

MELBOURNE METRO RAIL PROJECT ENVIRONMENT EFFECTS STATEMENT
INQUIRY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MMRA TECHNICAL NOTE

TECHNICAL NOTE NUMBER:	035
DATE:	19 August 2016
PRECINCT:	All Precincts
EES/MAP BOOK REFERENCE:	Maps 2 and 3 (Horizontal/Alignment Plans); EES Chapter 16; Technical Appendix L – Landscape and Visual; Technical Appendix M – Urban Design Strategy
SUBJECT:	Landscape and visual Response to Section 10 of the ‘Preliminary Matters and Further Information’ Request.

NOTE:

1. This Technical Note has been prepared with the assistance of Urbis and responds to Section 10 of the ‘Preliminary and Further Information’ request made by the IAC on 25 July 2016 (**Request**).
2. For ease of reference, this Technical Note adopts the topic headings set out in the Request and reproduces the relevant ‘references’ and ‘requests’ prior to setting out MMRA’s response.

10.1 Impact of proposed infrastructure

(i) Reference

Technical Appendix M, section 1.2 states that one of the purposes of the Urban Design Study is to “Set out design guidelines that, along with further detailed content, will inform the technical specifications for the project’s procurement phase”.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests clarification on:

50. *any dimensions of stations or other infrastructure that will represent key design influences on the stations and any concept or preliminary designs that have been prepared.*

MMRA Response:

3. The design of all project components will ultimately be resolved during the procurement process and subsequent detailed design. While some assumptions can be made about the size and specifications of below ground infrastructure, the final design of such elements will be influenced by a range of factors. These factors include construction methodologies and approaches, mechanical systems designs, geological conditions, stakeholder requirements, other specialist disciplines and project design decisions.
4. The Urban Design Strategy has sought to address potential design conflicts by outlining above-ground structures that are required for the project, and providing guidance as to how these elements can be brought together in a holistic and integrated precinct design.
5. The Urban Design Strategy is limited to the ground plane, but requires designers to consider below ground infrastructure and station architecture so that it does not negatively impact the composition of the precincts, and reads as a cohesive design between the various levels.
6. The Urban Design Strategy is the strategic framework for the entire project. The Strategy provides site-specific interpretation for each precinct, setting out what those designs should aim to achieve and providing guidance for project design, procurement and implementation.

10.2 Western Portal/South Kensington Station

(i) Reference

Technical Appendix L, section 6.1 states “The existing South Kensington station building façade and entry forecourt are proposed to be refurbished as part of the portal works. A new pedestrian crossing from JJ Holland Park would connect to the station.”

The near proximity of a decline or a tunnel at this point (depending on option) suggests that this crossing may be provided in the form of a bridge. If so, this will require attendant ramps or lifts necessary for station access.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

51. *further consideration of how this design might inform the Environmental Performance Requirements outlined in Table 6.3 of Appendix L.*

MMRA Response:

7. The intention of the statement in Appendix L Section 6.1 is to provide clarity that MMRA intends to provide a refurbished building façade / entry forecourt for South Kensington Station and provide a realigned zebra pedestrian crossing at grade connecting JJ Holland Reserve to the existing entrance. A pedestrian bridge is not proposed for access to South Kensington Station.

10.3 Arden Station

(i) Reference

Maps 2 of 15, and 3 of 15 in the map book identify two alternative design options for the Electrical Substation Construction Site. The legend states there are three alternative design options.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

52. *on the correct number of the alternative design options for Electricity Substations at Arden Station and advice about which is the preferred option and why.*

MMRA Response:

8. There are a total of four sites which have been identified for the Electricity Substation at the western end of the project. There are three sites identified in the EES Map Book at Arden, and a fourth site would be in the 50 Lloyd Street business estate (Map 2 of 15) if Western Portal Option A is adopted by the contractors.
9. The Langford Street site is the preferred site due to its size, accessibility with regards to construction, and availability as the land is owned by VicTrack and is currently vacant. The Langford Street site will however require a significant easement to be created through the future Arden development to connect the Station to the substation. This may have impacts on future development of the Arden site. This is why the three other options have been retained through the EES process. Unless the EES results in options being removed, the PPP contractor will be able to select the site which it sees as most viable.

