Level Crossing Removal for Frankston

Endorsed Council Submission paper – 30 October 2016

Footnote: Council at its Ordinary Meeting on Monday 19th December 2016, endorsed the submission sent to the Level Crossing Removal in October 2016.
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Declaration of Limitation

Council notes that the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA) has undertaken a consultation process with stakeholders and the Community to determine the preferred grade separation options. However, this consultation was undertaken during the time that Council cannot consult with the Community nor meet to formulate a response due to Council Elections and the caretaker requirements pursuant to the Local Government Act 1989. Frankston City is therefore disappointed that this submission could only include the resolutions of Council made prior to the consultation period and not that of a new Council.

Frankston City’s ability to provide a fulsome response to the options under consideration was hampered by the lack of detailed technical information available for review, despite numerous verbal and written requests for access to information. Key information requested from LXRA in order to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the key issues of concern to our Community included geotechnical, hydrology, traffic modelling, shadow diagrams and stabling relocation information.

To the date of preparation of this submission, other than the generic information available to the public, only the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation report for Skye/Overton Road site has been received.

Whilst Council officers with responsibilities for such areas as economic development, traffic planning, drainage, urban design, biodiversity and environment have reviewed the Technical Investigations Update for each of the crossing sites, there still is insufficient information to conduct a detailed assessment.

~

Definitions:

1. “Council” means Council Officers
Executive Summary of Response to LXRA Options

An assessment has been made by Council on the submitted information supplied by LXRA. Based on the previous review of options conducted by Council that lead to Council’s submission in July 2016 and based on the review of LXRA’s preferred options presented to the public during September and October 2016, Council provides the following response to LXRA.

Council’s preferred grade separations are as follows:

- **Seaford Road**, rail under road as previously requested.
- **Skye / Overton Road**, rail under road as previously requested. Council requests that an engineering solution utilising siphons be fully investigated to manage the drainage and flooding issues.
- **Eel Race Road**, no change to the Level Crossing at Eel Race Road, with funding to be redirected to Council’s strategic rail needs. However if the LXRA’s intention is to proceed with road/rail separation, Council’s preferred option is rail under road.

   It is requested that LXRA investigate an option to move the Carrum Station south so that a rail under road solution can be considered. It is noted however that the rail over road at McLeod Road but Eel Race Road closed option is in line with Council’s preferred option.

Council Officers have reviewed the proposed grade separation options and the corresponding technical investigation update information presented to the public for feedback during the public consultation process. Tables detailing Council’s response are provided in **Appendix B**. Council Officers also have provided a summary of the key responses for each site, this is detailed in Section 2 below.

Finally a detailed response on Council’s desired outcomes for each grade separation site to maximise community benefit is provided to LXRA in Section 3. This information is provided to ensure that LXRA considers Council’s preferred outcomes during the design of the final grade separation option.

Council has also raised significant concerns of the potential for relocation of stabling from Carrum Station to an alternate location within our municipality which has not been articulated by LXRA or has been able to be considered by our Community.
Introduction

The Victorian Government committed in 2015 to remove 50 level crossings on the metropolitan rail network by 2022, in line with a pre-election commitment. The implementation of this plan is being delivered by the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA). Three of these crossing removals are located within Frankston City at Eel Race Road, Seaford Road and Overton / Skye Road.

The removal of level crossings will improve safety, deliver transport network efficiency, reduce congestion and provide significant local and road user benefits. Additional development and open space opportunities will be facilitated by the proposed at grade crossing removals.

Council Focus

Each of the level crossing removals will have positive and negative impacts on the immediate and wider Frankston communities, and Council has desired outcomes it wants to achieve at both levels.

Level crossing removal projects can not only relieve congestion and improve safety at the crossing point, but can also provide redevelopment opportunities, and deliver urban realm improvements. However, each of the solutions can also result in adverse social, economic and environmental impacts on the local area.

Frankston City’s position on the options aims to achieve the best possible results for the community, particularly by preserving and enhancing adjacent amenity.

To assess what these results might be, the advantages and disadvantages of potential options have been reviewed which lead to the preferred level crossing removal options favoured by Council in this submission.

Strategically, Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the best way to realise the full potential of the crossing replacement projects to deliver a once in a lifetime opportunity for the revitalisation of Frankston as the premier regional bayside capital.

It is essential that the level crossing removal projects are not undertaken in isolation of Council’s broader goals, that being, the electrification of the rail line to Baxter (including its impact of Frankston Station redevelopment) and the extension of the third rail southbound from Moorabbin.

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA) with Council’s view of LXRA’s preferred grade separation options, Council’s option preferences for each of the crossings to be removed within Frankston, and to provide the context for additional rail corridor initiatives and Frankston Station improvements.

This includes the urgent need for the State Government to commit to the electrification to Baxter prior to the previously projected delivery date of 2027.

Relationship Protection

Council proposes to be proactive as planning and implementation of the level crossing removals proceeds. There is great sensitivity amongst communities directly affected by prospective changes associated with the level crossing removal projects.

Further, there will be ramifications for the wider Community, particularly during the construction phases – including road and rail network closures. A strong and structured communication process that includes input from the LXRA and aligned transport authorities must be established.
In order to obtain the best possible outcomes for our Community, Council acknowledges that it is also vital to ensure that a respectful and collaborative partnership with the LXRA is established and maintained.

**Organisation of Submission**

Reflecting Council’s focus, the report is organised into six sections:

1. Desired Council Rail Outcomes previously presented.
2. Consideration of Rail Crossing Options proposed by LXRA.
3. Council preferred options.
5. Summary.
6. Submission to LXRA.
Section 1.0
Desired Council Outcomes

To assist with establishing Council’s priorities for each of the rail removal crossings, an initial workshop was held with Councillors on 25 May 2016. The general priorities identified from the workshop were:

- Noise impacts no greater than currently
- Minimised visual impact
- Improved landscaping
- Better amenity
- Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists
- Equivalent or better road access
- Safer roads
- Increased personal safety
- Economic benefits

A later workshop was held with Councillors on 29 June 2016 to review the application of these priorities to each of the potential crossing options, and to establish Council’s option preferences.

The workshop covered:

- A description of the potential crossings options (road over and under rail, and rail over and under road) for each crossing location.
- Confirmation of Council’s desired outcomes.
- Consideration of the respective options by the use of a multi criteria assessment tool.
- The implications of each of the options for Council’s priorities.
- Identification and assessment of the positives and negatives of the options for each crossing location.
- Establishment of Council’s initial option preferences.
Principles for Grade Separation in Frankston

The following objectives were devised in response to ideals articulated by Council and the Community.

These are the principles upon which the respective options were considered:-

Maximised road network efficiency – Ensure that any change to the road network achieves improved traffic flows within proximity of the crossing.

Improved safety outcomes – Decrease in pedestrian and vehicular incidents at and around crossings. Pedestrian and cyclists are visible from the public realm, routes are well lit and should be designed to follow best practice Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

Enhanced community connectivity – Removal or reduction in physical and perceived barriers created by existing level crossings.

Improved visual amenity – Areas along the existing rail corridor are subject to an existing level of visual blight from the rail infrastructure and overlooking from passengers. Solutions should incorporate measures to improve visual amenity both from a resident and passenger viewpoint.

Noise amenity – Properties along the rail corridor are subject to existing levels of noise impacts, including warning bells, train horns, tires over tracks and the actual noise of the train itself. Any grade separation solution must present improved quantifiable benefits.

Allowance for future development opportunities – Certain grade separation solutions deliver opportunities for redevelopment of adjacent land for either private or public purposes.

Quality open space and urban design outcomes – Grade separation techniques can lead to increased open space opportunities and the delivery of positive urban design outcomes that benefit the passenger and the community as a whole. Crossings that deliver superior ground level activation through open space provision and built form improvements will be favoured.

Environmentally responsible solutions – Crossing solutions that mitigate impacts on receiving waters and provide habitat for increased biodiversity are considered superior.

Future proofing/ allowance for whole of corridor approach – The three crossings must not be viewed in isolation, but rather as part of the entire rail corridor through to Baxter and beyond. Provision must be made for the future relocation of train stabling from Carrum and Frankston to Baxter, and a third rail line from Baxter to Melbourne.
Council’s first submission to LXRA

Based on the detailed assessments and workshop conducted by Council in May and June 2016, at Council’s Ordinary Meeting on the 18 July 2016, Council resolved the following:

**Council Decision**

Moved: Councillor Aitken  Seconded: Councillor Spelman

That:

1. Council endorses the long term strategic rail needs and grade separation options assessment as documented by the Frankston City Council Level Crossing Preferred Options Submission paper (Attachment A).

2. Council agrees to submit the paper to the Level Crossing Removal Authority that recommends the preferred options namely:
   - Rail under Road for Seaford Road, Seaford;
   - Rail under Road for Skye/Overton Road, Frankston;
   - Indicates that the intended treatment at Eel Race Road crossing be waived in favour of the funding being transferred to facilitate a greater Frankston Station redevelopment outcome or electrification of the railway line to Baxter.

3. Council notes and appreciates Minister Jacinta Allan’s statement of Monday 13 June 2016:
   
   “We will not be building a Dandenong line-style ‘skyrail’ on the Frankston line. Any allegations we will, are false.”

4. Council accordingly strongly affirms rail under road as the only appropriate method to remove these level crossings.

5. Council emphasises the value which our community place upon the coastal low scale development and naturalistic qualities of the areas surrounding the Frankston line.

6. Any options that would consider the removal of housing would not be supported by Council.

7. Council seeks a copy of the Level Crossing Removal Authority’s Geotechnical report on the three sites within the Frankston Municipality for Council’s review.

8. Council forwards the level crossing preferred options report to the Minister for Public Transport, the Hon. Jacinta Allan MP, the Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resource, the Member for Frankston, Mr Paul Edbrooke MP, the Member for Carrum, Ms Sonya Kilkenny MP and Public Transport Victoria;

9. Council authorises the Mayor to present the submission at the next South East Melbourne Group of Councils’ meeting as well as distributing the paper to other Councils on the Frankston rail line; and

10. Council authorises the CEO to finalise the paper as an advocacy document for Frankston and Regional future rail needs and seeks an urgent meeting with the assistance from Mr Edbrooke MP – Member for Frankston and Ms Kilkenny MP – Member for Carrum to present this document to the Premier of Victoria, the Hon. Daniel Andrews MP, the Minister for Public Transport, the Hon. Jacinta Allan MP, and the Federal Members of Dunkley and Isaac by mid-September 2016.
11. That the petition addressed to both Frankston City Council and the State Legislative Council of Victoria be forwarded to Parliament accordingly.

12. Council writes to other Councils in the Melbourne – Frankston rail corridor to advise of our decision.

13. Council gives consideration to forming a collaborative group to present a united approach with other affected Councils.

14. Frankston City Council looks forward to working cooperatively with the LXRA.

Carried Unanimously

A copy of the Frankston City Council Level Crossing Preferred Options Submission paper is attached as Attachment A.

Section 2.0

Review of LXRA Proposed Options

Council Officers have reviewed the proposed grade separation options and the corresponding Technical Investigation Update information presented to the public for feedback during the public consultation process. Tables detailing Council’s response are provided in Appendix A. Council Officers provide the following summary comments for each site:

Seaford Road:

Two options are proposed, rail over road and rail under the road.

When reviewing the Design Outcomes Preliminary Assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- With respect to look and feel assessment, Council believes that rating for rail under the road should be a medium benefit. Visual impact from rail over road will be significant and rating should be changed to high impact.
- With respect to cycling and walking opportunities, Council considers that the rating for rail over road should be changed to medium benefit.
- With respect to environment - flora & fauna, the rating for rail under road for replanting should be the same as for rail over road as there is sufficient open space for replanting without trees being near lines.
- With respect to ground water impact on the Ramsar wetlands, it is felt that this cannot be rated at this stage as it has not been proven that ground water will impact the Ramsar listed wetland. Furthermore an engineering solution to manage ground water flow changes could be provided.
With respect to the technical considerations assessment, maintenance issues will be far greater for rail over road rather than rail under road and the rating should reflect this. In addition, access to utilities will be restricted for rail under road and as such the rating should be the same as rail over road.

