



Department of Transport

GPO Box 2392
Melbourne, VIC 3001 Australia
Telephone: +61 3 9651 9999
www.transport.vic.gov.au
DX 210292

Matthew Milbourne
Principal Strategic Planner
Melton City Council
232 High Street
MELTON VICTORIA 3337
e-mail: matthewm@melton.vic.gov.au

Dear Matthew,

PUBLIC EXHIBITION C232MELT TOOLERN DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS PLAN REVIEW AND TOOLERN PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN REFRESH, FEBRUARY 2024

I refer to the e-mail dated 8 April 2024 from Melton City Council's (**Council**) seeking comments on proposed planning scheme amendment C232 (**the Amendment**) to implement the recommendations of the Toolern Development Contributions and Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) Review, June 2022 by amending various provisions of the Melton Planning Scheme to the Melton Planning Scheme.

The Department of Transport and Planning (**The Department**) has reviewed the proposed amendment and the associated background documentation prepared by Council. In preparing this submission the Department has identified and considered the transport network as gazetted and the proposed changes. These are considered on a local, sub regional and wider western region basis. In preparing this response the Department has consulted with Major Roads Project Victoria (MRPV) and the Level Crossing Removal Project (LXRP). This submission forms a whole of transport response, incorporating their views and comments where necessary.

It should be noted that this submission is made in relation to transport matters only. It does not include any comments or considerations from the State's Planning Services (formerly DELWP) on the Amendment and associated background documents.

As planning for the future transport network within this sub regional area progresses, the Department aims to ensure that where land use change is occurring, that appropriate existing transport infrastructure and future transport planning and investment is aligned. To achieve this an integrated approach to land use planning is required to ensure that the current and future development and operation of the transport system is appropriately considered in the preparation of the PSP to ensure that it facilitates the efficient, safe, and sustainable movement of people and goods.

Whilst the Toolern PSP considered the ultimate Western Growth Corridor Plan, some elements of the network were not included due to updated planning considerations and upgraded transport networks in the 12 years since the PSP was gazetted. Further clarification and/or change is required on some of these items.

In considering the transport network for the PSP area, it is important to note and acknowledge the Department's position regarding the following key matters.

The inclusion (and removal) of projects and associated costs, including roads, bridges, and intersections from the Paynes Road PSP, Rockbank PSP, and Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre Urban Design Framework is generally supported, however further clarification and discussion around the allowances and considerations that have been included for these projects is required. This includes the designs used, responsibility for the delivery of infrastructure, and land take that has been included. Without this clarification, and potential changes, the Department is unable to fully support all inclusions from these documents.

Changes to road corridor widths and cross-sectional elements also requires further consideration prior to the Department being able to support them. As discussed below, some reductions to the widths of cross sections are not supported. The Department would like clarification on how these elements, particularly cycle lanes/paths, are shown, with potential changes to provide safer infrastructure expected. The proposed downgrading of roads originally identified as six lanes to four lanes is supported, provided the cross-sectional elements referenced above are clarified. The Department does, however, highlights the flow-on implications of this change, changes to traffic volumes on the surrounding network, with performance of intersections also likely to change, and acknowledges that Council have not undertaken work to understand these implications.

Specific comments relating to the document are included in Attachment 1 of this response.

Western Freeway upgrade

MRPV is preparing a business case for the Western Freeway Upgrade, expected to be completed in 2025. The project will seek to develop and plan for a program of freeway network improvements to improve safety, accessibility, efficiency to support the future demand along the Western Freeway Corridor. For Toolern, this includes considerations towards sections of Ferris Road, Mount Cottrell Road, Paynes Road, and Shogaki Drive.

MRPV's work to date has identified that the designs and land set aside within the PSP and DCP documents are either not sufficient to meet current design standards or don't allow for existing constraints within the allotted road reserve cross sections. As such the proposed reductions to cross sections are not supported by the Department. In particular, the following issues have been identified:

Mount Cottrell Road

- Adequate land provision for the future freeway interchange needs to be considered and provided.
 - o Adequate land for the future intersections between Shogaki Drive and the Western Freeway needs to be considered and protected.
 - o The reduction of RD12 from 45m to 41m is not supported as current designs indicate that a minimum of 45m will continue to be required to deliver the ultimate primary arterial corridor's configuration.

Shogaki Drive

- The ultimate alignment of the Shogaki Drive, including the intersections and consideration towards the existing sewer pumping station is unresolved. The Department seeks further discussion with Council to resolve this matter. Possible relocation or protection of the sewer pump and the potential costs and responsibilities for doing so require resolution.
- Discussions were held between MRPV and Council around the ongoing need for Shogaki Drive to be included as a 6-lane, primary arterial road corridor. The Department and MRPV

would like to understand why, following the advice from MRPV that a 4-lane arrangement is appropriate, the updated PSP and DCP retains a 6-lane corridor.