(iii) Reference

Technical Appendix L Sect 7.1 p55 suggests the interim station entrance at Arden Station entry would be raised two metres above surrounding ground level.

(iv) Request

The IAC requests clarification:

53. *on how this entrance will be addressed regarding visual and physical access to the station, and its relationship with the surrounding public realm.*

MMRA Response:

10. Early design thinking adopted the strictest interpretation of stakeholder requirements in concept development. As such the requirement to raise the station entry 2m from the natural ground level was adopted as a means of protecting the station entry from 1:1000 year flood events, as requested by Melbourne Water.
11. Since the EES was prepared, discussions have progressed with Melbourne Water, considering a much broader range of flooding issues, beyond just asset protection. These discussions have considered a range of asset/structural solutions, alongside potential operational and management solutions.
12. These discussions have been productive, generating general acceptance that a more practical position, one where the station entry could be raised above the 1:200 year flood level (approximately 1.1m above natural ground level) with a range of other flood mitigation measures that could be triggered in more extreme events, such as a 1:1000 year event. Such measure could include flood gates that effectively seal the station until such time as the flood waters recede and normal access to the station is restored.
13. MMRA is currently finalising technical requirements to support this approach during the design development stage.
14. These technical flood requirements will be developed in accordance with the Urban Design Strategy and land use and planning EPR LU3.

10.4 Eastern Portal

(i) Reference

Technical Appendix L Section 12 no landscape impact plan is provided for the Eastern Portal in a format as provided for other stations.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

54. *a Landscape Impact Plan for the Eastern Portal.*

MMRA Response:

15. As noted above, Landscape Impact Plans were prepared for all precincts.

16. While the analysis and written statements in Technical Appendix L was provided in the same format as other precincts, as a result of an administrative error, a similar drawing was not included the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.
17. To remedy this, the Landscape Impact Plan for the Eastern Portal is now provided (refer to **Attachment A**).

10.5 Visual impact

(i) Reference

EES volume 2 Section 16.8 states “visual impact of construction work on Southbank boulevard, Domain, St Kilda Road would be diminished because people see the area impacted only briefly as they move past them”.

(ii) Request

The IAC requests:

55. the basis for this conclusion.

MMRA Response:

18. This conclusion was based on three important factors:
 - a. the nominated places are primarily roads and transport corridors where the experience is relatively fleeting and only one part of a longer journey;
 - b. there are limited areas where open views of construction works are available; and
 - c. the proximity of the road or transport corridor from the proposed works.
19. The construction footprint of the Queen Victoria Gardens emergency access shaft is located at the existing toilet block on Linlithgow Avenue, approximately 70m east from the intersection of Linlithgow Avenue, St Kilda Road and Southbank Boulevard.
20. Open views towards the emergency access shaft construction footprint would be experienced by motorists on Linlithgow Avenue, with glimpsed views from St Kilda Road and partial views from Southbank Boulevard travelling east. Open-to-partial views would be experienced by recreational users of the gardens, particularly from the floral clock and the King Edward VII Memorial, and the Tan Track.
21. While it is noted there is a high visual sensitivity, the residual impact has been assessed as medium to high. However, given the experience of these places would typically be from passers-by or temporary visitors (and

filtered by the existing vegetation located along the surrounding roads and from within the gardens), overall visual impact is considered to be diminished.

22. Additionally, proposed mitigation measures, such as requirements for the construction hoarding to be designed to form a recessive backdrop, and any above ground elements would be maintained to be lower than the height of the memorial, will help to ameliorate the visual impact.

CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Eastern Portal – Landscape Impact Plan