

Appendix 6: Summary of individual written submissions in response to public notice

| Submission No. | Submitter | Issues | Advisory Committee Comments |
|----------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Anush Martins | Home owner in Wyndham Vale and the track will run parallel to her property. Concerned about noise and environmental impacts due to the building of the RRL close to residential dwellings. Wants amenity to be improved near the tracks and a noise barrier. | Suggested external noise standards, as targets, are in Chapter 6. Noise barriers as one aspect of noise mitigation are presented in Chapter 8. |
| 2 | Davis Land submitted by Minter Ellison | <p>Land is proposed to be developed by Leakes Pty Ltd (a DFC entity) for residential and related purposes. Requested that the AC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Confirm that the modelling underpinning the Management Plan and Management Report is accurate; ▪ Explain the impacts of variables on noise and vibration. This includes height (at grade, in cut, elevated), whether the rail tracks are straight or curved, train speed, impacts of climatic events such as wind; ▪ Advise on mitigation measures; ▪ Advise its position, as well as the position of the GAA, on what is an 'acceptable' impact; ▪ Invite affected landowners to contribute to the discussion about what is an 'acceptable' level of impact of noise and vibration; ▪ Clarify the precise mechanics by which the RRLA will fund the noise attenuation measures. | <p>These matters are addressed in the Advisory Committee report to the extent we are able.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise standards to assess an 'acceptable' impact are recommended in Chapter 6. ▪ Mitigation measures are assessed in Chapter 8 and how these might be implemented are discussed in Chapter 9. <p>The Advisory Committee has been asked to estimate costs but not detailed funding mechanics.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | Renzo Tonin & Associates reviewed and provided comments on noise impact documentation. | |
| 3 | Manor Commercial Company Pty Ltd and Manor Lakes (Werribee) Pty Ltd submitted by Minter Ellison | Refer Submission No. 2. | Refer to comments in Submission No. 2 |
| 4 | Wyndham City Council | <p>The Noise Management Plan does not provide an appropriate response to the noise impacts of RRL2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is suggested that the Noise Management Plan be amended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include the RRL communications requirements of the Contractor; ○ Specify the required minimum area/distance for notification for affected local residents during construction; ○ Define a process for acting on local resident feedback and accountability for resolving any issues raised; ○ Define a minimum distance from blasting areas in which dilapidation surveys of potentially affected buildings (including houses) and structures are carried out. ▪ The Noise Management Plan needs to define the acceptable (day and night) decibel using the appropriate metrics, to assist planning authorities | <p>The Advisory Committee believes that the Draft Noise Management Plan is inadequate and recommends substantial change. Our recommendations are in Chapter 10.</p> <p>Construction noise and vibration is presented in Chapter 5.</p> <p>We have concluded that the EPA Noise Control Guidelines 1254 and the NSW Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation Construction Noise Strategy are appropriate for communications on construction activities.</p> <p>We believe that dilapidation surveys are best handled by the construction contractor's risk management procedures.</p> <p>Recommended noise standards are in Chapters 6 and 7.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>with determining the extent to which planning controls are required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rather than a DDO, prefers an overlay to be developed similar to the Airport Environs Overlay, in combination with defined noise contours. ▪ The Noise Management Plan should define the required mitigation measures needed to address the acceptable (day and night) decibel levels for sensitive land uses and specify the appropriate distances from the RRL corridor to which they should apply. ▪ The operation of freight trains along the RRL corridor cannot be prevented and rail freight noise mitigation measures need to be considered in the Noise Management Plan, given that Section 251B of the <i>Victorian Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) Act 1983</i> does not apply to any noise emanating from freight rolling stock. ▪ The Noise Impact Management Plan should be amended to include predictive noise models for the future Regional Rail stabling facility near Black Forest Road. | <p>A DDO is discussed in Chapter 9. The direction of noise propagation is a fundamental difference between aircraft and rail noise.</p> <p>Possible noise mitigation measures are evaluated in Chapter 8 and how these might be most cost effectively implemented in Chapter 9.</p> <p>The scope of the project to be assessed is discussed in Chapter 3, and our estimate of possible freight train noise impacts in Chapter 7.</p> <p>We comment on noise from a possible future regional rail stabling facility in Chapter 7.</p> |
