information from future stakeholder consultation to determine the final design.</p> <p>The location of the pedestrian crossing is subject to further design and investigation with the road authority to achieve a safe crossing point on Toorak Road.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested bicycle facilities are accessible to all riders, particularly school children.</p> <p>One submission would like a bike path under the rail bridge from Kooyong to Tooronga Stations.</p>	<p>The rail over road solution provides additional open space along the Glen Waverley line. The rail over road solution may also facilitate addition of a shared user path under the rail line to improve safety and capacity. The exact design and placement of the infrastructure will be further refined during detailed delivery stage.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested upgrades to the pedestrian and bike path facilities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved lighting • separated pedestrian and cycling paths • elevated shared user paths • better connection • safer pedestrian movement along Glen Waverley line • Pedestrian activated road crossings • Improved connection across the Monash Freeway (between Talbot Crescent and Auburn Road). 	<p>The Project's proposed solution for a rail bridge will allow for better cross-corridor connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists since connections can be made along the entire length of the rail bridge instead of restricted to a limited number of bridges across a trench. The rail bridge will support pedestrian and cyclist accessibility through increased connectivity and opportunities for activation that encourage walkability.</p> <p>The Project scope does not include pedestrian overpasses or underpasses at road intersections. Pedestrian, cycling and shared user paths will be designed and developed to provide the safe, easy and convenient connection across roads. The final design of all paths will be determined in the detailed design stage of the Project.</p> <p>The project design will incorporate cyclist and pedestrian paths to provide safe movement and connectivity within the project area. This includes a safe crossing point of Toorak Road.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised concern over the need to install traffic lights that are activated by pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>The location of the pedestrian and cyclist crossing is subject to further design and investigation with VicRoads and the Stonnington City Council to achieve a safe crossing point on Toorak Road.</p>
<p>One submission was concerned with the effect of</p>	<p>Environmental controls in line with EPA requirements</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
stormwater runoff from the Project on Gardiners Creek Trail.	will be in place to ensure no adverse impacts of stormwater runoff to Gardiners Creek as part of the Project. Environmental matters will be considered in the EMS, which is proposed to be required as a condition of the Incorporated Document.
Multiple submitters would like better bike and pedestrian connectivity across the railway line.	The proposed elevated rail solution will result in improved pedestrian connectivity across the rail corridor in the east-west direction by removing the level crossing and providing direct and improved pedestrian connectivity.
One submission would like more secure pedestrian crossings at Tooronga Station.	Pedestrian crossing works at Tooronga Station are out of the Project scope.

9.4 Car parking

9.4.1 Description of issue raised

Concerns relating to car parking were raised by three submissions. Some submissions highlighted specific locations where they would like to see an increase in car parking:

- Submissions raised concern at the parking impact on local residences and businesses during construction; and
- Submissions were not supportive of using potential open space for additional parking.

Table 47 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Car parking	3	1%

9.4.2 Response

The Project will reinstate existing car parking numbers – there will be no net loss of car parking spaces within the wider area post construction of the Project but there will be no additional spaces created. Stonnington and Boroondara City Councils are responsible for the management of parking restrictions within the local road network and will be consulted if the Project identifies a need to change these restrictions during construction.

Table 48 specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Submissions requested the new open space could be used for additional parking for Kooyong Station. One submission requested that the new open space is not used for additional car parking and infrastructure	New open space is not proposed to be used for car parking purposes. The existing number of car parking spaces at the Kooyong and Tooronga Stations will be reinstated post construction of the Project. Stonnington and Boroondara Councils are responsible for on road car parking in their respective

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
purposes.	municipalities.

10. Property Impacts

10.1 Compensation

10.1.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions requested compensation for impacts and disturbance to their properties during construction.

Table 49 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Compensation	5	2%

10.1.2 Response

A detailed response to concerns regarding compensation is provided in Table 50.