When reviewing the construction impacts assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- Council believes that both options will have impact on the Community to an equivalent level.

When reviewing the Technical Investigations Update conducted by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- Notes that a number of technical assessments are currently in progress and not completed. This made it difficult for Council to fully assess impacts of the nominated options.
- Critical technical assessment should be completed and the impact fully understood by the Community before a final decision of the grade separation option for this site is.

Further comments:

- Based on the review of LXRA’s Design Outcomes Preliminary Assessment, rail under road is still Council’s preferred position.

**Skye/Overton Roads:**

Only the rail over road option was considered.

When reviewing the Design Outcomes Preliminary Assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- With respect to look and feel assessment, Council has significant concerns as residents south of Overton Road will be visually impacted. The rating should be changed to high impact.
- With respect to technical considerations assessment, maintenance requirements will have high impacts to Council and the rating should be adjusted.

When reviewing the Construction Impacts Assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- Council understands that construction activity will generate disruptions to the Community and requests that this is kept to a minimal amount.
- Council would prefer that car parks are not closed during construction.
- Council requires road closures to be kept to a minimum and that local access is provided at all times.
• Council requests that vegetation removal is kept to a minimum.
• Council requests that any service relocation works do not impact businesses and residents.

When reviewing the Technical Investigations Update conducted by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

• We note that a number of technical assessments are currently not completed. This has made it difficult for Council to fully assess impacts of the nominated options.
• It has been stated that overland flow drainage was the reason for LXRA to not consider a rail under road option. The documents assert that rail under road trenching would create a barrier to drainage of stormwater and interrupt overland flows, resulting in flooding of nearby properties. The only infrastructure solution is to install 8 - 11 siphons which has been deemed by LXRA to be not practical or maintainable. Council believes an engineering solution such as siphons could rectify drainage issues and believe this proposal should be considered in more detail.
• Critical technical assessments should be completed and the impact fully understood by the Community before a final decision of the grade separation option for this site, primarily those focussing on hydrology, hydrogeology, traffic and visual impact assessments.

Further comments:

• Council’s preferred option is a rail under road treatment and that LXRA conduct a further detailed review to determine an engineering solution.

Eel Race Road:

Two rail over road options have been proposed, namely rail over road with Eel Race Road closed, and elevated rail over both McLeod and Eel Race Roads.

When reviewing the Design Outcomes Preliminary Assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

• With respect to cycling and walking opportunities, Council considers that the option to close Eel Race Road provides equivalent benefit to the other option.
• With respect to integrated development opportunities, Council does not support any relocation of stabling from Carrum to a location further down the line in the Frankston Municipality. The rating does not take in consideration the impact of temporary stabling down the line. The rating should be adjusted accordingly unless installation of new stabling is part of the future electrification to Baxter project.

When reviewing the Construction Impacts Assessment table prepared by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:
Council believes that the option which closes Eel Race Road provides the least impact to the Community.

When reviewing the Technical Investigations Update conducted by LXRA, Council has the following key comments:

- A number of technical assessments have not been completed. This has made it difficult for Council to fully and assess impacts of the nominated options.
- Critical technical assessments should be completed and the impact fully understood by the Community before a final decision of the grade separation option for this site is made.

Further comments:

- LXRA should consider relocating the Carrum Station further to the south so that a rail under road option could be fully considered as trenching could occur just to the south of Patterson River and McLeod Road could be slightly raised to assist with clearances.
- Based on the review of LXRA’s Design Outcomes Preliminary Assessment, it would appear that the rail over road option with Eel Race Road closed is more in line with Council’s preferred position however Council would have preferred to have had a rail under road option assessed.

Section 3.0

Council’s Preferred Options

Seaford Road – Desired Outcomes

Council’s desired outcomes for the Seaford Road crossing are:

**Community connectivity**
Removal of the barriers that exist to enable safe and lineal movement across the rail line, particularly to Seaford Reserve.

**Quality open space and urban design outcomes**
Council has a number of improvements to RF Miles Reserve planned for the 2016/17 financial year, including the provision of a playground immediately abutting the proposed crossing removal site. Intergration of the masterplan for the reserve into the proposed work plan for the crossing removal site should be considered (refer to Appendix B).

**Environmentally responsible solutions**
Kananook Creek environs and existing vegetation must be preserved and additional opportunities provided to ensure water quality and vegetation expansion. No detrimental impact to the Seaford wetlands.

**Improved visual amenity**
The current crossing presents a clutter of rail, traffic and directional signage. The option selected for this site must present visual improvements and provide the opportunity for necessary infrastructure to be screened.

**Maximised road traffic efficiency and improved safety outcomes**
The existing tangle of roads and rail presents real impacts to road users, both for Seaford Road as well as Railway Parade and Fortescue Avenue. Improved connections across these vital road links must be a priority of this crossing removal.

**Seaford Road – Option Review**

The table below summarises Council’s previous assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences and LXRA options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>ADVATAGES</th>
<th>DISADVATAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIL UNDER ROAD</td>
<td>Increased transport safety</td>
<td>Reduced connectivity opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Considered by LXRA)</td>
<td>Improved road access</td>
<td>Removal of trees and vegetation along rail trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved noise amenity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved visual appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for open space and public realm improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL OVER ROAD</td>
<td>Better access pedestrians/cyclists</td>
<td>Visual impact of elevated tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Considered by LXRA)</td>
<td>Improved community connectivity</td>
<td>Potential noise issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased transport safety</td>
<td>Maintenance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved road access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for open space and public realm improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After reviewing the information supplied by LXRA as well as Council’s previous and current consideration of the options, Frankston City’s preferred option for Seaford Road is still the **rail under road** option. Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Seaford Road crossing:
- Superior access for pedestrians and cyclists by providing overbridges across tunnelled sections of the line to provide clear and efficient movement, particularly to Seaford Reserve.

- Improved public realm, including screening of infrastructure, where possible.

- Safer road transport movement, including treatments to the Railway Parade/Seaford Road and Fortescue Avenue/Seaford Road intersections.

- Integration into the crossing removal project elements of the RF Miles Reserve upgrade. (refer Appendix B)

- A thorough analysis of the potential impacts to the Seaford Wetlands and an appropriate engineering solution proposed should it be proven that deleterious drainage outcomes would occur as a result of trenching.

**Overton Road / Skye Road Crossing – Desired Outcomes**

Council’s desired outcomes for the Overton / Skye Road crossing are:

**Maximised road network efficiency**

Any improvements that can be delivered to the complex network of road and rail intersections in this location should be promoted.

**Enhanced community connectivity**

The existing rail reserve presents a significant barrier to movement from east to west. A solution that provides additional points for pedestrians and cyclists to move across the rail line is vital.

**Environmentally responsible solutions**

The Ebdale precinct is currently compromised by drainage inefficiencies. A solution that would enable the rail reserve to form part of a drainage basin would enable an improved drainage network through this integral residential growth area.

**Allowance for future development opportunities**

This Overton Road area is home to a number of high profile automotive retailers and service facilities. There are a number of underutilised sites within the area that would realise greater development potential if road access was safer. A crossing treatment that enhances this development potential should be a priority. Skye / Overton Road are key access points into and around Frankston City and industrial area.

The table below summarises Council’s previous assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences and LXRA options. Note LXRA did not present a rail under road option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAIL UNDER ROAD  
(Not considered by LXRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports Frankston’s economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better road access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transport safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced local land use opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved noise amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced visual impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible removal of trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OPTIONS | ADVANTAGES | DISADVANTAGES
---|---|---
RAIL OVER ROAD  
(Considered by LXRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports Frankston’s economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better access for pedestrians/cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better road access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transport safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced local land use opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced community connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to improve open space/linear trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual impact of elevated tracks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential noise issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overshadowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing maintenance issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is understood that drainage has been identified by LXRA as a key issue. After reviewing the information supplied by LXRA and Council’s consideration of the options, Council’s preferred option for Skye / Overton Road is still the **rail under road** option and request LXRA to investigate this option in more detail before a final decision is made.

Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Skye/Overton Road crossing:

- Economic development – Simplify intersections to enable development of underutilised land and improve accessibility to existing businesses.

- Connectivity – ensure that a pedestrian/cyclist overbridge is provided over tunnelled section of rail to ensure safe movement across rail reserve.

- Transport network – reconfigure complex intersections to enable through traffic improvements to the FMAC, Fletcher Road, Nepean Highway and Ebdale precinct.

- Environment – provide for the inclusion of WSUD to improve drainage in Ebdale and Dandenong Road East precincts.

- Amenity - Improved public realm, open space and streetscape including screening of infrastructure, where possible.
- Road Safety - Improved traffic safety and movement.

**Eel Race Road – Desired Outcomes**

Council’s key desired outcomes for the Eel Race Road crossing are:

- **Quality open space and urban design outcomes.**
  As Eel Race Road forms the northern border of our municipality – it is vital that the grade separation solution has superior urban design outcomes that befit this gateway site.

- **Connectivity**
  Eel Race Road provides access to Patterson River Secondary College and surrounding residential areas. The crossing removal solution must ensure that pedestrian and cyclist movement across the rail reserve is safe and easily accessible.

- **Noise and visual amenity**
  Due to the proximity of the crossing to residential enclaves, the crossing removal must ensure that residential amenity is preserved and enhanced.

The table on the following page summarises Council’s previous assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences and LXRA options. It is noted that LXRA did not present a rail under road option.

The possibility of the crossing being closed was also discussed in the context of train stabling constraints at Carrum Station.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade separation type</th>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIL UNDER ROAD</td>
<td>Better road access&lt;br&gt;Better access for pedestrians and cyclists&lt;br&gt;Improved noise amenity&lt;br&gt;Improved visual amenity&lt;br&gt;Good CPTED outcomes&lt;br&gt;Gateway and public realm opportunities</td>
<td>Loss of trees and vegetation along rail trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not considered by LXRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL OVER ROAD -</td>
<td>Better access for pedestrians and cyclists&lt;br&gt;Better road access&lt;br&gt;Enhanced connectivity&lt;br&gt;Ability to improve public realm and open space&lt;br&gt;Gateway and public realm opportunities</td>
<td>Visual impact of elevated tracks&lt;br&gt;Possible noise issues&lt;br&gt;Significant concerns about location of new stabling facilities further down the Frankston Line to accommodate this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at both McLeod and Eel Race Road (Considered by LXRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL OVER ROAD -</td>
<td>Less better access for pedestrians and cyclists&lt;br&gt;Improved noise and visual amenity&lt;br&gt;Enhanced connectivity&lt;br&gt;Ability to improve public realm and open space&lt;br&gt;Gateway and public realm opportunities</td>
<td>Access into the residential areas will not be from Eel Race Road (Refer Diagram below)&lt;br&gt;Some concern about location of temporary stabling facilities but impact should not be as significant as the Rail over Eel Race Road option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at McLeod but Eel Race Road Closed (Considered by LXRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Council’s previous submission to LXRA in July, Councillors’ preference was to advocate for the retention of the current situation and to redirect the funds proposed for a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment or improve rail services through the provision of a third rail.

Based on the review of LXRA’s two rail over options presented, it would appear that rail over road - Eel Race Road closed is more in line with Council’s preferred position if a rail under road option is not feasible.

Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Eel race Road crossing should it proceed:

- Improved public realm, including appropriate gateway treatments and signage.
- Superior access for pedestrians and cyclists by providing overbridges across tunnelled sections of line to provide clear and efficient movement to foreshore to the west and Patterson River Secondary College to the east.

- Improved traffic safety and movement.

**Alternatives to Eel Race Road Level Crossing Removal**

Council does not see great merit in removing the level crossing on Eel Race Road and an option is that this rail crossing remains in its current state or closed. Should this be the case, and as noted previously, Council would then advocate for retention of the existing level crossing arrangement. Considering this, Council has approached the State Government to divert the funding earmarked for the project (as much as $150 million) to achieving a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment and improve rail service through extending the third rail south of Moorabbin.

**Section 4.0**

**Stabling on the Frankston Line**

Currently stabling for trains on the Frankston line is primarily provided at Mordialloc, Carrum and Frankston. If the proposed removal of the Eel Race Road and Station Street Carrum crossings results in the removal of the stabling facility at Carrum, Council understands that this stabling could be relocated south to an area of rail reserve near Armstrong’s Road, Seaford.

This proposal is of significant concern to Frankston City as the potential for relocation of stabling to an alternate location within our municipality has not been articulated by LXRA or been able to be considered by our community.

The electrification of the Frankston line to Baxter has been included in PTV’s Network Planning documents. As such, Council asserts that the level crossing projects and the proposed electrification should be treated as integrated complementary projects.
Section 5.0

Summary

Council has made this submission in anticipation of the LXRA presenting its preferred rail crossing removal options to Council and the community in late 2016/early 2017.

To this end, Council has undertaken its own review of options based on the potential outcomes for each of the rail crossings. Resulting from this review, Frankston City’s strongly preferred options are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaford Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton/Skye Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel Race Road</td>
<td>No change to the Level Crossing at Eel Race Road, Seaford with funding be redirected to Council’s strategic rail needs However Council preferred option is Rail under Road if the LXRA’s intention is still to proceed with road/rail separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the overarching direction to realising the full potential of these projects. It is therefore important that any work does not jeopardise any future development opportunities such as the electrification, extending the third rail from Moorabbin and maximising land use opportunities at the Frankston Station Precinct.

As part of the Federal election campaign, funding was promised to investigate electrification to Baxter. This indicates the importance of ensuring that the level crossings projects take electrification into account, including its potential impact on the future operation and form of Frankston Station and the issues with stabling removal at Carrum.

An option proposed by LXRA for the Eel Race Road rail crossing removal is to close the road. If this is to be the case, Council will approach the State Government to divert the funding earmarked for the project to achieving a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment and improving rail service through extending the rail south from Moorabbin.

The scope of the projects, and the State Government funding for them, need to cover the works which meet Council’s expected outcomes. Care will also need to be taken that Council is not left with unnecessary ongoing maintenance costs, for example, because of inappropriate construction or design standards.
Based on the previous review of options conducted by Council that lead to Council’s submission in July and based on the review of LXRA’s preferred options presented to the public during September and October, Council preferred grade separations are as follows:

1. Seaford Road, rail under road as previously requested.

2. Skye / Overton Road, rail under road as previously requested. Council requests that engineering solutions utilising siphons be fully investigated to manage the drainage and flooding issues.

3. Eel Race Road, no change to the Level Crossing at Eel Race Road, Seaford with funding be redirected to Council’s strategic rail needs however Council preferred option is rail under road if the LXRA’s intention is still to proceed with road/rail separation. It is requested that LXRA investigate an option to move the Carrum Station south so that a rail under road can be considered. It is noted however that the rail over road at McLeod Road but Eel Race Road Closed option is in line with Council’s preferred option.
## Appendix A: Tables of detailed assessments

