

Annexure G — Response to Submissions

| Submission Number | Issue | Response | Recommend New or Modified EPR |
|-------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| Western Portal | | | |
| MM070 | <p>Increase in flood levels – Concern over the twin track declines retaining wall impact on flood water displacement (a likely increasing event due to climate change).</p> <p>Solution: Integrate a vertical green wall over the top of the retaining wall ... with additional water retention it will go some way to mitigating flood water displacement.</p> | <p>The need for compensatory flood storage capacity is adequately addressed in Section 8.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2. My detailed investigation of indicative compensatory flood storage at the Western Portal is set out in Annexure D to my expert witness statement.</p> | No |
| MM076 | <p>The Lloyd Street end of the business [park] is often flooded leaving the Chalmers [<i>sic</i>] Street entrances as the only workable entrance. Request that contractor develops a specific contingency plan to deal with this situation.</p> | <p>EPR SW2 requires that both permanent and associated temporary works do not adversely impact existing flooding conditions. This will ensure that the Project does not exacerbate existing conditions.</p> | No |
| Arden | | | |
| MM227 | <p>Submitter requests that stormwater management be prioritised to ensure appropriate Water Sensitive Urban Design techniques are applied to this construction activity.</p> | <p>This flooding issue is addressed adequately in Section 9.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and in EPRs SW1 and AE1.</p> <p>In my opinion the EPRs are framed appropriately in requiring the Project to implement Water Sensitive Urban Design to the satisfaction of the responsible authorities.</p> | No |
| MM237 MM365 MM377 | <p>The Arden Station Precinct is located on land that is subject to flooding.</p> <p>Excavation for the underground system will only further exacerbate flooding.</p> | <p>This flooding issue is adequately addressed in Section 9.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and in EPR SW2. My detailed assessment of compensatory storage within the Arden Precinct is set out in Annexure E to my expert witness statement.</p> <p>I do not anticipate that the Metro Tunnel will impact on Moonee Ponds Creek, provided that the proposed EPRs are met.</p> | No |

| Submission Number | Issue | Response | Recommend New or Modified EPR |
|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p>The mitigation and compensation measures implemented for the MMRP will also impact on future development within this urban renewal area.</p> <p>EPRs which relate to Moonee Ponds Creek should be added and existing EPRs strengthened.</p> | | |
| MM365 | <p>It is suggested that the emphasis of this EPR (i.e. SW002) is amended so that detailed design of works enhance flood protection rather than maintaining the status quo. (Section 7.7)</p> | <p>This flooding issue is adequately addressed in Section 9.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2.</p> <p>In my opinion the EPR is framed appropriately in requiring that the Project not give rise to any increase in existing flood levels.</p> | No |
| Parkville | | | |
| MM308 | <p>Flooding of stations - Further assessment is required to understand the inundation risks, given the age of Royal Melbourne Hospital infrastructure.</p> | <p>This flooding issue is adequately addressed in the EES: refer Section 10.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2.</p> <p>EPR SW2 will ensure existing conditions are not exacerbated. It requires that all permanent and associated temporary works, including those in Parkville, do not increase flood levels, thereby creating any additional flood risk.</p> | No |
| MM318 | <p>It may also be necessary for flood modelling to be undertaken to ensure that surface levels are not materially increased as a result of temporary or permanent works.</p> | <p>This flooding issue is adequately addressed in the EES: refer Section 10.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2.</p> <p>EPR SW2 requires that modelling be undertaken in respect of the design of permanent and temporary works to demonstrate the resultant flood levels and risk profile.</p> | No |
| CBD North | | | |
| MM180 | <p>Diversion of stormwater may cause disruption to service to RMIT buildings and therefore produce operational impacts. (Section 4.8)</p> <p><u>Recommendation 33</u>: RMIT suggest that during future detailed design works, ERP's development and management of issues arising</p> | <p>This flooding issue is adequately addressed in the EES: refer Section 11.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2.</p> <p>EPR SW2 requires that modelling be undertaken in respect of the design of permanent and temporary works to demonstrate the resultant flood levels and risk profile.</p> <p>Consultation with affected stakeholders may also be appropriate in the preparation of a detailed response to EPR SW2. Importantly, that design is required to be</p> | No |