Table 50 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions requested compensation for disturbance during construction.</p> <p>One submission was concerned with impacts to parking and construction noise to residents on Talbot Crescent, and requested compensation.</p>	<p>Compensation is not offered for construction impacts. Instead LXP will have a series of mitigation measures including relocations during noisy works, traffic management plans, water carts to reduce dust etc., to reduce construction impact on the local community as much as possible.</p>
<p>One submission would like compensation for triple glazed windows for properties where the train line becomes closer.</p>	<p>All level crossing removal projects to date have considered noise in the design phase of the project, and various projects have used a combination of different measures to reduce noise, including the use of U-trough structures on elevated rail and rail bridges.</p> <p>Noise mitigation measures, if required, on the Toorak Road project will be based on baseline noise data, noise modelling, and the project's requirement to adhere to the Victorian Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy 2013. It is not currently expected that installation of double glazing on nearby properties will be required to meet Policy requirements.</p>

10.2 Reduction in property value

10.2.1 Description of issue raised

Impacts to private property were a concern raised in several submissions. Generally, submitters were concerned that a change to the level crossing would negatively impact property prices.

Table 51 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Reduction in property value	17	6%

10.2.2 Response

Predicted impacts on value for specific properties as a result of the Project can only be speculative, however improved transport infrastructure and new public spaces are considered to be a benefit to communities. A detailed response to concerns about reductions in property values is provided in Table 52.

Table 52 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions raise a general concern about affects to property values, including a reduction in property values associated with a rail over road design.</p>	<p>Property values are affected by prevailing market conditions and influenced by many factors other than infrastructure development. Given the many different factors that influence property values generally, speculation about long-term impacts on property prices from the Project, whether positive or negative, can only be conjecture.</p> <p>However, the Project will benefit nearby properties including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing congestion on local roads and decrease in travel times; • providing safer pedestrian connections; • improving pedestrian and cyclist amenities; • stimulating the local economy with temporary increase in labour to the area during construction; and • improving urban amenity through consideration of urban design treatments.

10.3 Associated developments

10.3.1 Description of issue raised

Both concern about and support for associated development along the rail corridor was provided within the submissions.

Table 53 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Associated developments	4	1%

10.3.2 Response

The Project does not propose any development beyond transport infrastructure. All future developments throughout the area are regulated by the application of the Stonnington and Boroondara Planning Schemes.

Table 54 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions believe that a capped trench solution will allow for future land development of residential and commercial properties to meet the housing and job demand.	<p>Although a capped trench with a structural decking could create additional land for development within the Kooyong area, such a design is not feasible for this Project.</p> <p>Constructing a capped trench would require a deeper and longer trench, which would impact additional existing level crossings which remain outside the Project scope. A range of additional requirements including, fire and ventilation systems would increase the cost and reduce feasibility for the Project. Further, it is likely that a capped trench would not provide for as much replacement landscaping opportunity as the rail over road solution.</p>

11. Construction Impacts

Submissions frequently raised non-specific concerns about the impact of noise, dust or vibration during the construction works. Several submissions raised concerns over the impacts construction would have on the ability of pedestrians and cyclists to move around the area, in particular crossing between each side of the tracks.

A number of submissions noted the likely impact on public transport services. During construction the availability of parking for local residents may be impacted by the extent of the worksites required and the presence of construction vehicles in the area.

The Project will cause traffic disruptions at certain times during the removal of the level crossing. Submissions were concerned with the presence of trucks associated with construction works moving through the local area and the impact that would have on the local road network and the community. A significant number of submissions raised concerns about the level of impact that such disruptions will generate. These included:

- Traffic management during construction;
- Disruptions and congestion on Toorak Road and adjacent streets during construction;
- Increased 'rat-running' in residential streets; and
- Concerns about road closures.

A range of other construction issues were raised by respondents with safety concerns, general disruption concerns, concerns with potential building damage and a desire for ongoing communication with affected residents to occur throughout construction being the most common responses.

11.1 General construction concern

11.1.1 Description of issue raised

Table 55 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
General construction concern	17	6%

11.1.2 Response

Table 56 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised concern that rail-over has significantly more disruptions during construction than rail-under.	The multi criteria assessment of the three shortlisted options (rail over road, rail under road and hybrid option) demonstrated that the rail over road solution has the least construction impacts in relation to time required for road and rail closures. Rail over road avoids extensive excavation works, resulting in fewer overall potential impacts from construction noise, vibration, dust and additional truck movements.

One submission raised concern over the impact of light from construction activity after hours.

The lighting equipment to be used by the project will be positioned and designed to ensure the direction of light is in to the project land therefore avoiding direct light into nearby residences.

11.2 Noise and / or vibration

11.2.1 Description of issue raised

Most submissions raised non-specific concerns about the impact of noise and vibration during the construction works for the Project. Submissions were generally related to impacts to local residents during construction. Specific concerns are examined in Table 57.