### LXRA Technical Investigations Update

#### Analysis of studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>FCC comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>Water table levels, soil composition and potential contamination, presence of acid sulphate soils, etc</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Groundwater level high therefore rail under option no longer under consideration.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions could rectify groundwater issues, more information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Flood impact/overland flow disturbance/drainage</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Rail under trench would create barrier to drainage of stormwater and interrupt overland flows resulting in flooding of nearby properties. Only infrastructure solution is to install 8 - 11 siphons which has deemed to be not practical or maintainable.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions such as siphons could rectify drainage issues, no explanation why this solution has been deemed more information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Groundwater flow and levels could impact available options, cumulative impact of multiple below ground works is a factor</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Low lying former swamp conditions present challenges to managing groundwater flow. Rail under trench would create a barrier to flows, dispersing groundwater to other areas around the trenched site.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Further information of the impact of a trench on groundwater flow needs to be produced before this element could be a determinant for option selection is mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological flora and</td>
<td>Disruption to habitat for Growling Grass Frog and Dwarf Galaxia. Native vegetation removal by works.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>No evidence of protected fauna in study area. Native vegetation found, offsets will be required. Construction Environmental management Plan will be produced to minimise impacts during construction.</td>
<td>Manageable issue. Potential options not affected by results of studies to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>FCC comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>Water table levels, soil composition and potential contamination, presence of acid sulphate soils, etc</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Groundwater level high therefore rail under option no longer under consideration.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions could rectify groundwater issues, more information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Flood impact/overland flow disturbance/drainage</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Rail under trench would create barrier to drainage of stormwater and interrupt overland flows resulting in flooding of nearby properties. Only infrastructure solution is to install 8 - 11 siphons which has deemed to be not practical or maintainable.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions such as siphons could rectify drainage issues, no explanation why this solution has been deemed more information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Groundwater flow and levels could impact available options, cumulative impact of multiple below ground works is a factor</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Low lying former swamp conditions present challenges to managing groundwater flow. Rail under trench would create a barrier to flows, dispersing groundwater to other areas around the trenched site.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Further information of the impact of a trench on groundwater flow needs to be produced before this element could be a determinant for option selection is mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological flora and</td>
<td>Disruption to habitat for Growling Grass Frog and Dwarf Galaxia. Native vegetation removal by works.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>No evidence of protected fauna in study area. Native vegetation found, offsets will be required. Construction Environmental management Plan will be produced to minimise impacts during construction.</td>
<td>Manageable issue. Potential options not affected by results of studies to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fauna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual assessment</td>
<td>Using photo renders to develop a greater understanding of how the landscape will look when the crossing removal is complete. Completing shadow diagrams to determine shadow cast by structures.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>There has been significant community concern about the visual appearance of completed crossing removal options, particularly rail over road. The shadow impacts of rail over road solutions have also been raised as a legitimate concern. Unfortunately, neither rendered photos nor shadow diagrams were available at the public consultation sessions, leaving these as unresolved concerns.</td>
<td>Medium level issue. How the proposed crossing removal options will impact upon the visual appearance and amenity of the individual sites is perhaps one of the most relevant considerations, however the Skye Road location has low amenity currently and the predominant land use is commercial and industrial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility services assessment</td>
<td>Determination of the location and function of services within the proposed work zones. Projected infrastructure needs within proximity of the crossing sites to allow for future proofing.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>The location and function of utility infrastructure can have a significant impact on the feasibility of options, particularly below ground solutions. At the Skye road site, significant drainage, water and sewage assets have been identified, which would require relocation of these services, therefore adding time and cost to the works.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. All service relocation is possible, even if additional costs are incurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature survey</td>
<td>Survey of natural and man-made features and levels of the subject sites.</td>
<td><strong>Complete</strong></td>
<td>The topography of land can impact on design solutions for crossing removal. Skye/Overton Road is generally flat, and has significant clutter of signage, power poles, commercial buildings and the like and therefore is a blighted area currently.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. No significant features that will affect options at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and vibration assessment</td>
<td>Modelling is conducted to determine the impact of each option, and then this data is compared against the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy. Vibration assessment is harder to complete, with no standard guidelines or criteria in place.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>Given the predominant non-residential land usage in the Skye/Overton Road location noise and vibration impacts are not as critical as in residential locations.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. Given that there is only one option under consideration for the Skye/Overton Road crossing removal, it is disappointing that this modelling and assessment has not been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park survey</td>
<td>Analysis of origin of vehicles parked in proximity of crossing removal site to determine requirements for parking provision during construction.</td>
<td>Not undertaken</td>
<td>As there is no commuter parking provided at the Skye/Overton Road site, this study is not necessary.</td>
<td>Not applicable. No commuter parking provided at site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic monitoring and modelling</td>
<td>Modelling and monitoring of traffic conditions and issues affecting the site, and examination of measures to achieve improved outcomes post removal.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Traffic movements in and around the Skye/Overton Road crossing are challenged and motorists are subject to significant delays. There is considerable doubt that the crossing removal alone will create appreciable positive impacts on traffic flows in this location.</td>
<td>Very critical issue. This road inter-section is a primary gateway entry to the Frankston Metropolitan Activity centre, including significant commercial and industrial land uses. It is integral that detailed traffic assessments are conducted for this site to achieve real improvements to traffic flow and reduction of congestion and waiting times at this intersection and surrounding road networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of impacts of removal options to determine impact on heritage values at each location.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Given that this site has been subject to considerable land disturbance due to the existing infrastructure and development it is doubtful if a complex assessment is required for this site.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. Site and location has been significantly disturbed therefore it is most unlikely that any heritage value exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of non-indigenous significance such as heritage structures.</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>No heritage structures in location.</td>
<td>Not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land survey</td>
<td>Property boundary and land ownership identification.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Non contentious item for this location as land holders are state or local authorities.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. Given that there is only one option under consideration for the Skye/Overton Road crossing removal, it is disappointing that this survey has not been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Seaford Road, Seaford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>FCC comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>Water table levels, soil composition and potential contamination, presence of acid sulphate soils, etc</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Rail under would require additional engineering based solutions during construction due to high water table in area. Rail over would require reinforced soil embankments which would reduce ability for east west pedestrian/cycle movements.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions could be designed to counter impacts of soft, sensitive soils. More information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Flood impact/overland flow disturbance/drainage</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>No significant flood mitigation works required in this location.</td>
<td>Manageable issue, crossing solution can be designed to maintain existing flow conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Groundwater flow and levels could impact available options, cumulative impact of multiple below ground works is a factor</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Shallow groundwater in area. Rail under trench would create a barrier to flows, dispersing groundwater to other areas around the trenched site. Additional investigations are being conducted to establish impact of changed groundwater flow that would be created by a rail under trench on the nearby Seaford Wetlands.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Further information of the impact of a trench on groundwater flow needs to be produced before this element could be a determinant for option selection is mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological flora and fauna</td>
<td>Disruption to habitat for Growling Grass Frog and Dwarf Galaxia. Native vegetation removal by works.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>No evidence of protected fauna in study area. Native vegetation found, offsets will be required. Construction Environmental management Plan will be produced to minimise impacts during construction.</td>
<td>Manageable issue. Potential options not affected by results of studies to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual assessment</td>
<td>Using photo renders to develop a greater understanding of how the landscape will look when the crossing removal is complete. Completing shadow diagrams to determine shadow cast by structures.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>There has been significant community concern about the visual appearance of completed crossing removal options, particularly rail over road. The shadow impacts of rail over road solutions have also been raised as a legitimate concern. Unfortunately, neither rendered photos nor shadow diagrams were available at the public consultation sessions, leaving these as unresolved concerns.</td>
<td>Critical issue. How the proposed crossing removal options will impact upon the visual appearance and amenity of the individual sites is perhaps one of the most relevant considerations, and the Seaford Road Road crossing is located in an area with sensitive interfaces to adjacent residential/recreation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility services assessment</td>
<td>Determination of the location and function of services within the proposed work zones. Projected infrastructure needs within proximity of the crossing sites to allow for future proofing.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>The location and function of utility infrastructure can have a significant impact on the feasibility of options, particularly below ground solutions. At the Seaford Road site, significant drainage, water and sewage assets have been identified, which would require relocation of these services, therefore adding time and cost to the works.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. All service relocation is possible, even if additional costs are incurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature survey</td>
<td>Survey of natural and man-made features and levels of the subject sites.</td>
<td><strong>Complete</strong></td>
<td>The topography of land can impact on design solutions for crossing removal. The two options under active consideration are not assisted/affected by topography in this location. The area does have significant clutter of signage, power poles, railway infrastructure and therefore is a blighted area currently.</td>
<td>Non critical issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and vibration assessment</td>
<td>Modelling is conducted to determine the impact of each option, and then this data is compared against the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy. Vibration assessment is harder to complete, with no standard guidelines or criteria in place.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>Modelling will not be undertaken until preferred solution has been selected.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Given the predominant land uses in this location are residential/leisure it is disappointing that this modelling and assessment has not been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park survey</td>
<td>Analysis of origin of vehicles parked in proximity of crossing removal site to determine requirements for parking provision during construction.</td>
<td>Not undertaken</td>
<td>As there is no commuter parking provided at the Seaford Road site, this study is not necessary.</td>
<td>Not applicable. No commuter parking provided at site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic monitoring and modelling</td>
<td>Modelling and monitoring of traffic conditions and issues affecting the site, and examination of measures to achieve improved outcomes post removal.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Traffic movements in and around the Seaford Road crossing are challenged and motorists are subject to delays and sometimes risky situations due to the amount of local roads accessing Seaford Road within close proximity to the crossing. There is considerable doubt that crossing removal alone will create appreciable traffic improvements in this location without accompanying changes to access/egress onto Seaford Road.</td>
<td>Critical issue. The community will expect to have improvements delivered to traffic networks in conjunction with the crossing removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of impacts of removal options to determine impact on heritage values at each location.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Given that this site has been subject to considerable land disturbance due to the existing infrastructure and development it is doubtful if a complex assessment is required for this site.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. Site and location has been significantly disturbed therefore it is most unlikely that any heritage value exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of non-indigenous significance such as heritage structures.</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>No heritage structures in location.</td>
<td>Not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land survey</td>
<td>Property boundary and land ownership identification.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Non contentious item for this location as land holders are state or local authorities.</td>
<td>Non critical issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>Water table levels, soil composition and potential contamination, presence of acid sulphate soils, etc</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Rail under would require additional engineering based solutions during construction due to high water table in area. Rail over would require reinforced soil embankments which would reduce ability for east west pedestrian/cycle movements.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Engineering solutions could be designed to counter impacts of soft, sensitive soils. More information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>Flood impact/overland flow disturbance/drainage</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>As rail under is not under consideration for this location, no investigations have been conducted regarding impacts of a rail under solution. Topography of site allows both above and below ground water to discharge from rail corridor for rail over solution.</td>
<td>Manageable issue. It is disappointing that rail under impacts were not examined in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeology</td>
<td>Groundwater flow and levels could impact available options, cumulative impact of multiple below ground works is a factor</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>As rail under is not under consideration for this location, no investigations have been conducted regarding impacts of a rail under solution. Shallow groundwater in area. Rail under trench would create a barrier to flows, dispersing groundwater to other areas around the trenched site. Additional investigations are being conducted to establish impact of changed groundwater flow that would be created by a rail under trench on the nearby Seaford Wetlands.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Further information of the impact of a trench on groundwater flow should have been considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological flora and fauna</td>
<td>Disruption to habitat for Growling Grass Frog and Dwarf Galaxia. Native vegetation removal by works.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>No evidence of protected fauna in study area. Native vegetation found, offsets will be required. Construction Environmental management Plan will be produced to minimise impacts during construction. The native Vegetation offset site at the south eastern corner of Eel Race Road was not identified in the investigations.</td>
<td>Manageable issue. Potential options not affected by results of studies to date, however as the offset site was not identified, some modification to potential overpass locations will have to be considered. The stand of coastal banksias present at the gateway location is part of the Frankston City landscape character and will need to preserved and enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual assessment</td>
<td>Using photo renders to develop a greater understanding of how the landscape will look when the crossing removal is complete. Completing shadow diagrams to determine shadow cast by structures.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>There has been significant community concern about the visual appearance of completed crossing removal options, particularly rail over road. The shadow impacts of rail over road solutions have also been raised as a legitimate concern. Unfortunately, neither rendered photos nor shadow diagrams were available at the public consultation sessions, leaving these as unresolved concerns.</td>
<td>Critical issue. How the proposed crossing removal options will impact upon the visual appearance and amenity of the individual sites is perhaps one of the most relevant considerations, and the Carrum crossings are located in an area with sensitive interfaces to nearby residential/recreation areas. There are in excess of 40 dwellings that directly abut the rail corridor, some within a metre or two from where elevated rail may be. Eel Race Road is the northern municipal boundary Frankston City, and it is essential that suitable gateway treatments are included in any designs for this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility services assessment</td>
<td>Determination of the location and function of services within the proposed work zones. Projected infrastructure needs within proximity of the crossing sites to allow for future proofing.</td>
<td><strong>Incomplete</strong></td>
<td>The location and function of utility infrastructure can have a significant impact on the feasibility of options, particularly below ground solutions. At the Seaford Road site, significant electricity, telecommunications and sewage assets have been identified, which would require relocation of these services, therefore adding time and cost to the works.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. All service relocation is possible, even if additional costs are incurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature survey</td>
<td>Survey of natural and man-made features and levels of the subject sites.</td>
<td><strong>Complete</strong></td>
<td>The topography of land can impact on design solutions for crossing removal. The two options under active consideration are not assisted/affected by topography in this location.</td>
<td>Non critical issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and vibration assessment</td>
<td>Modelling is conducted to determine the impact of each option, and then this data is compared against the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy. Vibration assessment is harder to complete, with no standard guidelines or criteria in place.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Modelling will not be undertaken until preferred solution has been selected.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Given the predominant land use in this location are residential it is disappointing that this modelling and assessment has not been undertaken. This is particularly so given the very close proximity of over 40 dwellings within Frankston City boundaries to elevated rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car park survey</td>
<td>Analysis of origin of vehicles parked in proximity of crossing removal site to determine requirements for parking provision during construction.</td>
<td>Not undertaken</td>
<td>As there is no commuter parking provided at the Eel Race Road site, this study is not necessary.</td>
<td>Not applicable. No commuter parking provided at site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic monitoring and modelling</td>
<td>Modelling and monitoring of traffic conditions and issues affecting the site, and examination of measures to achieve improved outcomes post removal.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>The Eel Race Road crossing removal has been considered as part of a two crossing removal package along with Station Street, Carrum. One of the options on the table is to close Eel Race Road to the east of the rail line, and to extend McLeod Road under elevated rail to intersect with the Nepean Highway. A further option is to construct a road bridge over the Patterson River to the east of the rail bridge to connect Station Street north and south.</td>
<td>Critical issue. Eel Race Road serves residents and Patterson River Secondary College. If it is to be closed the impacts for Frankston residents will have to be fully assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>FCC comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of impacts of removal options to determine impact on heritage values at each location.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Given that this site has been subject to considerable land disturbance due to the existing infrastructure and development it is doubtful if a complex assessment is required for this site.</td>
<td>Non critical issue. Site and location has been significantly disturbed therefore it is most unlikely that any heritage value exists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European cultural heritage</td>
<td>Assessment of non-indigenous significance such as heritage structures.</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>No heritage structures in location.</td>
<td>Not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land survey</td>
<td>Property boundary and land ownership identification.</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>Not known as land survey has not been completed.</td>
<td>Critical issue. There appears to be at least one dwelling which abuts the rail reserve that is very close to the boundary – with aerial images indicating it may be partially constructed in the rail reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations / criteria to meet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail bridge over the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td>900m footprint from Boonong Avenue to Tooyal Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property acquisition impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>• No property acquisition required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported but can be achieved with rail under road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Look &amp; feel</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual impact and overshadowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant concerns by Council as residents South of Overton Road will be impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permanent land use impacts (includes community infrastructure &amp; amenity)</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential for additional retail car parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported but can be achieved with rail under road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycling &amp; walking</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for new paths and greater connections across the railway line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported but can be achieved with rail under road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local access and connections</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• No impact on local road connections after construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported but can be achieved with rail under road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment – flora &amp; fauna</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for replanting vegetation after construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported but can be achieved with rail under road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations / criteria to meet</td>
<td>How did we assess each preliminary option?</td>
<td>Council comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extend of construction site) | Rail bridge over the road 900m footprint from Boonong Avenue to Tooyal Street | Ongoing maintenance required – such as graffiti removal  
Access maintained for utility services, repairs and upgrades | Maintenance requirement will have high impacts to Council, rating should be adjusted  
Support but can be achieved with rail under road |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>Preliminary Assessment</th>
<th>Seaford Road, Frankston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations / criteria to meet</td>
<td>Rail under the road</td>
<td>Rail bridge over the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property acquisition impacts</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look &amp; feel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent land use impacts (includes community infrastructure &amp; amenity)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling &amp; walking</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating for rail under the road should be a medium benefit. Visual impact from rail over road will be significant and rating should be changed to high impact.

Rating for Rail over road should be changed to medium benefit.

Supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>How did we assess each preliminary option?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Assessment</td>
<td>Seaford Road, Frankston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations / criteria to meet</th>
<th>Rail under the road</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road</th>
<th>Council comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local access and connections</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No impact on local road connections after construction</td>
<td>• No impact on local road connections after construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment – flora &amp; fauna</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>- -</th>
<th>Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vegetation close to the rail line to be removed and some trees within Seaford reserve may need to be removed/lopped</td>
<td>• Vegetation close to the rail line to be removed and some trees within Seaford reserve may need to be removed/lopped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited opportunities for replanting vegetation after construction</td>
<td>• Greater opportunities for replanting vegetation after construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible change in regional groundwater flows may potentially impact nearby Ramsar listed wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not agree. This cannot be rated at this stage as it has not been proven that ground water will impact the Ramsar listed wetland. Furthermore an Engineering solution to manage ground water flow changes can be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DESIRED OUTCOMES

### Preliminary Assessment

**Seaford Road, Frankston**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations / criteria to meet</th>
<th><strong>Rail under the road</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rail bridge over the road</strong></th>
<th><strong>Council comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Do not agree. Maintenance issues will be far greater for Rail over road rather than Rail under Road. Please change rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Do not agree that access to utilities will be restricted for rail under road. Rating should be the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extend of construction site)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing maintenance required – such as graffiti removal and pumping water from the trench</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access restricted for utility access repairs and upgrades</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing maintenance required - such as graffiti removal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access maintained for utility service upgrades and repairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council comment**