Ferris Road

- Adequate land provision and appropriate intersection design is required for the Ferris Road / Treelead Lane / Shakamaker Drive intersection. The current FLP does not adhere to current road design standards.
- The Department does not support the reduction of RD15 from 45m to 41.8m. Preliminary work undertaken indicates that 41m would be insufficient to enable the corridor's ultimate configuration. The existing width should be retained to ensure future upgrades can be delivered without delay or additional costs
- As such, it is the Department's preference is that the full extent of the (existing) easement is maintained.

Rail corridor interface

The Department notes that there are a several proposed changes to the PSP and DCP documents directly interface with the planning of the rail corridor infrastructure including:

- The Department seeks further clarification to understand how land requirements for the Paynes Road and Ferris Road road-over-rail grade separations will be delivered. It is noted that these (grade separations) and their corresponding land requirements have not been included in the PSP or DCP. The Department seeks to discuss this matter with Council and for the DCP and PSP to be updated as agreed / necessary.
- A connection across the rail corridor (BD11) has been removed under the assumption that a connection will be provided with the construction of a future rail station in the vicinity of this location. There is no commitment to deliver the connection at this location as part of any future station upgrade. This item must be reinstated in the DCP. Any discussion / agreement on the delivery of a bridge over the rail corridor is subject to agreement as part of any future project.

Melton Line Upgrade and Level Crossing Removals

The Victorian Government is removing four dangerous and congested level crossings on the Melton Line by 2026. This includes the removal of the Ferris Road level crossing.

The level crossing removals will pave the way for the introduction of larger 9-car VLocity trains as part of the \$650 million Melton Line Upgrade, including investigation of a new train stabling facility at Cobblebank.

The Department is committed to working with the Melton City Council and stakeholders in the delivery update of this PSP and DCP and welcome the opportunity to engage further in this process. If you have any queries, please contact Callum Wilson at callum.j.wilson@transport.vic.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Daniel Kowalczyk

Associate Director, Transport Network Planning Integration
Metropolitan Melbourne
Department of Transport and Planning

14 / 06 / 2024

Attachment 1

Specific comments

Comments below are applicable to both the Precinct Structure Plan and Developer Contributions Plan and any changes should be reflected in both documents.

Item	Comment	Change requested
1	Exford Road/Toolern Road has been reduced to a secondary arterial east of Mt Cottrell Rd. This is reflected in the Rockbank PSP east of Paynes Road. This would otherwise be 4 lane west of Mt Cottrell and east of Paynes, with 6 lanes in between. Whilst this is supported by the Department, the off-road cycle lane is also removed from this section. This is included in the Rockbank PSP meaning removing this section would cause a gap in the cycling network.	Include an off-road cycle path on Exford Road/Toolern Road between Mount Cottrell Road and Paynes Road aligning with the Rockbank PSP.
2	Plan 7 of the PSP - 'North west mixed use precinct' should now read 'North West Precinct Urban Design Framework Area'.	Update text.
3	'The OMR is shown in the West Growth Corridor Plan... and continues to be a committed project in Plan Melbourne 2017-2050' – Whilst the OMR continues to be a planned project and needs to be considered within the PSP, there has been no commitment to deliver the corridor.	Update text to 'potential future' to align with wording in <i>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050</i> .
4	3.2.5 references road over rail at Ferris Road, but 4.1.5 C8 mentions the requirement to 'provide a well-designed and high-quality rail underpass' – planning for this grade separation is for road-over-rail and reference to an underpass should be reworded.	Update wording to reflect road-over-rail.
5	Changes to the DSS and what is subsequently shown in the integrated water management plan - it would be good to have a comparison showing the changes visually so we can understand transport network impacts.	Provide a figure showing changed DSS infrastructure. Whilst this should not be included in the PSP/DCP, it would be useful to further understand any impacts on the transport network.
6	The road network figure shows '2 lane vehicular bridge' for grade separated crossings on arterials - these need to reflect the ultimate cross section of the specific road corridor. It is currently ambiguous in this figure which of these bridges are expected to be four or six lanes.	Update figure to be more specific and reflect required cross sections for each bridge.
7	BD17 and BD18, and BD19 (land only) and BD20 are shown as separate projects for the interim and ultimate Paynes Rd and Mount Cottrell Rd rail overpass. Other LX projects are only shown for the ultimate.	Clarify the intention of each crossing and why some are interim/ultimate, as well as the reasoning for the ultimate scope to upgrade an already removed level crossing with gates.

