Statement of Facts & Outcomes: Bulleen Road Precinct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date / Time</th>
<th>7 August 2019 at 2:30pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Attendees**
- Charmaine Dunstan (CD) – Traffix Group representing Marcellin College;
- Brett Young (BY) – Ratio representing Carey Grammar School;
- Valentine Gnanakone (VG) – One Mile Grid representing ALH Property Pty Ltd;
- Hilary Marshall (HM) – Ratio representing Manningham City Council;
- Andrew O’Brien (AOB) – O’Brien Traffic representing Manningham, Banyule and Whitehorse Councils;
- John Kiriakidis (JK) – GTA;
- Matt Hall (MH) – Department of Transport;
- Richard Fanning (RF) – Department of Transport;
- Tony Frodsham (TF) – SmedTech;
- Phoebe Hollins (PH) – GTA (as note keeper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Preliminaries | JK commenced the meeting by establishing that the conclave had been initiated following notification through Clayton Utz from Rigby Cooke requesting additional background and explanation on the alternative design for Bulleen Road tabled at technical note R34. JK outlined that in support of the conclave discussion, he had requested clarity from SmedTech on the following matters:
  * how the vehicular connection GTA recommended to the IAC between the Park and Ride and the Bulleen Road might be facilitated (i.e. extend the alternate concept plan to show more detail),
  * how access to Carey Grammar Sports Ground would be provided to the signalised intersection through Bulleen Park,
  * how the Veneto Club signalised access might function within that site (i.e. layout and configuration).

JK tabled a document, Alternative Design Option - Park & Ride Access, which had been provided to him earlier in the day, which provides additional detail as outlined above.

JK advised he had no fixed view on how the meeting would be run and would be guided by CD as her client had initiated the meeting. JK suggested one meeting objective should include a common understanding of how the Reference and Alternative Designs should be interpreted (i.e. how will the function including what circulating paths are provided between and to individual land use user groups).

CD expressed concern about the uncertainty around the potential implications of the Alternative Designs as the EES was based on the Reference Design and suggested that the meeting could be used to provide clarity on matters such as construction, access and modelling completed to date. |
| 2    | Key Issues / Discussion topics | • Loss of Marcellin College’s Bulleen Road Street Address
• Design drivers of Alternative Design
• Construction
• Modelling
• Vehicle and pedestrian access from Park and Ride Facility |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Loss of Marcellin College’s Bulleen Road Address</th>
<th>CD stated concern about the potential for the Alternative Design to alter Marcellin College’s street address and expressed a preference to maximise the Bulleen Road street address.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Drivers of Alternative Design</td>
<td>TF outlined that the two drivers for the development of the Alternative Design were to reduce construction impacts and reduce the need for the tunnel component of the Project to pass under Bulleen Road twice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>CD expressed concern that the EES did not provide discussion on the side-track that was shown in tabled doc 132. TF stated that there was no detail or understanding at the time of preparation of the TTIA, however, as the Project progressed it became apparent that to construct the Reference Design, it is likely a side-track on the east side of Bulleen Road will need to be built to maintain Bulleen Road functionality during construction of the tunnel. JK outlined that his advice was that the side-track was estimated to be required for three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>CD sought clarification on the level of analysis and modelling that underpinned the preparation of the Alternative Design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ITEM OUTCOME: NOTED.**
JK stated that earlier conclave agreements around the collection of updated traffic data including weekend data remain valid and applicable.

TF stated that he would need to obtain instructions from NELP on completing any further modelling for the Alternate Design.

CD sought confirmation that there is no dispute as to whether further modelling of the Bulleen Road precinct needs to be completed. TF confirmed that there is no dispute, only a decision as to whether additional modelling is completed now or later.

**ITEM OUTCOME: NOTED.**

CD confirmed that it was her understanding from TF’s responses at the hearing that the motivation for providing the link road from the Bulleen Park and Ride via the shared signalised intersection on Bulleen Road was to provide access to users travelling south, as both the Reference and Alternative Designs do not provide an option to turn right on to Thompsons Road. JK clarified that it was a recommendation from his peer review for access to be provided via Bulleen Road, and TF stated that he did not believe it was originally required given the land uses to the south are unlikely to utilise the facility.