- Do not agree. Maintenance issues will be far greater for Rail over road rather than Rail under Road. Please change rating
- Do not agree that access to utilities will be restricted for rail under road. Rating should be the same
### Appendix A: Tables of detailed assessments cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>How did we assess each preliminary option?</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel Race Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key considerations/ criteria to meet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rail bridge over the road – Eel Race Road closed</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approximately 900m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Eel Race Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rail bridge over the road – at both McLeod Road and Eel Race Road</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approximately 1400m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Kananook Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Council Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property acquisition impacts</td>
<td>• No property acquisition required</td>
<td>Supported for Eel Race Road Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No property acquisition required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Look &amp; feel</strong></td>
<td>• Visual impact and overshadowing</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A new station provides an opportunity for improved lighting, visibility and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater visual impact and overshadowing due to increased structure length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A new station provides an opportunity for improved lighting, visibility and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent land use impacts (includes community infrastructure &amp; amenity)</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – Eel Race Road closed</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – at both McLeod Road and Eel Race Road</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations/ criteria to meet</td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Eel Race Road</td>
<td>Approximately 1400m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Kananook Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not preclude future removal of Mascot Avenue level crossing</td>
<td>• Does not preclude future removal of Mascot Avenue level crossing</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No net loss of car parking at the station. Station car park can be reinstated underneath the structure</td>
<td>• No net loss of car parking at the station. Station car park can be reinstated underneath the structure</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling &amp; walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for new paths and greater connections, improving pedestrian access to the beach and shops, although opportunities are restricted by stabling</td>
<td>• Opportunity for new paths and greater connections, improving pedestrian access to the beach and shops</td>
<td>Recommend that rating for Eel Race Road Closed option provides an equivalent level of access as the Rail over Road option for Eel Race Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRED OUTCOMES</td>
<td>Preliminary Assessment</td>
<td>How did we assess each preliminary option?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Eel Race Road** | **Rail bridge over the road**  
  **Eel Race Road closed**  
  Approximately 900m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Eel Race Road | **Rail bridge over the road – at both**  
  **McLeod Road and Eel Race Road**  
  Approximately 1400m footprint from south of Patterson River to north of Kananook Creek |
| **Key considerations/ criteria to meet** | **Council Comments** |
| **Local access and connections** | **+ + +** | **-** |
| • Design allows for consideration of Station Street extension over Patterson River | **+ + +** | **-** |
| • Redirects Eel Race Road traffic to Nepean Highway via McLeod Road | **+** | **+** |
| • Maintains connectivity to Nepean Highway at Eel Race Road | | Supported for Eel Race Road Closed |
| **Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extent of construction site)** | **-** | **+** |
| • Ongoing maintenance required - such as graffiti removal | **-** | **+** |
| • Access maintained for utility service upgrades and repairs | | Supported for Eel Race Road Closed |
| • Ongoing maintenance required - such as graffiti removal | | Supported for Eel Race Road Closed |
| • Access restricted for utility access repairs and upgrades | | |
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### DESIRED OUTCOMES
#### Preliminary Assessment
Eel Race Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations/ criteria to meet</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – Eel Race Road closed</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – at both McLeod Road and Eel Race Road</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated development opportunity</td>
<td>• Opportunities for retail development in the station precinct</td>
<td>• Greater opportunities for retail/ residential development within the station stabling precinct</td>
<td>Relocation of any stabling from Carrum to location further down the line in the Frankston Municipality is not supported. The rating does not take in consideration of impact of temporary stabling down the line. Rating should be adjusted accordingly unless new stabling is part of the future Electrification to Baxter project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| + | Has low benefits |
| ++ | Has medium benefits |
| +++ | Has high benefits |
| -- | Has low impacts |
| --- | Has medium impacts |
| --- -- | Has high impacts |
Appendix A: Tables of detailed assessments cont’d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS</th>
<th>How did we assess each preliminary option?</th>
<th>Council comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Preliminary Assessment | **Rail bridge over the road**  
Approximately 900m footprint from Boonong Avenue to Tooyal Street | |
| Key considerations / criteria to meet | | |
| Disruption during construction | • Likely to require significant rail closures during construction  
• Commercial car parks will likely be closed during construction  
• Likely to require minor road closures during construction | Council understand that construction activity will generate disruptions to the Community and request that this is kept to a minimal amount.  
Council would prefer that car parks are not closed during construction.  
Council would like road closures to a minimum and that local access is provided at all times. |
| Environment – flora & fauna | • Vegetation close to the rail line to be removed | Council request that vegetation removal is kept to a minimal. |
| Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extent of construction site) | • Extent of construction site likely to affect residents and adjacent commercial properties (i.e. construction equipment will need to be located on existing car parks and possibly elsewhere)  
• May require the relocation of some utility services | Council request that any service relocation works do not impact Businesses and Residents. |
### CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
#### Preliminary Assessment Seaford Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations / criteria to meet</th>
<th>How did we assess each preliminary option?</th>
<th>Council comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Disruption during construction | **Rail under the road**
Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue | **Rail bridge over the road**
Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue | Council understand that construction activity will generate disruptions to the Community and request that this is kept to a minimal amount. Based on the past rail under road projects, construction impact rating for Rail under road appears to be high and should be reviewed |
| | - Likely to require major rail closures during construction
- Likely to require major road closures during construction | - Likely to require minor road closures during construction |
| | - Potential to build part of the rail bridge offline, resulting in less impact on rail commuters during construction | |

Council comment:
Disruption during construction
- Likely to require major rail closures during construction
- Likely to require major road closures during construction
- Potential to build part of the rail bridge offline, resulting in less impact on rail commuters during construction
- Likely to require minor road closures during construction

Council understand that construction activity will generate disruptions to the Community and request that this is kept to a minimal amount.
Based on the past rail under road projects, construction impact rating for Rail under road appears to be high and should be reviewed.
### CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
#### Preliminary Assessment
#### Seaford Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations / criteria to meet</th>
<th>Rail under the road</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road</th>
<th>Council comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extent of construction site)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rating" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td>Approximately 900m footprint from south of Seaford Station to Bardia Avenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extent of construction site likely to affect residents (ie construction equipment will need to be located in the rail reserve and possibly elsewhere. This solution may also require temporary space to store the soil removed from the ground)</td>
<td>- Extent of construction site likely to affect residents (ie construction equipment will need to be located in the rail reserve)</td>
<td>- Extent of construction site likely to affect residents (ie construction equipment will need to be located in the rail reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will require the removal and relocation of major utility services</td>
<td>- May require the relocation of some utility services running across and along the rail corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Groundwater present within 0-2m of surface, presenting water management considerations during and after construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations/ criteria to meet</td>
<td>Rail bridge over the road – Eel Race Road closed</td>
<td>Rail bridge over the road – at both McLeod Road and Eel Race Road</td>
<td>Council Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Disruption during construction       | • Likely to require significant rail closures during construction  
• Likely to require minor road closures during construction  
• Station and retail car park will likely be closed during construction | • Likely to require significant rail closures during construction  
• Likely to require minor road closures during construction  
• Station and retail car park will likely be closed during construction | Council understand that construction activity will generate disruptions to the Community and request that this is kept to a minimal amount. |
<p>| Environment – flora &amp; fauna          | • Vegetation close to the rail line to be removed | • Vegetation close to the rail line to be removed | Council request that vegetation removal is kept to a minimal. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key considerations/ criteria to meet</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – Eel Race Road closed</th>
<th>Rail bridge over the road – at both McLeod Road and Eel Race Road</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations (includes ground conditions, site constraints, utilities, extent of construction site)</td>
<td>• May require the removal of some utility services&lt;br&gt;• Construction may impact Station Street and Nepean Highway, with some lane closures required&lt;br&gt;• Extent of construction site likely to affect shops and residents (i.e. construction equipment will need to be located at existing car parks and possibly elsewhere)</td>
<td>• May require relocation of more utility services&lt;br&gt;• Construction will impact Station Street and Nepean Highway, with some lane closures required&lt;br&gt;• Extent of construction site likely to affect shops and residents (i.e. construction equipment will need to be located at existing car parks and possibly elsewhere)&lt;br&gt;• Narrow rail reserve south of Eel Race Road will make construction access difficult</td>
<td>Council note that the option that closes Eel Race Road provides less impacts than rail over Road option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Has low benefits
- Has medium benefits
- Has high benefits
- Has high impacts
- Has medium impacts
- Has low impacts
Appendix B: Integration into the crossing removal project elements of the RF Miles Reserve upgrade

Please review from the next page.
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Executive Summary

The Frankston City Council strongly supports the commitments made by the State Government to the removal of three dangerous and inefficient level crossings on the Frankston Rail line, and the transformation of the Frankston Transit Interchange precinct.

Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the overarching direction to realising the full potential of these projects to deliver a once in a lifetime opportunity for the revitalise Frankston as the premier regional bayside capital.

It is essential that the level crossing removal projects are not undertaken in isolation of Council’s broader goals that being the electrification of the rail line to Baxter and the extension of the third rail southbound from Moorabbin.

This submission provides the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA) with Council’s preferred option for each of the crossings to be removed within Frankston, and to provide the context for additional rail corridor initiatives. This includes the correlation between the forthcoming station precinct redevelopment and the crossing removal options, and the urgent need for the State Government to commit to the electrification to Baxter prior to the previously projected delivery date of 2022.

Council has made this submission in anticipation of the LXRA presenting its preferred rail crossing removal options to Council and the community in early August 2016. To this end, Council has undertaken its own review of potential options based on the potential outcomes its wants for each of the rail crossings.

Towards establishing Council’s priorities for each of the rail removal crossings, an initial workshop was held with Councillors on 25 May 2016. The general priorities identified from the workshop were:

- Noise impacts no greater than currently
- Minimised visual impact
- Improved landscaping
- Better amenity
- Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists
- Equivalent or better road access
- Safer roads
- Increased personal safety
- Economic benefits

A later workshop was held with Councillors on 29 June 2016 to review the application of these priorities to each of the potential crossing options, and to establish Council’s option preferences. The workshop covered:

- A description of the potential crossings options (road over and under rail, and rail over and under road) for each crossing location.
- Confirmation of Council’s desired outcomes.
- Consideration of the respective options by the use of a multi criteria assessment tool.
• The implications of each of the options for Council’s priorities.
• Identification and assessment of the positives and negatives of the options for each crossing location.
• Establishment of Council’s option preferences.

Resulting from this review, Council’s strongly preferred options are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaford Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton/Skye Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel Race Road</td>
<td>No change to the Level Crossing at Eel Race Road, Seaford with funding be redirected to Council’s strategic rail needs, however Council preferred option is Rail under Road if the LXRA’s intention is still to proceed with road/rail separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the overarching direction to realising the full potential of these projects. It is therefore important that any work does not jeopardise any future development opportunities, such as the electrification to Baxter, extending the third rail from Moorabbin and maximising land use opportunities at the Frankston Station Precinct.

As part of the Federal election campaign, both of the main political parties announced funding to investigate electrification to Baxter. This indicates the political importance of ensuring that the level crossings projects take this into account, including its potential impact on the future operation and nature of Frankston Station.

It is understood that there is a possibility that the planned Eel Race Road rail crossing removal may not proceed as planned. In which case, Council will approach the State Government to divert the funding earmarked for the project to achieving a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment and improving rail service through extending the rail south from Moorabbin.

To achieve the best outcomes for the immediate and wider community, a strong and structured communication partnership needs to be maintained between the LXRA and other relevant State Government agencies.

The scope of the projects, and the State Government funding for them, need to cover the works which meet Council’s expected outcomes. Care will also need to be taken that Council is not left with unnecessary ongoing maintenance costs, for example, because of inappropriate construction or design standards.

This submission defines the principles that formed the basis for the assessment criteria, describes the methodology that was used to assess the respective grade separation techniques and provides Council’s preferred options. The submission concludes with Council’s vision for the rail corridor, incorporating the redevelopment of the Frankston Transit Interchange and electrification to Baxter.
Introduction

Context
The Victorian Government committed in 2015 to remove at 50 level crossings on the metropolitan rail network to 2022 in line with a pre-election commitment. The implementation of this plan is being delivered by the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA). Three of these are located within the City on the Frankston Line at Eel Race Road, Seaford Road and Overton / Skye Road.

The removal of level crossings will improve safety, deliver transport network efficiency, reduce congestion and provide significant local and road user benefits. Additional development and open space opportunities will be facilitated by the proposed at grade crossing removals.

Council notes that the LXRA have committed to an extensive consultation process with all stakeholders and the Community to determine the preferred grade separation options.