8	Paynes Rd overpass is for construction; Mt Cottrell Rd overpass is just for the land; Ferris Rd overpass is included, but with no funds attributed to it. This is despite the FLP showing land acquisition being required. Why is there this inconsistency?	Clarify the intention for each crossing and why some for construction/land/no funds included.
9	What is the justification for removing BD09, BD11, BD12, and BD13 (it is not clear from old or updated documents where 12 and 13 were meant to be located)?	Provide clarification (further action required below on BD11).
10	RD08 (East-west arterial east of Mount Cottrell Road) cross section is also not consistent for both carriageways (2m should on both sides of one carriageway, only one side of the other). Why? Why is there 6m of shoulder included in the cross section when original cross sections had no shoulder, but included protected bike lanes. Recommend removing/reducing the shoulder width and providing additional width on the SUP (or dedicated cycling if possible).	Clarify reason for inconsistent carriageway width and consider updating to include protected cycling facilities where possible (would need to consider full corridor design, including at intersections, to ensure this is possible).
11	Why is RD08 reduced in the number of lanes but retains the same cross section width. What is the purpose for providing an 11m nature strip? This is also not consistent with the rest of this corridor to the east of Mount Cottrell Road.	Council to clarify reason behind 11m nature strip.
12	Shared use paths on Strategic Cycling Corridors do not meet the target level of service for a SCC's and should only be provided as a last resort. Previous designs included SUPs but now have unprotected shoulders that could be used as bike lanes, as well as SUPs. Feedback in 2020 asked for separated facilities on SCCs. Melton's response stated that 0.5m chevron linemarking could be used in the 2m on road lanes however this is not adequate physical separation. Further discussion indicated that this can be worked out at detailed design stage, however, it is recommended that this is shown in current plans if feasible (again, would need to consider full corridor design, including at intersections, to ensure this is possible).	Update cross sections to include protected cycling facilities where possible on Strategic Cycling Corridors.
13	Most of the secondary arterials include unprotected bike lanes in the shoulders with 60km/h speed limit - this is not supported - Cross sections RD01, RD02, RD03, RD04, RD05, RD06, RD07, RD08 (originally primary arterial), RD16, RD17, RD18, originally included protected paths. The cross section taken from the Rockbank PSP for Paynes Rd should also replace the proposed 2m unprotected bike lanes with protection.	Council to clarify why protected paths have been removed from cross sections and update if feasible.
14	RD15 (Ferris Rd) cross section shows 41.8m but is shown as 45m in table 10. Cross section north of Shogaki Dr (RD15) doesn't include any facilities for pedestrians.	Ensure cross sections and tables are consistent. Confirm how pedestrian movements will be accommodated within the cross section where they aren't currently shown. If there will be additional width provided outside of what is shown here, this should also be included in the figure.
15	What is the justification behind reducing the Mount Cottrell Rd cross section from 45m to 41m? (reduces ped path to 1.5m on one side only). Given there is a town centre on one side of Mount	Update cross section to ensure sufficient width is provided for all required elements.

	Cottrell Road and a potential rail station on the other, why provide a footpath on only one side? If this is proposed to be included in frontage roads considered outside the 41m, then this should be shown. DTP and MRPV does not support this reduction as stated above.	
16	Mount Cottrell Road cross section (RD11 and RD12) includes 4 lanes with additional width for 6 lanes (ultimate). Given the DCP includes an interim 2 lane arrangement, why does the ultimate cross section include both 4 and 6 lane cross sections? Same goes for Shogaki Dr (RD14 and RD19). RD11 in the DCP also includes widening to 45m whereas table 11 of the PSP and the cross section show 41m.	Ensure consistency between cross sections, table and what will be provided in the DCP. Update RD11, RD12, RD14, and RD19 accordingly.
17	Why are so many secondary arterials proposed to be council roads? What modelling has been undertaken to understand the volumes on these roads? If these corridors are ever required to be declared as state arterial roads, then there may be significant costs to do so if they are not constructed to adequate standard. Noting that any modelling that was undertaken as part of the development of this PSP is likely to be outdated and incorrect.	Confirm expected volumes and intent behind arterial status to cater for these volumes. Confirm intent that corridors are not expected to become declared state arterials.
18	Abey Road bridge over Toolern Creek has 2.5m SUPs (needs to be at least 3), and doesn't consider the ultimate 4 lane arrangement (second bridge). Can council confirm that the road reservation for RD18 includes land to provide the second structure over Toolern Creek? Note that there is a requirement in section 4.6.3 that states that they must 'provide 4 vehicle lanes for the Abey Road creek crossing'.	Update cross section to ensure SUP desirable minimum width is met. Confirm that the land reservation for the bridge accounts for the ultimate corridor required, and ensure consistency between the figure, DCP, and requirement 4.6.3.
19	RD03 - Exford Rd north of East-west arterial includes a sub-standard 2.5m SUP.	Update cross section to ensure SUP desirable minimum width is met.
20	RD05 Exford Rd from IT03 to Toolern Creek is not included in road hierarchy table.	Include all required sections in the road hierarchy table.
21	BD10 is still included as an underpass despite other changes to the document providing overpasses. Can council confirm that this is the intent, and why it is included as an underpass rather than an overpass?	Confirm intent, wording, and assumptions behind costing for BD10. Update if required.
22	BD11 has been removed and its said 'to be constructed as part of the Thornhill Park Railway Station project' - this is pushing the cost to the state. Any land required for this connection also needs to be protected - removing this from the PSP has potential to lose this.	Include BD11 in the PSP and DCP.
23	Road Hierarchy table (Table 10) uses the title 'Access Management Policy' for column 3, however the tracked changes document uses 'Indicative Vehicles per Day'. These indicative vehicles are far less than the capacity of primary and secondary arterials and also what these corridors specifically are likely to see. Can Melton provide the justification behind these figures?	Update column headings. See item 17 above.
24	RD06 uses the phrase 'create road reserve 34m (ultimate)' which is different to 'purchase land...' used for other corridors. Confirm whether these should be different and why. The wording here is not consistent with the DCP.	Confirm intent behind different wording and update if required.

