Contents

1 Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 1
   1.1 The Inquiry and Advisory Committee ................................................................................. 1
   1.2 Terms of Reference and Role of the IAC ......................................................................... 1
   1.3 Exhibition ........................................................................................................................... 2
   1.4 Submissions .......................................................................................................................... 3
   1.5 Hearings .............................................................................................................................. 6
   1.6 Site inspections .................................................................................................................... 7
   1.7 The IAC’s approach to the task ......................................................................................... 7
   1.8 Project boundary .................................................................................................................. 7

2 The Project .................................................................................................................................... 9
   2.1 Project rationale .................................................................................................................. 9
   2.2 Project inception ................................................................................................................ 10
   2.3 Project description ............................................................................................................. 10

3 Legislative and Policy Context .................................................................................................. 14
   3.1 Legislative context ............................................................................................................. 14
   3.2 High level policy context ................................................................................................. 17

4 Traffic and Transport .................................................................................................................. 21
   4.1 Key issues.......................................................................................................................... 22
   4.2 Meeting Project Transport Objectives ......................................................................... 22
   4.3 Adequacy of the strategic transport modelling ................................................................. 29
   4.4 City connections .............................................................................................................. 32
   4.5 Port Connections ............................................................................................................. 39
   4.6 Millers Road, Brooklyn ..................................................................................................... 43
   4.7 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities .................................................................................... 47
   4.8 Construction Traffic Impacts ............................................................................................ 50
   4.9 Tolls ................................................................................................................................... 51
   4.10 Other issues ...................................................................................................................... 52
   4.11 Response to Terms of Reference ................................................................................... 52
   4.12 Recommendations .......................................................................................................... 53

5 Land Use and Infrastructure ...................................................................................................... 55
   5.1 Key issues.......................................................................................................................... 56
   5.2 Strategic Support and Consistency with State Planning Policy ............................................ 56
   5.3 Effect on the Brooklyn residential community ................................................................. 59
   5.4 Effect on Precinct 15 Urban Renewal Site, North Altona .................................................. 63
   5.5 Effect on Hyde Street Residential Properties .................................................................... 64
   5.6 Effects on Maribyrnong River in Footscray ....................................................................... 65
   5.7 Effects on E-Gate Urban Renewal Area ............................................................................ 70
   5.8 Effects on other urban renewal areas ................................................................................. 77
   5.9 Response to Terms of Reference ...................................................................................... 79
Mr Hunt gave evidence that the Footscray Road cross-section under the viaduct (Project) could be reduced.

(vi) Other submitters
The Hyde Street Residents Group\(^{45}\) submitted that diverting truck traffic from Francis Street to Hyde Street does not meet the Project objective of removing trucks from residential streets and that the LOS of F for the Francis Street/Hyde Street intersection was not acceptable.

There were several submissions that sought the inclusion of transit lanes on the West Gate Freeway.

4.2.2 Discussion
There was general agreement that the Project meets the transport objectives of improving transport capacity, improving connectivity to and from the west and moving freight from residential streets. With regard to the latter, the truck kilometre travelled by road category clearly shows that there is an overall reduction in trucks on residential streets. However, there are still some residential frontage, principally Millers Road and Williamstown Road, that will have increased truck volume as a result of the Project. This is primarily due to the full-time truck bans proposed in Yarraville and Footscray. The effects of those increases will need to be carefully managed. It will be important to enforce the truck bans to realise the full benefits of the Project.

There is a specific residual risk not identified in the EES in relation to the diversion of trucks onto Millers Road from the inner west streets. While it may be possible to mitigate some of the impacts on the adjacent residential community, this road will have a physical and environmental capacity limit that have not been explored in the EES. Further work should be undertaken to understand the residual risk, mitigation measures and to ensure that a solution to managing medium to long term growth in truck traffic between the Brooklyn/Tottenham industrial area and the Port is developed.

In this regard, it is noted that the Business Case for the Project\(^{46}\) includes a future Northern Corridor east-west link between the M80 and City Link, which may provide some relief in the long term.

Performance Targets
EPR TP1 contains a requirement to optimise design performance to “minimise adverse impact on travel time” and to “maintain, and where practicable, enhance the existing traffic movements at interchanges”.

In the EES Summary Report at page 15, it states that some of the key transport benefits include “significantly reducing peak period travel times” and “Reducing bus journey times”. The concept of reducing travel times is not reflected in EPR TP1.

---

\(^{45}\) Submission 192.

\(^{46}\) Document 68.
The EES contains LOS and DOS performance targets, yet accepted that these would not be met at a number of locations.

In making the decision that it was acceptable for some performance targets not be met, there was no assessment provided in the EES of any potential mitigation works to improve performance of the road network or any advice that such a decision was approved by the relevant road authorities. There was no evidence that the road authority may or may not seek to take action to improve performances, nor any assessment of whether the design of the Project may preclude future upgrades, or if there was any benefit in the Project seeking to actively facilitate, through its design[^47], any future upgrades.

Unlike performance targets set for noise and air quality, there are no performance targets in the EPR for traffic performance.

This EES is not related to a new land use where it may be appropriate to require mitigation only for the additional impacts caused to the road network by the development and not hold the developer responsible for the road authorities’ obligations to improve the arterial network. By contrast this Project is aimed at improvement of the road network itself to meet VicRoads’ obligations under the TI Act. The EES (Volume 1 section 1.1) recognises the “increasing pressure on Melbourne’s transport network, particularly the already constrained connections to, from and through the city’s west” and that the “Project is an important opportunity to deliver real improvements to Melbourne’s transport performance in the heavily used M1 corridor and relieving pressure on the West Gate Bridge”.

This Project, particularly by virtue of new bridges and other treatments, may make it difficult, or even potentially preclude future upgrades to intersections and freeway ramps and interchanges. For example, the proposed Wurundjeri Way extension overpass of Dudley Street has the potential to add a further constraint to widening Dudley Street as it utilises the full available road reservation within the Wurundjeri Way reserve to the south of Dudley Street. This is of particular concern given that this intersection is predicted to operate at a LOS of F with and without the Project, and the modelling has not fully considered the traffic impacts of the development of E-Gate, an urban renewal area identified in Plan Melbourne.

A 10-year period in the lifespan of a critical and large piece of infrastructure is very short. Providing a LOS D or a DOS of 0.9 would provide some spare capacity for further growth while balancing the impacts of cost and potential for other changes to road user behaviour that may occur over a longer time frame.

**Additional connections to the West Gate Freeway**

With respect to future freeway ramps at the Dohertys Road and Grieve Parade interchanges, such facilities may provide additional connectivity to the road network. The IAC considers based upon the evidence and submissions advanced, that the ramps are not required to meet the Project objectives.

[^47]: For example, by setting back bridge abutments to allow for future road widening.