The LXRA planned timelines to complete this group of rail crossing removal are:

i. Project awareness late 2015.
ii. Pre-design options discussion to input into Feasibility design early 2016.
iii. Feasible options for discussion mid-2016.
v. Tender (2017).
vii. Post construction.

This submission contributes to LXRA’s committed consultation process on the three Frankston crossing removal options programmed for mid-2016.

Council Focus
Each of the level crossing removals will have positive and negative impacts on the immediate and wider Frankston communities, and Council has desired outcomes its wants to achieve at both levels.

Level crossing removal projects can not only relieve congestion and improve safety at the crossing point, but can also provide redevelopment opportunities, and deliver urban realm improvements. However, each of the solutions can also result in adverse social, economic and environmental impacts on the local area.

Frankston City’s position on the options aims to achieve the best possible results for the community, particularly preserving and enhancing adjacent amenity.

To assess what these results might be, the advantages and disadvantages of potential options have been reviewed and lead to the preferred level crossing removal options favoured by Council in this submission.
Strategically, Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the best way to realise the full potential of the crossing replacement projects to deliver a once in a lifetime opportunity for the revitalise Frankston as the premier regional bayside capital.

It is essential that the level crossing removal projects are not undertaken in isolation of Council’s broader goals, that being, the electrification of the rail line to Baxter (including its impact of Frankston Station re-development) and the extension of the third rail southbound from Moorabbin.

The purposes of this paper is to provide the Level Crossing Removal Authority (LXRA) with Council’s option preferences for each of the crossings to be removed within Frankston, and to provide the context for additional rail corridor initiatives and Frankston Station improvements. This includes the urgent need for the State Government to commit to the electrification to Baxter prior to the previously projected delivery date of 2022.

Implementation Principles

Relationship Protection

Council proposes to be proactive as planning and implementation of the level crossing removals proceeds. There is great sensitivity amongst communities directly affected by prospective changes associated with the level crossing removal projects. Further, there will be ramifications for the wider community, particularly during the construction phases – including road and rail network closures. A strong and structured communication process that includes input from the LXRA and aligned transport authorities must be established.

In order to obtain the best possible outcomes for our community, it is also vital to ensure that a respectful and collaborative partnership with the LXRA is established and maintained. By ensuring that open and constructive dialogue exists through the planning, contract awarding and construction phases, Council will significantly enhance its abilities to interact with the delivering agencies, and therefore can advocate for superior community outcomes.

Scope of Works

The scope of the projects is a critical issue. The extent of the LXRA is limited to level crossing removal only. The provision of corridor infrastructure upgrades, for example the installation of a third line to Frankston, is considered by the LXRA as being beyond the scope of their delivery function. However, Council can lobby to ensure that grade separation options which provide the potential to ‘future proof’ the rail corridor are promoted. For example, the provision of vertical retailing walls for rail under solutions that can be moved to allow for expansion of the track area to allow for the construction of a third rail.

The scope of the rail crossing removal projects needs to also accommodate potential road network improvements identified in conjunction with VicRoads. The ability to improve the existing road network is one of the major benefits from road/rail separation and should not just rely in maintaining existing road layouts. That is particularly the case with the Overton Road / Skye Road intersection.
Budget

Construction of the level crossing removal projects is funded entirely by the Victorian Government. However, it will be necessary to include the funding for potential for additional benefits, such as enhanced landscaping and urban design projects. Care will also need to be taken that Council is not left with unnecessary ongoing maintenance costs, for example, because of inappropriate construction or design standards.

Organisation of Submission

Reflecting Council’s focus, the report is organised into seven sections:

1. Desired Council and Community Rail Outcomes.
2. Consideration of Rail Crossing Options.
3. Results of Options Review.
4. Electrification to Baxter (including consideration of rail opportunities south of Baxter).
5. Frankston Station redevelopment.
6. Other potential Rail Corridor Enhancements.
7. Summary.
Section 1.0

Desired Council and Community Outcomes

LXRA Consultation

The State Government’s program for removing level crossings is primarily aimed at improving safety, delivering transport network efficiencies (including for trains), reducing congestion and providing better access. The LXRA was also required to consult with affected communities to garner their respective views on what they expected from the crossing removals and crossing removal options.

Initial community consultation by the LXRA was undertaken in March 2016. Key themes from the consultation received by LXRA were:

- Overwhelming support for the removal of level crossings:
  - Different preferences for the crossings to be removed.
  - Requests for additional sites to be considered for removal.
  - Questions on how the 50 sites were selected.
- Concern over elevated rail (linked to concern about loss of property values, overshadowing, noise and visual impacts, and undesirable behaviour).
- Desire for long term planning now, rather than focus on just next step.
- Integration with surrounding area and desire to maintain the ambience of the area as local seaside towns, distinct from the City of Melbourne.
- Scepticism of the engagement and design development process and the inclusion and consideration of community feedback in design development.

Council’s Desired Outcomes

To assist with establishing Council’s priorities for each of the rail removal crossings, an initial workshop was held with Councillors on 25 May 2016. The general priorities identified from the workshop were:

- Noise impacts no greater than currently
- Minimised visual impact
- Improved landscaping
- Better amenity
- Improved access for pedestrians and cyclists
- Equivalent or better road access
- Safer roads
- Increased personal safety
- Economic benefits
A later workshop was held with Councillors on 29 June 2016 to review the application of these priorities to each of the potential crossing options, and to establish Council’s option preferences. The workshop covered:

- A description of the potential crossings options (road over and under rail, and rail over and under road) for each crossing location.
- Confirmation of Council’s desired outcomes.
- Consideration of the respective options by the use of a multi criteria assessment tool.
- The implications of each of the options for Council’s priorities.
- Identification and assessment of the positives and negatives of the options for each crossing location.
- Establishment of Council’s initial option preferences.

Principles for Grade Separation in Frankston

The following objectives were devised in response to ideals articulated by Council and the community. These are the principles upon which the respective options were considered.

- **Maximised road network efficiency** – Ensure that any change to the road network achieves improved traffic flows within proximity of the crossing.

- **Improved safety outcomes** – Decrease in pedestrian and vehicular incidents at and around crossings. Pedestrian and cyclists are visible from the public realm, routes are well lit and should be designed to follow best practice Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

- **Enhanced community connectivity** – Removal or reduction in physical and perceived barriers created by existing level crossings.

- **Improved visual amenity** – Areas along the existing rail corridor are subject to an existing level of visual blight from the rail infrastructure and overlooking from passengers. Solutions should incorporate measures to improve visual amenity both from a resident and passenger viewpoint.

- **Noise amenity** – Properties along the rail corridor are subject to existing levels of noise impacts, including warning bells, train horns, tyres over tracks and the actual noise of the train itself. Any grade separation solution must present improved quantifiable benefits.

- **Allowance for future development opportunities** – Certain grade separation solutions delivers opportunities for redevelopment of adjacent land for either private or public purposes.

- **Quality open space and urban design outcomes** – Grade separation techniques can lead to increased open space opportunities and the delivery of positive urban design outcomes that benefit the passenger and the community as a whole. Crossings that deliver superior ground level activation through open space provision and built form improvements will be favoured.

- **Environmentally responsible solutions** – Crossing solutions that mitigate impacts on receiving waters and provide habitat for increased biodiversity are considered superior.
Future proofing/ allowance for whole of corridor approach – The three crossings must not be viewed in isolation, but rather as part of the entire rail corridor through to Baxter and beyond. Provision must be made for the future relocation of train stabling from Carrum and Frankston to Baxter, and a third rail line from Baxter to Melbourne.

Grade Separation Options

Five potential options are available to LXRA replace current at grade level crossings. They are:

- Road Over Rail.
- Road Under Rail.
- Rail Over Road.
- Rail Under Road.
- Hybrid of the above (where rail and road options are combined).

All of the above options except for the hybrid option were evaluated by Council.

“Sky Rail”

The term “skyrail” has been frequently used in recent times to describe the level crossing removal solution for the grade separation of nine existing crossings on the Cranbourne Pakenham line between Caulfield and Dandenong. The project also includes the reconstruction of five existing stations. Both the stations and the connecting rail track will be elevated for the length of the line.

Through the Council workshops and in public, Councillors have expressed their opposition to any “skyrail” options.

The Minister for Public Transport, the Hon Jacinta Allan MP has reassured that Dandenong Line type “skyrail” will not be constructed on the Frankston Line (see APPENDIX A).
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Consideration of Rail Crossing Options

Assessments

To assist Councillors, in appreciating the positives and negatives of options, a Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) was first undertaken by Council officers for each option at each of the three crossing locations.

Eleven criteria were assessed for each of the crossings and grouped under five categories. Each criteria was further assessed based on their relative importance which were seen to represent Council's Priorities.

MCA Criteria used for the options assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Create suitable development opportunities</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Better, safer access for pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better, safer road access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports strategic transport networks and improved transport efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Enhanced local land use</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced community connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved personal safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>Visual Amenity</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Improved local natural environment</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality open space and urban Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the MCA, the expected attributes of options were also reviewed as advantages and disadvantages.
Section 3.0

Results of Options Review

Seaford Road – Desired Outcomes

Council’s desired outcomes for the Seaford Road crossing are:

**Community connectivity**
Removal of the barriers that exist to enable safe and lineal movement across the rail line, particularly to Seaford Reserve.

**Environmentally responsible solutions**
Kananook Creek environs and existing vegetation must be preserved and additional opportunities provided to ensure water quality and vegetation expansion.

**Improved visual amenity**
The current crossing presents a clutter of rail, traffic and directional signage. The option selected for this site must present visual improvements and provide the opportunity for necessary infrastructure to be screened.

**Maximised road traffic efficiency and improved safety outcomes**
The existing tangle of roads and rail presents real impacts to road users, both of Seaford Road as well as Railway Parade and Fortescue Avenue. Improved connections across these vital road links must be a priority of this crossing removal.

Seaford Road – MCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEAFORD</th>
<th>Road Over Rail</th>
<th>Road Under Rail</th>
<th>Rail Over Road</th>
<th>Rail Under Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Mildly Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENITY</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Moderately Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
<td>Mildly Positive</td>
<td>Moderately Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seaford Road – Option Positives and Negatives

The table below summarises the assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade separation type</th>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Road UNDER            | Increased transport safety  
                      Supports transport networks  
                      Improved visual amenity  
                      Improved noise amenity | Possible Loss of approximately 40 dwellings  
                      Poor pedestrian/cyclist amenity  
                      Poor personal safety  
                      Decreased community connectivity  
                      Visual impact of trenching, retaining walls and fencing  
                      Possible removal of trees and vegetation alongside road cuttings |
| Road OVER             | Increased transport safety  
                      Supports transport networks | Possible loss of approx. 40 dwellings  
                      Poor pedestrian/cyclist amenity  
                      Visual appearance of overpasses  
                      Poor personal safety  
                      Poor CPTED outcomes  
                      Reduced community connectivity |
| Rail UNDER            | Increase transport safety  
                      Improved road access  
                      Improved noise amenity  
                      Improved visual appearance | Visual impact of trenching, retaining walls and fencing  
                      Reduced connectivity opportunities  
                      Removal of trees and vegetation along rail trench |
| Rail OVER             | Better access pedestrians/cyclists  
                      Improved community connectivity  
                      Increased transport safety  
                      Improved road access  
                      Opportunity for open space and public realm improvements | Visual impact of elevated tracks  
                      Potential noise issues |

After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of the options and the results of the MCA assessment, Council endorsed the rail under road as their preferred option.
Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Seaford Road crossing:

- Superior access for pedestrians and cyclists by providing overbridges across tunnelled sections of line to provide clear and efficient movement, particularly to Seaford reserve.

- Improved public realm, including screening of infrastructure, where possible.