**Right turn onto Thompsons Road**

CD sought clarification as to whether the option of a right turn was discounted from the start of the Project or whether it was considered from either the proposed Park and Ride access, or via Sandra Street.

TF stated that the design was guided by the Project’s requirements established by DOT, referencing both the need to design for Level of Service D at intersections and design a bus way with capacity for 140 buses per hour in each direction. TF outlined that a right-turn on to Thompsons Road would require all phases at the signals on Thompsons Road to stop, and the intersection could not meet LOS D and still support 280 buses per hour.

CD referred to a SCO map that showed that the entirety of the Manningham Club was covered, suggesting that this would provide sufficient scope for changes in design as well as storage for right turns from an upgraded intersection at Sandra Street. The SCO map was not tabled in the conclave and could not be found online during the conclave.

JK expressed the view that the priority for the network in this location should be to protect and prioritise public transport movement. He suggested that as modelling indicated including a right turn exit would undermine targeted LOS outcomes alternate access via Bulleen Road should be sought. JK noted that a right turn exit either where currently shown on plans or at Sandra street would equally and adversely impact on targeted LOS outcomes.

CD expressed concern that the response to provide access to the Park and Ride was out of proportion given the likely low demand. CD expressed concern that the need for the right turn access was dismissed quickly and stated she was not convinced that it was investigated adequately. TF stated...
that it was modelled in early iterations of the Project and found to not meet Project requirements including LOS targets, so an on-balance decision was made to not pursue a right turn exit.

**ITEM OUTCOME: NO AGREEMENT.**

**Grade separated access**

AOB asked whether grade separation of the busway from Thompsons Road was considered to achieve better access and reduce bus delays.

TF clarified that it was considered, however, it was not found to be possible whilst still meeting Project requirements including a request for 90m platform stops. Consideration was given to providing multiple 45m stops, however the impact on parking was too great for the option to be feasible.

HM expressed concern that the access issues were predicated on an idea that the Project needed to meet demand for 280 buses per hour. She suggested that this requirement has impacts on the functionality for a whole range of options and should be challenged. TF outlined that it is a requirement of the Project established by DoT. AOB expressed scepticism that such bus numbers could or would be achieved, but that the O’Brien Traffic alternative design became better as bus numbers increased.

**ITEM OUTCOME: PARTIAL AGREEMENT.**

**Preferences**

HM stated a preference for full functionality for people who want to use the Park and Ride and head south. She stated a preference for the connection to be direct to Thompsons Road, stating concern that the Alternative Design Park & Ride requires people to travel north to go south.

VG stated that the Detailed Design would need to take the precinct demands into account and expressed concern with the capacity shown in the Alternative Design layout. VG stated that he is satisfied that a target of LOS D for intersections is acceptable, however expressed concern that the proposed access points for the Manningham Club in their current form would not achieve a LOS D.

**ITEM OUTCOME: PARTIAL AGREEMENT.**

2.6 **Signalised Intersections on Bulleen Road**

There was discussion relating to the different intersection configuration and spacing along Bulleen Road in the Alternative Design.

HM sought clarification on the decision to separate the Veneto Club access from the Bulleen Park / Carey Grammar Sports Club access (noting they were previously in the same intersection) and questioned why the decision was made without modelling, suggesting that whilst the Veneto Club would likely benefit from signals, HM questioned whether they were required. HM also expressed concern about intersection spacing, noting that the right-turn on to Thompsons Road was not progressed in part due to intersection spacing.

TF outlined that the queues at the Veneto Club can be long during events, particularly in the evenings. TF outlined that the signals are approximately 140m apart and coordination of the signals should assist in minimising concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Carey Grammar Sports Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BY expressed concern about Bulleen Road shifting west towards Carey Grammar Sports Ground and sought clarification as to whether this diminished the ability to maintain a circulating road around the eastern most sporting oval. BY stated his preference would be to maintain as much space as practicably possible between Carey Grammar and the Project, as per the Reference Design, noting concerns about access, noise and visual intrusion (BY noted noise and visual intrusion matters are not within his expertise).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF stated that as Detailed Design progressed the requirement to maintain access to the circulating road would be flagged to the Project. TF noted that he did not have access to information about noise walls, however, acknowledged the road structure is lower in the Alternative Design. Experts sought clarification on the difference in height, but TF did not have specific information available. TF noted that the Project would need to comply with VicRoads noise reduction guidance at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BY sought clarification about the western leg of the signalised intersection providing access to Bulleen Park and Carey Grammar Sports Ground. TF referred to the additional detail shown on the Alternate Design Option – Park and Ride Access drawing which demonstrates that there is a proposal to extend the road to tie into the existing internal road network. TF acknowledged that this extended beyond the Project boundary. JK outlined that it may be possible to tie into the existing road by passing to the east of the Bulleen Park pavilion, without moving the Project boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITEM OUTCOME: NOTED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Preference between Reference and Alternative Designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JK suggested that it may assist the IAC if the experts could seek to achieve consensus on a preferred design subject to further considerations, or agreement on the principles to be prioritised through Detailed Design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AOB noted that the signalised intersections could run as a pair, suggesting there are many examples where closely spaced intersections are run together.