25	Phrasing between sections is inconsistent - Table 11 references 'Exford Road' which is called 'East-west arterial' in other sections. This should also be consistent with the DCP tables. This is called 'Exford Road', 'East-west arterial', and 'Toolern Road' at different times throughout the documents.	Ensure reference to this corridor is consistent.
26	RD14 - Shogaki Dr should be 'Ferris Road (IT13) to Industrial...'	Update reference to include correct intersection reference.
27	Table 10 and cross section shows RD18 (Abey Road) to be 40m whereas table 11 says to purchase land to make it 38m.	Confirm which figure is correct, and whether the correct width has been used in calculating the DCP costs for the additional land.
28	It is not clear whether the entirety of Paynes Rd north of Alfred Road is fully covered under BD17 and IT30? There is no road number or FLP for this section is not included.	Confirm whether BD17 and IT30 includes the road section for this part of Paynes Road, and update to include if not.
29	Why is the widening of Paynes Road (RD22, RD23, RD24) from existing (~21m) to 34m not included (just the 2-lane construction).	Clarify why the land to enable the widening is not included and update if required.
30	All intersections, bar IT18 - Ferris Road and Shakamaker Drive, are included as interim. Can Melton confirm that the land for the ultimate intersection is also provided, as well as land for interim intersections where land is not explicitly stated (IT01, IT02, IT03, IT12, IT14, IT15, IT16, IT17, IT19, IT20, IT21, IT22, IT23, IT24, IT25, IT26, IT27, IT28, IT29, IT30, IT31, IT32)?	Clarify and update tables and figures if required.
31	Tables explaining bridge projects should specify the number of lanes to be constructed under 'construction of an arterial road bridge'.	Update wording.
32	Where bridges are required and the DCP is only constructing an interim arrangement, can council confirm that they will provide the ultimate arrangement on arterial roads that will be retained under council's responsibility?	Melton Council to confirm.
33	Please confirm that all bridge projects constructed to interim arrangements also provide the ultimate land take required for a second carriageway.	Melton Council to confirm.
34	Previous correspondence indicated that IT25 (Bridge Road and Mount Cottrell Road) would be removed due to the vicinity with the rail corridor and planned future grade separation. The FLP shows the interim design with LILO as discussed, however the signalisation of the intersection has not been removed from the PSP or DCP. Whilst Council has indicated that modelling shows that the traffic from removing this intersection can be adequately accommodated elsewhere, it has not been specifically tested. How the active transport facilities are accommodated with the removal of the intersection has also not been addressed.	Confirm why IT25 is still included, and how the removal (as discussed previously) will account for all movements being removed.
35	BD16 (East Street over the rail corridor) is a non-existing road that will be a future council road but has DTP as the lead agency.	Update to include Melton City Council as the lead agency.

36	Consistency is required between table 11 of the PSP and what is included in the DCP. This includes any comments made on items in this table which are also applicable to the DCP (particularly section 1.4.3 and Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7).	Ensure consistency, including with any updates made due to comments made in this response.
37	RD06 uses the phrase 'create road reserve 34m (ultimate)' which is different to 'purchase land...' used for other corridors. Confirm whether these should be different and why. The wording here is not consistent with the DCP.	Clarify wording and ensure consistency between the PSP and DCP.
38	The East-west arterial and Paynes Road intersection (IT07) does not include the purchase of land in the DCP but is included in table 11 of the PSP.	Confirm that sufficient land to provide the ultimate intersection is included and update wording/table accordingly.