Table 57 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Noise and / or vibration	19	7%

11.2.2 Response

Table 58 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions raised concerns about construction noise impacts, particularly during the night.</p> <p>One submission raised concern over not being supplied adequate information on the construction noise impacts.</p>	<p>Noise and vibration are at times unavoidable on major infrastructure projects. However, works will be planned with due consideration to the amenity of nearby stakeholders and monitoring will be completed to ensure compliance with EPA guidelines and with engagement required by the EMS which will be a condition in the Incorporated Document.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested relocation when construction noise and disturbances occur.</p>	<p>The management of construction impacts such as noise and vibration will be in accordance with the Project's Construction Environmental Management Plan, Environmental Management Strategy and EPA requirements.</p> <p>The Project will implement a Construction Noise Risk Action Plan with detailed mitigation measures to ensure impacts to residents and the community are minimised as far as practicable. The Plan will be implemented to the Project workforce at toolbox and pre-start meetings. Noise minimisation methods will be implemented during construction to manage noise.</p> <p>Regular noise monitoring will be carried out throughout the construction period to ensure that the Project team is proactive regarding noise concerns.</p> <p>Relocation is not expected to be required, however will be considered as an option if impact is higher than the requirements specified by EPA.</p>

11.3 Disruption to public transport

11.3.1 Description of issue raised

Many submissions raised concern with the construction impacts on public transport, in particular how the Project will affect their daily commute. The Project will implement a train replacement bussing strategy during periods of rail occupation. The bussing strategy will be determined following a decision on the design solution and the associated shutdowns required. Reducing public transport disruption is a significant consideration for the Project team.

Table 59 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Disruption to public transport	5	2%

11.3.2 Response

Table 60 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>One submission requested free public transport during the construction period to offset disruptions.</p>	<p>The Project will tailor the program to minimise disruption to all transport modes during construction. However, when planned disruptions occur on the public transport system, the Project will offer free alternative transport (such as train replacement busses) to connect the passengers to their destinations.</p> <p>In maintaining consistency with other level crossing removal projects, standard transport fares will remain in place when public transport services are not disrupted by construction works.</p>
<p>One submitter would like adequate notification of replacement services and alternative transport routes available.</p>	<p>The Project will have a comprehensive communications and engagement strategy to inform the community of any transport interruptions well in advance of the event.</p> <p>In maintaining consistency with other level crossing removal projects, residents and commuters will be informed through a variety of means and the following outlets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LXR website • Public Transport Victoria application • Social media • Email updates • Station signage • Advertisements in local papers • Advertisements on radio stations

11.4 Traffic and access disruption

11.4.1 Description of issue raised

The Project will cause traffic disruptions at certain times during the removal of the level crossing. A number of submissions raised concerns about the level of impact that such disruptions will generate. These included:

- Disruptions to already congested roads.
- Increased ‘rat-running’ in residential streets.
- On-street parking in local streets.
- Concerns about road closures.

Table 61 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Traffic and access disruption	24	9%

11.4.2 Response

LXRP is working closely with VicRoads and Stonnington and Boroondara City Councils to develop an integrated road and rail solution. There will be traffic disruption at times to facilitate construction, however LXRP is committed to keeping the community informed regarding the impacts of this disruption and will endeavour to minimise delays to the maximum extent practicable.

Table 62 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions raised concerns about the construction impact on local roads within the Project area.</p> <p>Multiple submissions raised concerns over surrounding arterial roads becoming congested as a result of construction works.</p> <p>Multiple submissions requested to minimise construction impacts on pedestrian and bike paths.</p> <p>One submission would like Glenferrie Road to become a Clearway during construction.</p> <p>Multiple submissions would like “Local Traffic Only” signs to be placed on Talbot Crescent and Elizabeth Street during construction.</p> <p>One submission suggested closing off the Monash Freeway exit lanes at Toorak Road during construction.</p>	<p>To mitigate and manage the impact of construction on traffic, the Project will develop a Traffic Management Strategy. At each construction site a Traffic Management Plan will be developed to ensure localised traffic disruptions are managed efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>This management strategy will plan and control the appropriate use of local streets to limit the impact of construction on residents.</p> <p>A communications strategy will identify the lead-in times for community notice if the road network is to be impacted.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions raised concern over on-street parking availability during construction.</p>	<p>Prior to the commencement of construction, a Traffic Management Strategy will be developed to ensure that property access and on-street parking is maintained throughout the Project. The Traffic Management</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
	Strategy and haulage plans will form part of the overall traffic management plan to mitigate the impact of construction on residents and businesses.
Multiple submissions requested construction is finished promptly to minimise disruption to traffic.	<p>Construction works are anticipated to commence in 2019 and be completed in 2020.</p> <p>While there will be disruptions during the construction period, LXP is committed to keeping the community informed and minimising construction impacts to the extent practicable.</p>