| 5 | Growth Areas Authority | <p>The GAA is currently working with the RRLA, government departments and other stakeholders in relation to proposed noise attenuation measures associated with RRL2.</p> <p>The GAA is also preparing Growth Corridor Plans (strategic corridor-wide land use and transport plans) for undeveloped land within the Urban Growth Boundary. This will include the RRL2 land which has a proposed</p> | <p>The Advisory Committee has been assisted by the advice from GAA on projected land developments adjoining the RRL2 Project Area.</p> <p>We discuss noise mitigation measures in Chapter 8 with cost estimates.</p> <p>In Chapter 9 we, <i>inter alia</i>, discuss the role of a</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | <p>length of approximately 27 kilometres and width of generally 60 metres. The majority of the Werribee-Deer Park section will be through existing and future urban development areas.</p> <p>To address the Advisory Committee regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The planning process that will be undertaken for land in the Corridor; ▪ Expected future development of land adjoining the Deer Park-Wyndham Vale section of the RRL2; ▪ Issues that may require additional consideration; and ▪ The potential to minimise impacts of rail noise on future development including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise attenuation measures; ○ The costs of those measures, and ○ Planning controls that may be appropriate. | DDO as a planning measure including the challenge of developing a DDO that is effective and administratively simple. |
| 6 | The Golden Group submitted by Taylors Development Strategists | Owns land located at 1070 Sayers Road Tarneit. Wants certainty as to how the noise reduction treatments are to be funded and implemented, and where this funding is to be sourced from given that the project is expected to be completed by 2014. | We discuss implementation of noise reduction treatments at Chapter 9. The Advisory Committee has been asked by the Minister for Planning to estimate costs but not funding sources. |
| 7 | YourLand Developments submitted by Taylors Development Strategists | Owns land at Leakes Road, Tarneit. Refer Submission No. 6. | Refer to comments on Submission No. 6. |
| 8 | The Concoris Group submitted by Taylors Development Strategists | Owns land at 1121 Dohertys Road, Tarneit. Refer Submission No. 6. | Refer to comments on Submission No. 6. |
| 9 | Walsh Building Services | Owns land at 1245 and 1170 Sayers Road. States that: | The Advisory Committee has considered these |

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|--|
| | submitted by Sweett | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The noise from the operation of the new rail line will not be reasonable and will require noise mitigation works. These mitigation works have not been addressed in the Noise Management Plan; ▪ Insufficient consideration has been given to noise impacts on future residents and that the noise management plan does not achieve a 'net community benefit' for future communities that will occupy the subject lots; ▪ Neither the Noise Impact Management report or the Noise Impact Management Plan attempt to consider the 'reasonableness' of the predicted noise levels in a quantitative manner; ▪ Approximately 45 dwellings would receive noise levels above the relevant trigger levels in the Guidelines; ▪ Noise mitigation works in the form of noise barriers are required. ▪ Consideration should be given to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The potential for additional noise radiation from trains crossing the proposed rail bridge over the Werribee River; ▪ The impact of noise from trains arriving and leaving a future railway station adjoining the subject land; ▪ An assessment of the additional noise provided by the interaction between road and rail traffic at the Sayers Road grade separation. ▪ The onus to mitigate noise levels should be on the RRL operator and not future developers and | <p>matters. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise standards are recommended in Chapter 6. ▪ Mitigation measures are assessed in Chapter 8 and how these might be implemented are discussed in Chapter 9. ▪ We have recommended substantial change to the Draft Noise Management Plan. ▪ We support the intention of RRLA to construct bridges of concrete rather than steel to eliminate noise radiation. ▪ We agree with the RRLA submission that assessing the noise of trains at stations has been done conservatively by assuming that trains pass through stations at line speed. |
|--|---------------------|---|--|

| | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| | | residents. | |
| 10 | Paul Ryan submitted by Taylors Development Strategists | Owns land at Lot 63 Bulban Road, Werribee. Refer Submission No. 6. | Refer to comments on Submission No. 6. |