- Safer road transport movement, including treatments to the Railway Parade/Seaford Road and Fortescue Avenue/Seaford Road intersections.
Overton Road / Skye Road Crossing – Desired Outcomes

Council’s desired outcomes for the Overton / Skye Road crossing are:

**Maximised road network efficiency**

Any improvements that can be delivered to the complex network of road and rail intersections in this location should be promoted.

**Enhanced community connectivity**

The existing rail reserve presents a significant barrier to movement from east to west. A solution that provides additional points for pedestrians and cyclists to move across the rail line is vital.

**Environmentally responsible solutions**

The Ebdale precinct is currently compromised by drainage concerns and inefficiencies. A solution that would enable the rail reserve to form part of a drainage basin would enable an improved drainage network through this integral residential growth area.

**Allowance for future development opportunities**

This Overton Road area is home to a number of high profile automotive retailers and service facilities. There are a number of underutilised sites within the area that would realise greater development potential if road access was safer. A crossing treatment that enhances this development potential should be a priority.

### Overton Road / Skye Road Crossing – Desired Outcomes

The table on the following page summarises the assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade separation type</th>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Road UNDER** | Supports Frankston’s economy  
Improved transport safety  
Improved visual amenity  
Improved noise amenity | Possible removal of significant businesses required  
Poor personal safety  
Environmental impacts  
Very difficult to activate public realm  
Possible loss of property |
| **Road OVER** | Improved transport safety  
Support Frankston economy | Possible loss of property  
Possible loss of significant businesses  
Poor pedestrian/cyclist amenity  
Reduced community connectivity  
Poor personal safety  
Visual appearance of overpasses  
Very difficult to activate public realm |
| **Rail UNDER** | Supports Frankston’s economy  
Better road access  
Improved transport safety  
Enhanced local land use opportunities  
Improved noise amenity  
Reduced visual impact  
Improved amenities | Possible removal of trees  
Reduced connectivity |
| **Rail OVER** | Supports Frankston’s economy  
Better access for pedestrians/cyclists  
Better road access  
Improved transport safety  
Enhanced local land use opportunities  
Enhanced community connectivity  
Opportunity to improve open space/linear trail | Visual impact of elevated tracks, but less of concern given lack of sensitive interfaces  
Potential noise issues |

After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of the options and the results of the MCA assessment, Council endorsed the *rail under road* solution as their preferred option.
Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Seaford Road crossing:

- Economic development – Simplify intersections to enable development of underutilised land and improve accessibility to existing businesses.

- Connectivity – ensure that a pedestrian/cyclist overbridge is provided over tunnelled section of rail to ensure safe movement across rail reserve.

- Transport network – reconfigure complex intersections to enable through traffic improvements to FMAC, Fletcher Road, Nepean Highway and Ebdale precinct.

- Environment – provide for the inclusion of WSUD to improve drainage in Ebdale precinct.

- Amenity - Improved public realm, open space and streetscape including screening of infrastructure, where possible.

- Road Safety - Improved traffic safety and movement.
Eel Race Road – Desired Outcomes

Council’s key desired outcomes for the Eel Race Road crossing are:

**Quality open space and urban design outcomes.**

As Eel Race Road forms the northern border of our municipality – it is vital that the grade separation solution has superior urban design outcomes that befit this gateway site.

**Connectivity**

Eel Race Road provides access to Patterson River Secondary College and surrounding residential areas. The crossing removal solution must ensure that pedestrian and cyclist movement across the rail reserve is safe and easily accessible.

**Noise and visual amenity**

Due to the proximity of the crossing to residential enclaves, the crossing removal must ensure that residential amenity is preserved and enhanced.

Eel Race Road - MCA

The following are MCA results reviewed at the 29 June 2016 Councillor Workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEL RACE</th>
<th>Road Over Rail</th>
<th>Road Under Rail</th>
<th>Rail Over Road</th>
<th>Rail Under Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Mildly Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMENITY</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
<td>Highly Negative</td>
<td>Highly Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL</td>
<td>Mildly Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eel Race Road - Option Positives and Negatives

The table on the following page summarises the assessment of the potential options against Council’s desired preferences.

The possibility of the crossing being closed was also discussed in the context of train stabling constraints at Carrum Station.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade separation type</th>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Road UNDER            | Improved road network connectivity  
                        | Improved noise amenity  
                        | Increased transport safety  |
|                       |           | Poor access for pedestrians, cyclists.  
                        | Very difficult to improve public realm  
                        | Visual impact of trenching, retaining walls and fencing  
                        | Poor personal safety  
                        | Environmental impacts  
                        | Poor entrance to municipality  
                        | Possible removal of dwellings (Kingston)  |
| Road OVER             | Improved road network connection  
                        | Increased road safety  |
|                       |           | Poor access for pedestrians and cyclists.  
                        | Visual amenity significantly impaired by overpasses.  
                        | Possible removal of dwellings (Kingston)  
                        | Compromised road access  
                        | Poor CPTED outcome  
                        | Poor environmental outcomes  
                        | Poor ability to provide quality open space  |
| Rail UNDER            | Better road access  
                        | Better access for pedestrians and cyclists  
                        | Improved noise amenity  
                        | Improved visual amenity  
                        | Good CPTED outcomes  
                        | Gateway and public realm opportunities  |
|                       |           | Loss of trees and vegetation along rail trench  |
| Rail OVER             | Better access for pedestrians and cyclists  
                        | Better road access  
                        | Enhanced connectivity  
                        | Ability to improve public realm and open space  
                        | Gateway and public realm opportunities  |
|                       |           | Visual impact of elevated tracks  
                        | Possible noise issues  |

After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of the options and the results of the MCA assessment, the Councillors preference was to advocate for the retention of the current situation and to redirect the funds proposed for a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment or improve rail services through the provision of a third rail. Should however the LXRA deem to provide a rail crossing at this location, Council’s preferred position is the rail under road option.
Council requests that the following components are included within the final design for the grade separation of the Eel race Road crossing should it proceed:

- Improved public realm, including appropriate gateway treatments and signage.
- Superior access for pedestrians and cyclists by providing overbridges across tunnelled sections of line to provide clear and efficient movement to foreshore to the west and Patterson River Secondary College to the east.
- Improved traffic safety and movement.

**Principles for Grade Separation in Frankston**

Whatever the option to be progressed by the LXRA for each crossing, achieving the following objectives are key for Council and the community:

**Maximised road network efficiency** – Ensure that any change to the road network achieves improved traffic flows within proximity of the crossing.

**Improved safety outcomes** – Decrease in pedestrian and vehicular incidents at and around crossings. Pedestrian and cyclists are visible from the public realm, routes are well lit and should be designed to follow best practice Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

**Enhanced community connectivity** – Removal or reduction in physical and perceived barriers created by existing level crossings.

**Improved visual amenity** – Areas along the existing rail corridor are subject to an existing level of visual blight from the rail infrastructure and overlooking from passengers. Solutions should incorporate measures to improve visual amenity both from a resident and passenger viewpoint.

**Noise amenity** – Properties along the rail corridor are subject to existing levels of noise impacts, including warning bells, train horns, tyres over tracks and the actual noise of the train itself. Any grade separation solution must present improved quantifiable benefits.

**Allowance for future development opportunities** – Certain grade separation solutions delivers opportunities for redevelopment of adjacent land for either private or public purposes.

**Quality open space and urban design outcomes** – Grade separation techniques can lead to increased open space opportunities and the delivery of positive urban design outcomes that benefit the passenger and the community as a whole. Crossings that deliver superior ground level activation through open space provision and built form improvements will be favoured.

**Environmentally responsible solutions** – Crossing solutions that mitigate impacts on receiving waters and provide habitat for increased biodiversity are considered superior.

**Future proofing/ allowance for whole of corridor approach** – The three crossings must not be viewed in isolation, but rather as part of the entire rail corridor through to Baxter and beyond. Provision must be made for the future relocation of train stabling from Carrum and Frankston to Baxter, and a third rail line from Baxter to Melbourne.
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Electrification to Baxter

Introduction

Electrification of the railway line from Frankston to Baxter has highly important implications for the future of Frankston rail corridor, particularly for Frankston Station. It also influences and is influenced by decision made on rail crossing plans, including level crossing removals along the Frankston railway line.

Operating Reasons for Electrification to Baxter

Units for the Frankston line are currently stabled across the rail corridor, utilising large tracts of high value land in Mordialloc, Carrum and Frankston. A significant number of units are also stored at North Melbourne.

In the future, additional Frankston Line stabling will be required for units relocated from elsewhere and from increases in services. Stabling will still occur north of Frankston to coincide with service terminations, but this will not be sufficient together with current stabling at Frankston.

This demand for additional stabling is the main driver for electrifying the railway line to Baxter where extra stabling capacity can be provided. A further option is to also stable trains at Langwarrin.

This has benefits for Frankston (covered below) but it also allows for land currently used for stabling closer to Melbourne to become available for other uses, which also has high development value and/or could be utilised for other infrastructure projects.

Importance to Frankston

The immediate need for the electrification to Baxter has been strongly advocated by Council for some time. There are a range of reasons for this including socio-economic, transport accessibility, land-use efficiency and rail corridor management.

Most importantly, electrification and the removal of stabling at Frankston Station will free up land in the precinct for a range of potential alternative uses. These include commercial, education, health, community and/or open space.

Electrification to Baxter also has other potential benefits for Frankston which include:

- Improved connectivity to the Frankston Hospital, Frankston Private and Monash University through relocating Leawarra Station.
- Establishing a new station at Langwarrin together with park and ride facilities.
- Generally improving access to employment.

These potential benefits and those for the Frankston Station precinct are discussed further as follows.

Freeing up Station Land for Development

As well as consolidation of train stabling, there are further opportunities to disperse transport related land uses, such as parking, which is currently occupying high-value land that could be providing substantially greater public benefit.
The car park and train stabling at Frankston Station occupies prime land which is adjacent to education uses (Chisholm), the central precinct of the FMAC and the Health and Education Precinct. The electrification will enable this parking to be relocated to Langwarrin and/or Baxter. The parking and stabling land around Frankston Station can then be made available for significant commercial, health and education developments as well as community uses such as open space. This will generate much needed employment opportunities in a central location with excellent connectivity.

There is also an opportunity to provide a substantially better connection between the east and west sides of the train line, by improving pedestrian and bicycle linkages.

There is at least 32,000sqm of potential development land around Frankston Station. If this land provides the same employment yield as the commercial centre of the FMAC, it would provide approximately 2,387 jobs. This equates to an increase in the quantity of jobs in Frankston City of 6.5%.

Langwarrin Station

A key opportunity that the electrification will enable is the establishment of a train station in Langwarrin. A station at Langwarrin will provide opportunities for car parking, train stabling and park and ride facilities that service a broad catchment to the south (Mornington Peninsula) and east (Langwarrin, Cranbourne West). As it currently stands, Langwarrin and Langwarrin South are very poorly served by public transport connections, which has been a principle contributor to high levels of youth disengagement. These catchments are largely responsible for Frankston City being ranked the third highest local government area in the metropolitan Melbourne for youth disengagement (2011 Census of Population and Housing).

Leawarra Station

Leawarra Station, currently located on the Stony Point line, could be reconfigured or relocated to better service the Frankston Health and Education Precinct. This includes Monash University, Frankston Hospital (Public), Frankston Private.

Access to improved education

Monash University Peninsula Campus (Monash) is currently located next to Leawarra Station on the Stony Point train line, with irregular services that make student access via public transport extremely challenging. As a result of this, students without access to a private vehicle have very limited access to the campus.

If the electrification occurs, this will link the entire Frankston train line catchment to Monash. In addition, it will provide a rail linkage between Monash University’s Caulfield Campus, enabling students to travel between them.