The group sought to agree on a preference. HM noted that as the Veneto Club were not represented in the conclave, she was not in a position to judge what was in their best interest. HM stated a preference to avoid having two closely spaced intersections on a high-volume road.

BY expressed the position that Carey Grammar’s preference is to separate the intersections. BY noted that the intersection is not proposed to be located on Carey Grammar’s land, stating his concern is for a functioning intersection, not a smaller footprint.

JK sought agreement as to whether the experts supported a LOS D performance target for the signalised intersections on Bulleen Road.
VG, BY, CD agree. HM agreed on the proviso that full functionality was not compromised to achieve LOS D. AOB did not agree or disagree.

ITEM OUTCOME: PARTIAL AGREEMENT.
CD outlined that she was not in a position to do this as she did not believe she had access to all the available information. CD requested TF clarify whether he was withholding information that would assist her to provide advice to Marcellin.

CD expressed the view that she wanted to minimise the impacts on the Marcellin College land and stated the view that the proposed link road increases the impact on the land. CD suggested that consideration could be given to connecting the egress only link road shown around the Main Marcellin Sporting field to the Bulleen Park and Ride access road to minimise the impact on the Marcellin oval.

TF outlined that the Project team does not have a preference for one design over the other. He noted the Alternative Design may have simpler construction methodology, but there are other multi-disciplinary assessments required to influence the ultimate preference.

AOB expressed the view that there are still issues with the Alternative Design’s road alignment, noting the visual impact of the ventilation structure when travelling northbound on Bulleen Road.

Road Grades
CD expressed concern about the potential grade difference that would limit the view of Marcellin College from Bulleen Road. CD suggested this added to her concern about the loss of the Bulleen Road address. CD expressed the view that whilst the Reference Design may have a biggest short-term impact, it will retain the Bulleen Road address, whilst the Alternative Design had potential to restrict views to the school from Bulleen Road.

AOB agreed with CD’s concern about limited information on road grades, suggesting that a plan view layout is not adequate to provide advice on design changes.

TF stated that he does not have information about road grades and visual impacts stating that the Alternative Design is just one further option for the IAC and community to consider.

JK acknowledged that there had been requests from AOB’s instructor relating to provision of information on road grades and suggested that the conversations continue to occur through those channels rather than the conclave.

CD sought clarification on who had completed the Reference and Alternative Designs. TF outlined that GHD and AECOM are technical advisors to NELP and are responsible for the design. He advised that he had been working collaboratively with those technical advisors to ensure that the layouts were functional and met LOS requirements.

Active Transport Considerations
HM expressed concern about bicycle and pedestrian access, stating that it appeared as though the Alternative Design provided greater opportunity to provide at-grade accessibility to Bulleen Park, the golf club, sporting grounds
and schools. She outlined that it’s a priority for Manningham Council to encourage bicycle and pedestrian access, and the design should seek to provide connectivity through the region. HM sought clarity on whether her understanding of the potential grades in the Alternative Design did provide improved connectivity and accessibility for active transport.

TF outlined that his understanding was that the Alternative Design structures were closer to the ground plane than the Reference Design, resulting in the SUP on the west of Bulleen Road being closer to the grade of the existing land uses than in the Reference Design.

ITEM OUTCOME: NO AGREEMENT.

3 Meeting close  JK closed the meeting at 3:29pm, stating the Alternate Design Option – Park and Ride Access should be provided to experts through the conclave minutes acknowledging that it had only been designed that day.

Attached: Alternate Design Option - Park and Ride Access
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