

WGTP IAC HEARING

Noise & Vibration

Hearing Presentation of Evidence for City of Melbourne area / Port,
CityLink and City Connections Component

Darren Tardio

Octave Acoustics Pty Ltd



INSTRUCTIONS

- Review port, CityLink and city connections component
- Review EES and EPRs

CoM key concerns and submissions:

1. Appropriateness of EPRs
2. Wurundjeri Way extension - impacts in West Melbourne from operation and construction
3. Impacts at Urban Renewal Areas
4. Impacts due to changing traffic volumes on existing road network



BASIS OF EVIDENCE, KEY DOCUMENTS

- EES Review
 - Technical Report H
 - Map Book Series B & C
- Reference Documents
 - VicRoads:
 - Traffic Noise Reduction Policy (Document 88)
 - Road Design Note 06-01 (Document 90)
 - Traffic Noise Measurement Requirements (Document 89)
 - Previous Infrastructure Projects:
 - East West Link, Assessment Committee Report and Approval Decision
 - CityLink Concession Deed, Project Scope and Technical Requirements
 - Melbourne Metro Rail Project (MMRP), IAC Report and EPRs (Document 56)
 - Other Regulations and Guidelines:
 - EPA Publication 1254 (Document 91)
 - AS2107



NEW INFORMATION SINCE SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE

- Expert Conclave Report (Document 28)
 - Participated with M Stead & B Zerbst
- M Stead:
 - Statement of Evidence and Peer Review
 - Presentation (Document 87)
 - Recommendations (Document 93)
 - Noise level contours provided above proposed elevated roads through E-gate, 28.08.2017 email
 - Heavy vehicle volume percentage provided for Wurundjeri Way extension (7%), 29.08.2017 email
- D Munro
 - Expert Advice (Document 18)
- Revised EPRs
 - Version 3, 24.08.17 (Document 106)
 - Project Note No. 53 in relation to NVP1



CONCLAVE – ISSUES AGREED

Item	Recommendation	EPR Status
13	EPR NVP1 revised to delete 'internal' and to reference VicRoads RD-06-01.	Unresolved in V3 Refer Stead Recommendation No. 14
14	Part 1: EPR NVP1 to clarify 'Operational Phase'. Part 2: Date of assessment eligibility (<u>occupied</u>) inconsistent with generally agreed approach, including VicRoads (<u>planning</u>).	Part 1: Resolved in V3 NVP 1A Note: Reference only to 'noise barriers' being maintained. Recommend this be deleted. Part 2: Unresolved in V3 Refer Stead Recommendation No. 16
15	EPR NVP2 revised to require IREA to review and audit compliance monitoring	Unresolved in V3 Also recommended by D Munro in Document 18
16 (8)	EPR NVP3 to be consistent with MMRP NV21 and SC2.	Unresolved in V3 Refer Stead Recommendation No. 12
18 (6)	EPR NVP3 to include condition inspection.	Resolved in V3 NVP3 (Note: Conclave Item 6 not implemented in full) Also recommended by D Munro
19	EPR NVP4 revised to catch all 'other noise sensitive areas' in accordance with AS2107. Recommended deletion of 'Highly Sensitive Areas' reference.	Unresolved in V3 Refer Stead Recommendation No. 18



CONCLAVE – ISSUES DISAGREED

Item	Recommendation	Comment
12	EPR NVP1 to assess upper levels of multi-storey residential buildings.	Requires consideration of evidence by IAC. Issue also highlighted by D Munro in Document 18.
17	EPR NVP4 to include objective reference to 'inaudibility' for the purpose of informing the CNVMP during design and modelling. LA90 +0dB agreed with B Zerst (EPA). Agreed by all not required during compliance phase.	Requires consideration of evidence by IAC. Issue also highlighted by D Munro in Document 18.



SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED EPR REVISIONS NOT DRAFTED TO DATE

- NVP1
 - Not revised in V3 despite agreement from experts
 - Deletion of 'internal'
 - Reference to VicRoads RDN-06-01
 - Change assessment eligibility (planning approval to replace occupation of building)
- NVP2
 - Not revised in V3 despite agreement from experts
 - Reference to IREA
- NVP3
 - Not revised in V3 despite agreement from experts
 - Consistency with MMRP NV21
- NVP4
 - Not revised in V3 despite agreement from experts
 - Other sensitivities



SUMMARY OF OTHER MATTERS IN DISPUTE

1. NVP 1A only references 'noise barriers' to be maintained
2. Protection for Urban Renewal Areas / NVP1 reference to 'occupied' buildings
3. Mitigation to multi-storey residential buildings
4. Inaudibility assessment trigger



1. NVP 1A

- NVP 1A and PN53 references ‘noise barriers’ to be maintained (20 years).
 - Not clear if this limits maintenance responsibilities to comply with noise objective
 - What happens after 20 years if attenuation types (barriers, road surface) have reached end-of-life or have to be decommissioned for other reasons?
- **Recommendation: Delete ‘noise barriers’ reference so that maintenance of noise objective covers broader mitigation types**



2. Urban Renewal Areas

- Protection for Urban Renewal Areas / NVP1 Reference to ‘occupied’ buildings
 - Noise level contours shown in EES irrelevant to assess implications. Information provided by M Stead suggests >74dBA above elevated roads. Dependent on setback of buildings.
 - M Stead’s evidence is that ‘not practical’ to treat URA’s but agrees NVP1 wording is inconsistent with VicRoads approach to planning
 - Practical options do exist to reduce the noise (barriers, road surface, off-reservation treatments). It is possible to apply mitigation after road construction
 - Not a technical matter, a planning matter. ‘Agent-of-change’ principle with respect to onus of cost
 - NVP1 ‘occupied’ wording. VicRoads Policy as benchmark infers planning approval (not occupation) as agent-of-change division. Refer to Exceptions To Policy wording. M Stead agrees
 - Outside of my expertise as planning approval matter - a matter for the IAC to consider
- **Recommendation: IAC to consider appropriate planning rights and whether noise should be mitigated by WDA or by developers / local planning policy / PSP**



3. Multi-Storey Buildings

- Treatment to multi-storey residential buildings
 - Precedent: CityLink and East West Link (Committee recommendations and approved)
 - VicRoads Policy silent
 - VicRoads RDN-06-01 conflicting
 - D Munro recommends assessment at ‘most traffic noise affected habitable level’
 - Detached dwellings vs multiple occupancy buildings
 - Elevated roads can result in compliance assessment being conducted below the road level
- **Recommendation: IAC to consider appropriateness of VicRoads interpretation vs more recent decisions**



4. Inaudibility Assessment

- CNVMP 'inaudibility' assessment trigger
 - Numerical objective in modelling also recommended by EPA
 - Current target set in EES Technical Report H considered inappropriate by all experts (including Stead in examination)
 - Required to inform CNVMP of risk areas and areas triggering management actions prior to construction
 - Refer to M Stead Recommendation No. 11. How will 'high risk areas' be defined without appropriate modelling to begin with?
 - Without such reference or using Technical Report H:
 - CNVMP actions may not be triggered when they should be
 - Construction impact assessments reliant on retrospective actions
- **Recommendation: Note is added to NVP4 to the effect of:**
 - *For the purposes of informing the CNVMP, NVP3 and areas likely to be impacted, modelling shall assume inaudibility to be LA90 +0dB where there are no annoying tones, impulsive sounds or intermittent noises. No numerical definition is required during compliance monitoring.*



Conclusion

1. Still several matters unresolved in EPRs despite expert agreement for the most part
2. Given ambiguous and conflicting wording in policies and guidelines, which dwellings and/or areas are considered for protection from the Project is a planning matter for IAC consideration
3. IREA critical where assessments may be otherwise open to interpretation:
 - Assessment of inaudibility during night construction
 - Unavoidable / high impact works during construction and implementation of management actions
 - Operational and construction compliance monitoring
 - Feasible and Reasonable test for off-reservation treatments or application of VicRoads RDN-06-01