With current student levels at Monash well below capacity (largely due to public transport constraints), the electrification would open the door for several thousand additional students to study at the campus. Monash has advised that the electrification would enable it to consider diversifying its course offer. As it currently stands, Monash has a narrow

Source: 2011 Census of Population and Housing
course offer, which limits tertiary education opportunities across south east Melbourne.

Additional course offering and improved student access has the potential to be transformational for both Frankston City and the greater south east Melbourne region. As of 2011, just 11.9% of Frankston City residents held a bachelor degree or higher level of education, compared with 23.6% across Greater Melbourne. Access to bachelor degree (or higher) level of education is critical to future employment prospects and the transition towards a knowledge-based economy.

If the electrification goes beyond Baxter to Hastings, it will provide regular public transport connections to some of the lowest socio-economic areas in Victoria. This is critical, as tertiary education is seen to be out of reach for many young people within the region. Not only will they be able to access Monash, they will also be able to access certificate and diploma level education at Chisholm Frankston.

Access to healthcare

Currently, Frankston Hospital is not easily accessible via train. The nearest station is Frankston, which is approximately 1.4km away, with extremely poor pedestrian and cycling linkages. The electrification will provide easier access to Frankston Hospital, which currently has a significant undersupply of car parking. The hospital has had to construct several car parks in order to meet public demand, largely due to poor public transport access.

A station could be situated within the Frankston Health and Education Precinct, servicing Frankston Hospital (public), Frankston Private Hospital, Monash and a range of other medical providers located within the precinct.

The electrification may also stimulate redevelopment within large sections of the Health and Education Precinct, which has been earmarked for rezoning to mixed-use. This would enable the development of medical, education, medium density residential (such as student accommodation and short-stay accommodation) and some commercial facilities.

The population along the rail corridor, particularly those without access to private vehicles, will have substantially better access the quality healthcare if the electrification occurs. The density of healthcare services available in the Frankston Health and Education Precinct is substantial enough for it to share its own train station with Monash University.

Access to employment for a growing population

There are several ways in which the electrification will improve access to employment. The most significant will be that a large catchment of the Region's population will be able to access employment nodes without requiring a private vehicle. With high proportions of unemployment and youth disengagement along the corridor, the electrification will prove to be a critical employment connector.

By 2036, there will be 66,244 people living along the train line corridor to Stony Point (beyond Frankston). This is a population increase of 10.7% on the current estimates. 38.2% of households have one or no car.

By 2036, there will also be 68,132 people living along the Mornington train line corridor (beyond Frankston). This is a population increase of 9.7% on the current estimates.

In total, the rail services south of Baxter, services a population along the train line corridor of over 130,000 in 2036, with population growth along this corridor occurring at over 10% across the 20 years. 40% of households have one or no car.
There is a very high proportion of the population with poor access to cars along both the Stony Point and Mornington rail corridors (almost 40%). Given the poor provision of public transportation at the moment, this makes it extremely challenging for more than one family member to access employment and/or tertiary education. This is a key factor in lower than average levels of education attainment (at bachelor and higher level) and higher than average levels of unemployment across the catchment area.

Youth disengagement is particularly high along the Stony Point train line corridor, with 9.8% not participating in education or employment, compared with 7.4% across Greater Melbourne (2011 Census of Population and Housing).

Positive impact on property prices
According to valuation firm Opteon, residential property prices will increase by between 5% and 10% along the rail corridor if the electrification occurs. This has positive taxation implications for government, which will assist with any business case for the electrification.

Beyond Baxter – Electrification to Stony Point
There are significant socioeconomic and logistical opportunities associated with electrifying the train line along the entire length of the current Stony Point line. The socioeconomic factors are captured under the ‘benefits of electrification’ section.

Form a logistical perspective, there are potential benefits if the future expansion of the Port of Hastings occurs. In addition to employment opportunities, the electrification will also enable future rail spurs to link up with the Dandenong industrial district, which has been earmarked as the warehousing and logistics hub for an expanded Port of Hastings.
Beyond Baxter - Electrification to Mornington

Electrification to Mornington will open up significant opportunities for tourism expansion through improved connectivity to some of our key tourism icons, as well as creating transport efficiencies. At the moment, the Mornington Peninsula (particularly the southern end) experiences enormous congestion especially during peak tourism periods.

The Electrification to Mornington would alleviate much of this pressure, with a significantly reduced burden on the road network.
Section 5.0
Frankston Station Precinct

Frankston Future Projects

The State Government has allocated $63 million towards the redevelopment of the Frankston Station Precinct. The works are a mixture of business activation programs, streetscape works, place activation, safety improvements, improved connectivity and station improvements.

Projects which have a transport and rail network component or focus are listed below and it is anticipated that approximately $40 million will go to these projects:

- New Public Plaza at the eastern end of Wells Street.
- New Public Plaza at Fletcher Roads at the subway.
- Enhance connections with Chisholm.
- Upgrade Hastings Road, Playne Street and rail trail to Hospitals and Monash.
- Improved access and management of Parking.
- Rebuild existing rail station.
- Undertake Bus Service Review.
- Upgrade subway and subway entrances.
- Remove and replace mechanical signalling to make land available and improve train reliability.
- Facilitate development of Council and State land.

Beach Street Pedestrian Level Crossing Project

Public Transport Victoria have indicated the need to remove the dangerous pedestrian link at Beach Street highly used by nearby residents and by Chisholm students. Due to the length of the crossing, the efficiency of the train service is also reduced as trains are required to slow at this point slower because of the crossing.

It is understood that Public Transport Victoria (PTV) are planning a pedestrian overpass to cross the rail line however the available space on the west side along Young Street is tight. The cost of a pedestrian overpass is anticipated to be approximately $15 million, this is to be funded by PTV through a separate from the Frankston Station Precinct Redevelopment project.

Station Re-Development

In defining the tasks to be undertaken for the Frankston Future Project, it was agreed that the redevelopment of Frankston Station would occur in its present location, but that it would not jeopardise the requirements for extending electrification to Baxter.

As part of electrifying to Baxter, the agreed concept plan envisages removal of the track nearest Young Street and the construction of a second platform to the east. One track would service the existing eastern platform whilst a new track would be adjacent to the western side of the new platform. A further track may also be located on the eastern side of the new platform depending on operating requirements. It was also envisaged that the platforms would be connected by overhead walkways.
The concept station layout is illustrated on this page. Examples of overbridges are on the next page.

Figure 4  Long term three platform station arrangements (associated with Baxter Electrification)
Alternative Station Concept

The currently envisaged station layout will release some five metres of land for alternative use beside Young Street. If car parking was removed, approximately 40 metres depth of land could be released for alternative use facing Fletcher Road.

However, an alternate layout could contemplate the relocation of the station complex to the east onto the site of the existing at grade commuter car park. Considering the level crossing removal works will occur at Overton Road at the same time as the proposed Station upgrade, consideration should be given to either raising or undergrounding the new station. This would enable the development of a multi-function transport hub, which could incorporate retail, commercial, education or community uses that orientate towards Young Street, but still provide permeability through to Fletcher Road and Chisholm.

The feasibility and cost and land use advantages of this option has yet to be tested. However, the option should not be foregone as the station redevelopment project proceeds.
Section 6.0
Other Rail Corridor Enhancements / Options

Third rail line south of Moorabbin
A third rail line south of Moorabbin will be required in future as population grows and more investment occurs to the south. The extension of the third rail will allow express trains from Frankston to operate for a greater distance, reaching the Melbourne CBD and inner suburbs more quickly. The reduced travel time will prove highly attractive for Frankston and Mornington Peninsula commuters and for businesses wanting to locate in the region. Travel time reductions will also encourage reverse commuting which widens the employment pool for businesses – particularly within the Frankston Metropolitan Activity Centre (FMAC). This is in line with State Government polycentric city policy. It will also give a large population catchment easier access to employment and education opportunities in and around Melbourne.

Alternatives to Eel Race Road Level Crossing Removal
Council does not see great merit in removing the level crossing on Eel Race Road.
It is also understood that there is a possibility that the planned Eel Race Road rail crossing removal may not proceed. As noted previously, Council would then advocate for retention of the existing level crossing arrangement.
Should the proposed crossing removal at Eel Race Road be abandoned, Council will also approach the State Government to divert the funding earmarked for the project (as much as $150 million) to achieving a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment and improve rail service through extending the third rail south of Moorabbin.
Section 7.0

Summary

Council has made this submission in anticipation of the LXRA presenting its preferred rail crossing removal options to Council and the Community in early August 2016.

To this end, Council has undertaken its own review of potential options based on the potential outcomes its wants for each of the rail crossings. Resulting from this review, its strongly preferred options are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Preferred Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seaford Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton/Skye Road</td>
<td>Rail Under Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eel Race Road</td>
<td>No change to the Level Crossing at Eel Race Road, Seaford with funding be redirected to Council’s strategic rail needs However Council preferred option is Rail under Road if the LXRA’s intention is still to proceed with road/rail separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council believes that a ‘whole of rail corridor’ approach is the overarching direction to realising the full potential of these projects. It is therefore important that any work does not jeopardise any future development opportunities such as the electrification to Baxter, extending the third rail from Moorabbin and maximising land use opportunities at the Frankston Station Precinct.

As part of the Federal election campaign, both of the main political parties have announced funding to investigate electrification to Baxter. This indicates the political importance of ensuring that the level crossings projects take this into account, including its potential impact on the future operation and nature of Frankston Station.

It is understood that there is a possibility that the planned Eel Race Road rail crossing removal may not proceed as planned. In which case, Council will approach the State Government to divert the funding earmarked for the project to achieving a more visionary outcome for the Frankston Station redevelopment and improving rail service through extending the rail south from Moorabbin.

To achieve the best outcomes for the immediate and wider community, a strong and structured communication partnership needs to be maintained between the LXRA and other relevant State Government agencies.

The scope of the projects, and the State Government funding for them, need to cover the works which meet Council’s expected outcomes. Care will also need to be taken that Council is not left with unnecessary ongoing maintenance costs, for example, because of inappropriate construction or design standards.
APPENDIX A: Media Release from Minister for Public Transport on Skyrail

Media Release

The Hon Jacinta Allan MP
Minister for Public Transport
Minister for Major Projects

Monday, 13 June, 2016

FRANKSTON LEVEL CROSSING LIES A DESPERATE POLITICAL STUNT

Minister for Public Transport Jacinta Allan has slammed the Liberal campaign of misinformation about the level crossings the Andrews Labor Government is removing on the Frankston line.

Federal Liberal election propaganda distributed in the federal seat of Isaacs is a desperate attempt to distract from their lack of funding for Victoria.

Despite being the fastest growing State and home to 25 per cent of Australia’s population, Victoria still receives just 9 per cent of Federal infrastructure funding.

The Labor Government will remove 11 level crossings on the Frankston line. Three of these crossings are almost gone, and the Government is undertaking extensive consultation on the removal of the remaining eight.

Between Caulfield and Dandenong, the Labor Government is removing every single level crossing. That’s not the case on the Frankston line, where the Government is removing level crossings at separate sites with crossings left in between.

As a result, a continuous elevated line over every one of the eight crossings won’t be possible, and won’t be built.

The Labor Government continues to assess the best option on a site-by-site basis, to ensure the best solution is found for each community.

Quotes attributable to Minister for Public Transport Jacinta Allan

“We will not be building a Dandenong line-style Skyrail on the Frankston line. Any allegations we will are false.”

“We will remove 11 dangerous and congested level crossings on the Frankston line. The first three are almost gone and we’re undertaking detailed consultation on the removal of the remaining eight.

“The Liberals are desperate to distract attention from the fact that they didn’t remove a single one of these crossings and are dallying Victoria – not giving us the funding we deserve for the projects we need.”

“We will work with the community, engineers and experts to develop the best solution at each site and get rid of these dangerous and congested level crossings that clog local streets and put lives at risk every single day.”