11.5 Parking availability

11.5.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions were concerned that construction vehicles will occupy residential car parking spaces. This comment was commonly linked with concerns about the impact this will have on local street parking. Other concerns raised related to the reinstatement of car parking following the completion of the Project.

Table 63 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Parking availability	4	1%

11.5.2 Response

During construction there will be unavoidable impacts on surrounding street car parking availability. The extent of this disruption is not yet known and will be determined once construction methods are established. Where possible, LXP will offset occupied car parking in appropriate locations. Once construction is completed LXP will reinstate or replace all car parks.

Table 64 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions raised concern about construction workers parking on Talbot Crescent and Toorong Road.	There will not be potential for construction workers to park their vehicles on Talbot Crescent between Elizabeth Street and Toorak Road because the road will be required for access to construction works by heavy construction vehicles. It is anticipated that construction workers will be required to park in a dedicated off-road car parking area.

11.6 Truck movements

11.6.1 Description of issue raised

One submission was received concerning truck movements. The submission raised concerns about the impact that increased heavy vehicle movements during construction will have on the resident's property.

Table 65 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Truck movements	1	0.5%

11.6.2 Response

Where possible, heavy vehicle movements on local roads will be kept to a minimum. Haulage routes will be carefully considered and will comply with all requirements of the road management authority.

11.7 Business impact

11.7.1 Description of issue raised

During the level crossing removal, there is potential for the Project to impact on local businesses. LXRP will undertake a significant process of consultation with business owners in the area close to the level crossing removal to inform them of the likely extent of any potential impacts and to understand the concerns of business owners and how they can be supported through this process. Submissions expressed concern at the impact construction works will have on local traders and requested that this impact be limited.

Table 66 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Business impact	1	0.5%

11.7.2 Response

LXRP will minimise disruption to local businesses during construction.

By engaging with traders early, the Project will be better positioned to roll out helpful campaigns during construction, allowing local businesses to have ownership over the campaign and prepare for any construction impacts.

Table 67 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised issues of construction and operational noise effecting their business.	Refer to section 6.4.2.

11.8 Project program / delays

11.8.1 Description of issue raised

Several submissions raised concerns over the length of the program and the resultant impacts that construction would have on local residents and the wider community.

Table 68 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Project program / delays	5	2%

11.8.2 Response

A majority of submissions relating to the construction program and delays were concerned about the timing of works and the impact this will have on their day to day lives, as shown in Table 69.

Table 69 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
Multiple submissions raised concern at the length of the construction timeframe.	<p>A key objective of the Project is to minimise construction duration. If works are confined to school holidays and/or off-peak periods the construction program and duration of consequent impacts would be significantly increased. Construction works are anticipated to commence in 2019 and be completed in 2020.</p> <p>Whilst there will be disruptions during the construction period, LXRП is committed to keeping the community informed and providing appropriate temporary provisions.</p>

11.9 Impact on services

11.9.1 Description of issue raised

Table 70 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Impact on services	1	0.5%

11.9.2 Response

One submission raised the impact to services under Toorak Road, particularly disagreeing that these services could not be moved for to allow for a rail under road design option.

Table 71 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission disagreed that services under Toorak Road could not be moved, preventing a rail under road option.	The underground utility services can be moved, however this is at significant cost and would add an additional 25 months to the Project's program, given the technical complexities associated with relocating utilities.

11.10 Construction safety

11.10.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions raised general concerns of the safety of their property and surrounding streets during construction.

Table 72 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Construction safety	4	1%

11.10.2 Response

Safety during construction is the Project's highest priority. Ensuring safe construction and operation of the Project through Safety in Design assessment and risk identification is central to the design process. The project will ensure activities are closely monitored and separated clearly from the public domain to ensure the public are safe near the construction activity.

11.11 Temporary disruption to public open space

11.11.1 Description of issue raised

The Project has identified Tooronga Park, Ferrie Oval, Paterson Reserve and the reserve on the corner of Talbot Crescent and Toorak Road as temporary occupation areas during the construction period, as equipment and material laydown areas.