| 11 | Dennis Family Corporation submitted by Minter Ellison | <p>Owns or has development agreements in place for significant parcels of land in Wyndham Vale and Truganina.</p> <p>The exhibited material provides expected noise modelling forecasts but otherwise provides virtually no further information on how noise is proposed to be mitigated.</p> <p>Recommends that the Advisory Committee makes directions that the relevant authorities publish proposed mitigation measures or options.</p> <p>The GAA position on noise issues should be made publicly available as part of the exhibition process.</p> <p>Noise affects cannot be fully assessed without detailed construction plans.</p> <p>Noise affect review would be assisted by GIS or CAD line work.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have responded to most of these issues in our report. ▪ We recommend noise standards in Chapter 6, discuss assessment of noise impacts in Chapter 7, present noise mitigation options in Chapter 8 and implementation of these in Chapter 9. ▪ GAA made a submission to the Committee. ▪ Our report discusses construction noise in Chapter 5. Construction noise will have less impact with much of the construction work to be done prior to completing abutting residential development. |
| 12 | Lend Lease | <p>Developing a large parcel of land of approximately 450 hectare (yielding circa 4000 lots) in West Werribee. Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Devaluation to land that adjoins the RRL; ▪ Increased development cost such as acoustic, landscape treatments and/or buffer distances to mitigate noise impacts; | The Advisory Committee has been asked to estimate costs of noise mitigation measures. That is presented in Chapter 8. Our Terms of Reference do not include land values or compensation. |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased housing costs to mitigate noise impacts. ▪ Expects that surrounding Landholders are not disadvantaged by these impacts and are compensated accordingly. | |
| 13 | Bozzo Group of Companies submitted by Watsons | <p>Owens lot 9 Ballan Road, Wyndham Vale. Part of this land (approximately 80 ha) is the subject of acquisition by the RRLA for track and stabling yards. The balance of the land (approximately 400 ha) is within the Urban Growth Zone and subject to deliberations by the Growth Area Authority for the preparation and approval of a Precinct Structure Plan.</p> <p>Opposed to conclusions of the Noise Management Plan and Noise Impact Management Report. Believes that without noise barriers or similar noise attenuation treatment, the residents, employees and visitors to the adjoining land once developed will suffer significant loss by virtue of the noise emanating from the stabling yard and track and the visual intrusion of the facility.</p> <p>Commissioned Vipac Engineers and Scientists Ltd to undertake a review, which concluded that noise from the RRL will significantly exceed the project noise limit. Noise attenuation treatment along boundary of the RRL in the form of 5-6m high noise walls, mounding and planting of similar should be provided along the development site boundary.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We recommend noise attenuation treatments. These mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 8 and how they might be implemented in Chapter 9. ▪ We advise that the Noise Impact Management Report should be revised and substantial change made to the Noise Management Plan. Chapter 10 presents these conclusions. ▪ Although stabling yards are not intended immediately we discuss these in Chapter 6 and 7. ▪ We support noise barriers as a noise mitigation measure but believe that in most cases 5-6m height is unwarranted. ▪ Our Terms of Reference do not encompass visual amenity. |
| 14 | Amex Corporation submitted by Minter Ellison | Owens land at 1030 Tarneit Road, Tarneit. The measures employed to mitigate noise associated with the RRL are | Our advice on noise mitigation measures and implementation of those is in Chapters 8 and 9 |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | unclear. | respectively of our Report. |
| 15 | Public Transport Ombudsman | <p>The PTO investigates and resolves complaints from consumers about public transport services. It receives complaints from consumers impacted by noise emanating from sidings. The majority of complaints relate to noise from trains being cleaned at the end of service, or having maintenance work undertaken on them prior to re-entering service. Generally, these complaints involve trains idling in sidings for long periods of time in the late evening or early hours of the morning.</p> <p>The train operator's position in relation to these complaints is that noise emanating from sidings due to idling trains is exempt from the usual claims of nuisance or environmental controls under Section 251(B) of the <i>Transport (Compliance and Miscellaneous) Act 1983</i>.</p> | <p>Stabling yards are not part of the immediate approved RRL2 project. However, the Advisory Committee believes that they form part of the project for which we have been asked to advise on noise impacts. This is discussed in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Our noise assessment of stabling yards is discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.</p> <p>We have responded to the implications of Section 251(B) as far as we are able. Our conclusions on this are in Chapter 10.</p> |