| Submission Number | Issue | Response | Recommend New or Modified EPR |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | <p>the following consideration be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hydrologic, hydraulic and surface flow modelling be undertaken to ensure and demonstrate that there is no detrimental effect to RMIT. - RMIT be consulted during detailed drainage design and supporting document development prior to works commencing to enable review by RMIT - RMIT request that the MMRA and / or its contractor undertake dilapidation reports of RMIT property and services in the vicinity of the works, inclusive if CCTV inspection of RMIT drainage and sewerage services prior to works. (Section 4.11) | <p>prepared to the satisfaction of the relevant authorities.</p> <p>On a case-by-case basis it might be appropriate to undertake dilapidation surveys of existing assets in circumstances where it is proposed that there will be a direct interaction with existing drainage systems. Whether this is the case in respect of RMIT assets will not be determined until the detailed design is completed.</p> | |
| Domain | | | |
| MM133 | <p>Managing water during construction – The need to manage site runoff for above ground construction is very important and clear soil and water management plans need to be in place. (Section 6.5)</p> | <p>This is adequately addressed in the EES: refer to Section 13.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPRs SW2 and AE1.</p> <p>Runoff from construction work sites is identified as a potential risk to water quality in receiving waterways (Risk AE001). This would include runoff from exposed ground surfaces and from above ground construction, including hard stands, pavement, stockpiles, building roofs etc.</p> <p>EPR AE1 requires that a stormwater treatment system be fully integrated into the design of the Metro Tunnel for construction to ensure that stormwater entering a receiving water body complies with <i>SEPP (Waters of Victoria)</i>.</p> | No |
| MM091 MM133 | <p>Integrated stormwater management - #38 Treat runoff prior to it entering the stormwater system at strategic locations around the interchange. (Section 7.5)</p> | <p>This is adequately addressed in the EES: refer to Section 13.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPRs AE1 and AE7.</p> <p>EPR AE1 requires that a stormwater treatment system be fully integrated into the design of the Metro Tunnel for construction to ensure that stormwater entering a receiving water body complies with <i>SEPP (Waters of Victoria)</i>.</p> <p>EPR AE7 imposes an equivalent requirement in respect of the operation phase of the Project. I recommend that EPR AE7 should operate in respect of all precincts</p> | <p>Amend the first paragraph of AE7 as follows:</p> <p>Fully integrate the stormwater treatment system into the design of the western portal and eastern portal all precincts to ensure that stormwater entering a</p> |

| Submission Number | Issue | Response | Recommend New or Modified EPR |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | and not just the Eastern and Western Portals. | receiving water body complies with <i>SEPP (Waters of Victoria)</i> . |
| MM226 MM240 MM267 MM283 MM289 MM315 | There are a number of submissions related to flooding in the Domain Station precinct. These submissions refer to matters such as: runoff during construction, localised flooding surrounding the Botanica, inadequate drainage, overflow into the basement of the Hallmark etc. | These flooding issues are addressed in the EES: refer Section 13.5 and EPR SW2. It is anticipated that works at Domain would affect the current underground drainage system and that diversions would need to be designed to take piped storm water into a new alignment with a higher capacity than the current arrangement. The EPRs will ensure runoff produced during construction works is appropriately managed. As far as practicable, existing overland flow paths (i.e. flows exceeding the piped system capacity) should be maintained, both during construction and in the finished development. | No |
| MM260 | More consideration must be given to the impacts to Albert Park Lake given that there is a risk that water will be discharged to storm water and ultimately Albert Park Lake. This Lake is a prominent and valued Melbourne landmark. It is unclear how this will be adequately managed during construction. | This flooding issue is adequately addressed in the EES: refer Section 13.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2. EPR AE1 requires that stormwater treatment systems are fully integrated into the design of the Metro Tunnel for the construction phase across all precincts to ensure that stormwater entering a receiving water body complies with <i>SEPP (Waters of Victoria)</i> . This would include any stormwater entering Albert Park Lake during construction. | No |
| MM367 | The surface water impacts of the project cannot be assessed as there is an absence of appropriately detailed modelling, design plans, design levels and drainage plans. Proposal - additional EPR should be added as follows: MGSW1 - Detailed information of drainage matters should be provided to and reviewed by MGS before construction commences MGSW2 - A broader stormwater strategy should be developed to ensure the works do not have a | These flooding issues are adequately addressed in the EES: refer Section 13.5 of the Surface Water impact Assessment and EPR SW2. EPR SW2 requires that modelling of the design and temporary works be undertaken to demonstrate the resultant flood levels and risk profile. Consultation with affected stakeholders may also be appropriate in the preparation of a detailed response to EPR SW2. Importantly, that design is required to be prepared to the satisfaction of the relevant authorities. | No |

| Submission Number | Issue | Response | Recommend New or Modified EPR |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | detrimental effect on MGS | | |
| Eastern Portal | | | |
| MM012 | Increase in flood levels | <p>Increases in flood levels are addressed in the EES, refer to Section 14.5 of the Surface Water Impact Assessment and EPR SW2.</p> <p>EPR SW2 will ensure existing conditions are not exacerbated. It requires that all permanent and associated temporary works, including those at the Eastern Portal, do not increase flood levels, thereby creating an additional flood risk.</p> | No |