Table 73 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Temporary disruption to public open space	5	2%

11.11.2 Response

Multiple submissions raised concerns about accessibility to open space during construction, as outlined in Table 74.

Table 74 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions raised that the impact to surrounding reserves must be minimised.</p> <p>One submission raised that the impact to laydown areas including surrounding reserves will be forever impacted.</p>	<p>LXRP has identified the Project may temporarily acquire up to four surrounding public open space Reserves (as listed above) during the construction period as equipment and material laydown areas. These areas are may be used as there is limited alternative vacant land in the locality.</p> <p>The area of land for laydown areas will be minimised because there are costs to the Project for temporary occupation and re-instatement of these areas. Following the completion of the project and demobilisation of the laydown areas, reserves that were used will be reinstated to existing or improved conditions.</p>

12. Consultation

12.1 Lack of consultation on design

12.1.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions raised concerns about consultation undertaken by the Project. Many submissions raised that due to the significant environmental and constructional impact caused by the Project, the community should have been consulted prior to the PSA to provide input on the option preference. Many of these consultation concerns were raised in relation to the lack of general consultation prior to announcing a preferred design solution.

Table 75 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Lack of consultation on design	41	15%

12.1.2 Response

Part A of this report contains a full summary of LXP’s consultation program for the Project to date.

LXP will seek community feedback to ensure that the detailed design remains responsive to community and stakeholder feedback. Additionally, the Project has, and will continue to, consult with the stakeholders throughout the design and delivery of the Project.

Table 76 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned with the lack of consultation undertaken for the Project to date.</p> <p>Multiple submissions were concerned with a lack of consultation on the preferred design solution (rail-over).</p>	<p>The options for removing the level crossings at Toorak Road, Kooyong have been carefully considered to take into account the particular characteristics of the site, the specific benefits and impacts of each design option, and feedback provided by local government and state government authorities.</p> <p>With the rail over road option assessed as clearly being the superior overall solution for the project, a decision was made not to consult with the community over the design solution. This was to ensure consultation did not mislead the community on potential solutions, or on what is negotiable. The Premier of Victoria formally announced on the 13 February 2019 the Project will be a rail over road solution. Community consultation on negotiable elements including use of open space, landscaping and walking and cycling connections followed the Premier’s announcement to commence discussions on detailed design for the rail over road solution.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions requested dimensioned plans of the rail-over design and additional architectural</p>	<p>Further consultation and information will be provided to the community to determine community views on</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
drawings looking from the direction of properties on Milton Parade and Talbot Crescent.	the design during the detailed design of the Project.
One submission would like clarity of Project timelines once known.	The community will be advised of construction timelines once they are more certain.
Multiple submissions would like further community engagement for the remainder of the Project.	The Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA) consultation period was open from 18 February to 18 March 2019. This consultation plan followed the standard consultation approach for a PSA by directly notifying residents, businesses and landowners within 250m of the Project area. This is consistent with the standard PSA consultation process for all other LXP projects to date, and there were no specific aspects of this Project that meant additional consultation was deemed necessary. Further community consultation and engagement will be ongoing throughout detailed design and construction.

12.2 Consultation Material and Approach

12.2.1 Description of issue raised

A number of submissions raised concerns about the consultation approach and materials presented to the community. A view expressed in multiple submissions was that there was a lack of consultation before the preferred design option was released. Some submissions also expressed a desire for more detailed representations of the design option during community consultation, and in distributed communication materials, to develop a better understanding of the Project.

Table 77 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Consultation material and approach	23	8%

12.2.2 Response

Part A of this report provides a detailed summary of the tailored community consultation that has been undertaken to date for the Project.

The preferred design solution has considered complex technical, environmental, due-diligence and construction impact matters. The rationale for the preferred design solution is discussed in the design section of this report. LXP acknowledges that the nature and scale of major transport infrastructure projects will result in an outcome that will not satisfy every member of the community. Notwithstanding thus, LXP is committed to engaging with the community and relevant stakeholders in a meaningful and constructive way and being responsive to identified concerns and feedback.

