

Submission Cover Sheet

North East Link Project EES IAC

357

Request to be heard?: yes

Full Name: Ross Nolan

Organisation: Aircar Industry

Affected property:

Attachment 1:

Attachment 2:

Attachment 3:

Comments: Hard copy submission - see attached

To Planning Panels Victoria North East Link Authority
Submission coversheet attached

From R Nolan.

Aircar Industry
30 Dublin Rd
East Ringwood
Vic 3135

Preliminary response to NELink EES public invitation .

This is a brief overview of the effects on indirect environmental factors likely to be caused by the proposed NELink after only briefly (2 hours) reading the material made available at the Whitehorse council library . The reports are far too voluminous for any person to comprehensively evaluate the accuracy of any of it and to deal with the obscure native fauna and flora detailed -- the basic issue is that in all that monumental detail there appears absolutely no consideration of technological advances that are now well underway that will definitely affect the future traffic flows and hence emissions and where they will be discharged (in terms of vertical dispersal and particularly above the trapping inversion level that corresponds to maximum loss of air quality)

The major technologies now approaching commercial adoption involved here are;-

Primarily *Flying* urban transport vehicles (google "urban air mobility" for an idea of the progress in this field . Uber Elevate . Google flying car, AIAA Urban Air Mobility conference et al) This firm is working on it's system of suburban personal air mobility that will compete with existing 'links' and road traffic and in doing so free up congested traffic that is the worst case for tailpipe emissions (the very reason for NELink/EWLink, et al IS congestion yet no notice has been taken of emerging technologies involving improved VEHICLES rather than just pathways for unchanged vehicles.

It is hoped that there are to be no monopolistic protection clauses in the contracts relating to NE Link such as that for City Link which prevents any competition and obliges the government to compensate the operator (Transurban) for any loss of projected future revenue (and breaches sect 93(0)2 of the Development Allowance Authority act)

By preventing airborne traffic the emissions are increased by creating congestion that need not be (the 'last 5%' of traffic flow prior to stop start/gridlock is the most damaging and causes the worst combustion efficiency and time of emission)

Secondarily there is the advent of Autonomous (self driving) vehicles which can reduce the amount of extra road space required -pooling of 'ride share' vehicles also can increase the average ridership per vehicle (Uber,Google and Tesla plus others are bringing this technology to market and major auto firms are planning to lease vehicles for public access)

Thirdly there are electric (battery or other) vehicles that will emit less en route pollution and may or may not become a significant fraction of the road vehicle population during the time of NELink .

The demographic maps of travel times versus geographic location and comparing public transport options against existing road and with NELink are quite interesting and make the case for "*non*" public transport ,as in buses trams and trains, but do not allow for the coming *public access* air and road vehicles (Airtaxis, Aircab, UberAir etc) which will largely not need NELink (only in the worst weather will full reversion to ground level 'crawling' be required -- and that case is so infrequent with modern synthetic vision/VR/GPS and other aids to not justify expensive roadworks such as NELink (see the European Union feasibility studies under "PPlane" and "Mycopter" or the NASA equivalents that all found airborne personal commuting to be viable and desirable. Googling key words will easily turn up more information .

None the less it is almost certain that the freeway/tollway building boom is going to proceed regardless of the possible partial obsolescence that will equally certainly occur early in the lifetime of these projects (they will likely be in excess of actual demand in the presence of new technology alternatives but inadequate in their absence (as are the existing other 'links' and freeways frequently derided as 'carparks') --given the lack of attention to any new transport technology and the inherent conservatism of government this outcome is predictable.

The damage done during the earthworks and drainage etc seem to form the major focus of the EES report even though shortlived during construction (and presumably rehabilitated afterwards) but the 'environmental' effects on humans might be the greater and on going ones if restrictive legislation is permitted to continue and deny Melbournians access to the most efficient transport corridor of all -the sky above them.

Time does not permit more comprehensive coverage of these so far overlooked issues but might be expanded on during hearings or otherwise (the treatment of earlier submissions and interactions with City Link, EWLink and so on gives no encouragement to go further either)

Thanks for the opportunity to at least inform you,

Ross Nolan for Aircar Industry.

4/6/2019