Table 78 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Multiple submissions would like access to detailed representations of the rail-over design.</p>	<p>Further consultation and information will be provided to the community to determine community views on the preferred design during the detailed design of the Project.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions were concerned that the consultation approach was not adequate.</p> <p>One submission was concerned that the public has been misled in regard to information supporting a rail-over design approach.</p>	<p>After a detailed options assessment, it has been decided that the dangerous level crossing at Toorak Road will be removed by building a rail bridge over Toorak Road.</p> <p>There are a number of technical and environmental site constraints at Toorak Road, which were important considerations in determining the design solution. The elevated rail design solution provides the quickest construction schedule, least disruption to road and rail users, new open space beneath the rail line, and better connections for drivers, passengers, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The information provided to the public explaining the reason for the design solution came from geotechnical investigations and site surveys, as well as a detailed options assessment conducted by the North Eastern Program Alliance’s engineering and design teams.</p>
<p>Multiple submissions would like a consistent, transparent and genuine consultation approach through planning and construction phases of the Project.</p>	<p>Further opportunities for the community to provide feedback will be established during the detailed design phase, where a detailed design solution will be presented to the community and they will have the opportunity to provide comment on more specific details of the design.</p> <p>Community members can subscribe to project updates at http://levelcrossings.vic.gov.au/subscribe and follow LXRP on social media to stay up to date with the Project’s progress.</p>

13. Planning and Approval Process

13.1 Planning approval process

13.1.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions were concerned with the PSA process, raising that the PSA was being implemented without providing full details and information about the Project to residents.

Table 79 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Planning approval process	3	1%

13.1.2 Response

Options for removal of the level crossing were subjected to a Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) which indicated that a rail over road solution represents the best outcome for the Project. Due to the constraints of the other options (rail under road and hybrid road over rail), it was appropriate that the design solution be announced prior to detailed community consultation on the design. This was to ensure that any discussions with community members was clear and did not mislead the community on what potential design solutions were being considered. The Premier of Victoria formally announced on the 13 February 2019 the Project will be a rail over road solution. Community consultation followed the Premier's announcement to commence discussions on detailed design for the rail over road solution.

Community members can subscribe to project updates at <http://levelcrossings.vic.gov.au/subscribe> and follow LXRP on social media to stay up to date with the Project's progress.

Table 80 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission requested that the Planning Scheme is not amended.	Relevant planning schemes have been amended for other level crossing removal projects. The Incorporated Document proposed to be introduced by the amendment contains conditions with which the Project must comply. Amending the planning scheme provides for a single, coordinated approval for the Project. This is considered to be an appropriate approach given the Project is part of a state-significant transport infrastructure program.

13.2 Positive comment on the project

13.1.1 Description of issue raised

A number of submissions praised the Project for eliminating a dangerous and heavily congested level crossing. A view expressed in multiple submissions was that although they would prefer a rail under road or rail tunnel design solution, they understand the constraints associated with this solution and continued to show support for the Project. Most submissions support the Project as it will relieve traffic congestion, is a cost effective option and will be delivered in a time efficient manner.

Table 81 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Positive comment on the Project	13	5%

13.1.2 Response

Table 82 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised that although the Project is a great idea it has taken a long time to deliver.	Considerable time has been expended in considering options for removal of the level crossing and then analysing the options to determine a preferred option.

13.3 Amendment Documentation

13.3.1 Description of issue raised

Multiple submissions provided feedback on information within the PSA documentation that reference project works including demolition, buildings and works, landscaping, heritage, subdivision and relevant construction methodologies.

Table 83 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Amendment documentation	5	3%

13.3.2 Response

The responses generally raised specific concerns with the incorporated document as outlined in Table 84 below.

Table 84 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
A submission from VicRoads suggested amendments to Condition 2.4.7-9 in the Incorporated Document. These relate to creating and altering access to roads or works within a Public Acquisition Overlay (Road) and development and use of construction access points. The submission also questioned whether it should be a party to preparation of the Environmental Management Strategy (EMS) or whether LXP is comfortable with VicRoads using its powers under the	<p>Amendment of clause 4.2.1 of the Incorporated Document to include VicRoads as a party to the EMS is not required because VicRoads' powers under the Road Management Act will be covered by a future works agreement.</p> <p>LXP agrees to the amendment of clause 4.2.7 of the Incorporated Document to clarify that creation or alteration of access to a road in Road Zone Category 1 (RDZ1) must be carried out to the satisfaction on</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>Road Management Act to protect its interests.</p>	<p>VicRoads where VicRoads is the acquiring authority.</p> <p>LXRP agrees to the amendment of clause 4.2.9 of the Incorporated Document to refer to buildings, works or vegetation removal within a RDZ1 to be carried out to the satisfaction of VicRoads where VicRoads is the acquiring authority.</p>
<p>One submission raised the following issues within Amendment documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise issues in CI 4.2. CI 5.0 are presumptuous as the planning process is yet to be completed with satisfying conditions before works begin. • The Explanatory Report responding to objectives of planning in Victoria • The EMP is not available and there has been no consideration of local impacts. • Environmental Effects: no evidence to determine answers on pages 4 and 5. • Response to Ministerial Direction 11 needs more consultative approach. • Nothing addressing Local Planning Scheme clause on visual amenity and noise. 	<p>Noise issues are to be addressed through the Environmental Management Strategy (EMS) under Clause 4.2.1. This document will include mitigation measures to noise created by the project.</p> <p>Clause 5.0 lists minor works that can take place whilst the plans and documents in Clause 4.2 are awaiting approval. These works are included to ensure the area is prepared for core works to commence once the plans and documents have been approved by the relevant approving authority.</p> <p>The EMP must be prepared before substantive construction works begin and must include a summary of consultation that informed the preparation of the EMS.</p> <p>The Explanatory Report is required to include a discussion about how the amendment addresses strategic considerations. Detailed provision of supporting material or evidence is not required in the Explanatory Report. As set out material provided as part of the PSA, LXRP has undertaken detailed technical analysis to support the relevant conclusions and statements.</p> <p>Ministerial Direction 11 sets out issues to be addressed in the Explanatory Report. These are addressed under the relevant heading. Ministerial Direction 11 does not require consultation.</p> <p>Local Planning Scheme policies on noise and amenity are addressed in the section of the Explanatory Report on Local Planning Policy Framework and Municipal Strategic Statement.</p>
<p>One submission raised concern that works will commence prior to the EMS being approved without consulting the community as recommended in the VAGO Report (Dec 2017).</p>	<p>Works commencing prior to the endorsement of the EMS are restricted to site-establishment and facilitating the setup of the site ready for core works delivery. The purpose of the EMS is to ensure that the major works are conducted in an approved manner that has shown how it will mitigate the impacts to community and the environment. The EMS as approved by the Minister for Planning is required by clause 4.2.1 of the Incorporated Document to include details of engagement with the councils and community during construction of the Project.</p>

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised concern that the heritage signal box was not protected by provisions in the Incorporated Document.	The Project will endeavour to avoid all impact to the heritage listed Kooyong railway signal box and switch house within the rail reserve (HO473) where possible. Specific conditions in the Incorporated Document impose obligations if any heritage listed building is impacted.
One submission would like a Condition added to remove graffiti within 24 hours.	Graffiti removal is managed outside of the PSA approval, as a maintenance issue. This approach is consistent across all other level crossing removal projects.
One submission would like a Condition added to prevent works between 11pm-7am.	Works will generally be between 6am – 6pm. Due to the high disruption profile of rail and arterial road occupations, LXP may be required to sometimes work 24 hour days. Should works be required overnight, negotiations will take place with the EPA and affected residents on potential temporary compensation.

13.4 Other planning and approvals information

13.4.1 Description of issue raised

Table 85 below outlines other planning and approvals information that was not covered in section 13 of this report.

Table 85 Summary of submissions received

Area of submission	Submissions per issue	Percentage of total submissions raising this issue
Other planning and approvals information	3	1%

13.4.2 Response

Table 86 Specific issues and responses

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
One submission raised concern over their rights in stopping in the Project from commencing.	The Minister for Planning will consider submissions lodged and decide whether or not to approve the proposed PSA, having regard to LX RTP's responses to matters raised in submissions as set out in this report.
One submission raised concern with prioritising pedestrians and cyclists pursuant to the <i>Transport Integration Act 2010</i> and is not convinced it will occur	The Project makes provisions for reinstatement and enhancement of shared user paths in the vicinity of the level crossing removal in accordance with the

Nature of Specific Issue	Response
<p>on this Project.</p>	<p><i>Transport Integration Act 2010.</i></p>
<p>One submission raised that an EES should be undertaken for the Project for reasons including significant effect to trees, heritage, chronic health and displacement.</p>	<p>The project does not trigger an EES under the Ministerial Guidelines for Assessment of Environmental Effects under the <i>Environment Effects Act 1978</i>.</p>