

# Meeting Minutes

## Community Reference Group (CRG)

**Subject:** November Yan Yean Road Upgrade CRG meeting

**Date:** Monday 9 November 2020 **Time:** 6.30pm-8pm

**Location:** Online Zoom meeting

**Meeting number:** 3

**Chair:** Charlotte Claney

**Minute-taker:** Clare Allen

### Attendees

Attendees (Name/Organisation)	Apologies (Name/Organisation)
Barbara Marshall (BM)	Adam Mitchell (AM), MRPV
Charlotte Claney (CC), MRPV	Alex Ramirez (AR), MRPV
Clare Allen (CA), MRPV	Grant Hollins (GH)
Fu-Ho Chung (FC), MRPV	Paige Krygger (PK), MRPV
George Barratt (GB)	Pam Hoyne (PH)
Joanne Jamieson (JJ)	Tony Nesci (TN)
John Yeomans (JY)	
Kelvin Bennetts (KB)	
Lawrence Seyers (LS), Nillumbik	
Mark Jackson (MJ)	
Richard Wilson (RW)	
Tori Harvey (TH), MRPV	

## Actions - previous

#	Action	Update
2.1	Provide length of turning lane on approach to Jorgensen Avenue jug handle turn to JJ	Length approximately 100m. Consultant currently reviewing intersection design. Subject to change. <b>Action closed</b>
2.2	Confirm for JJ if fence on west side of Yan Yean Road between Bannons Lane and Jorgensen Avenue will be moved to construct wide median design in this location	Slightly higher fence paling to be constructed along Diamond Valley Archers. Further north, Yarrambat Park fence to be constructed slightly to the west. FC to confirm approximately how many metres west the fence will be constructed. <b>Action remains open</b>
2.3	Provide information to BM about east west traffic movements through the Bridge Inn Road intersection and any additional traffic information about Doctors Gully Road	LS confirmed that traffic modelling data shows the project will likely lead to traffic increases on some roads surrounding Yan Yean Road but actually a decrease on Doctors Gully Road. <b>Action closed</b>
2.4	Invite representatives from Nillumbik Shire and City of Whittlesea Councils to attend a future CRG meeting to discuss changes to local roads abutting Yan Yean Road	MRPV contacted Nillumbik and Whittlesea to attend this meeting. MRPV didn't hear back from Whittlesea.  LS in attendance representing Nillumbik. MRPV to approach Whittlesea again at 12 November coordination meeting to see if a representative might be able to join us at the next meeting in January. <b>Action remains open</b>
2.5	Redistribute 31 Aug eDM to CRG members containing link to Planning Panels Victoria EES submissions webpage	CC redistributed eDM to CRG members. <b>Action closed</b>
2.6	Provide GB with details for contact at Nillumbik Shire Council to send his Laurie Street proposal on to	CC provided contact details to GB. <b>Action closed</b>

## Key discussion points

Agenda item	Discussion summary
Item 1 – Welcome & apologies	AM, AR, GH, PH, PK and TN apologies. CC chaired meeting in PK absence. FC represented project team in AR absence. LS attended as guest. CA attended to take meeting minutes
Item 2 – Confirm the agenda	Agenda confirmed. No new topics added to other business

Agenda item	Discussion summary
Item 3 – Project & EES update	<p>MRPV gave a presentation on the Environmental Effects Statement (EES) process and site investigations.</p> <p>TH presented an EES exhibition update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 69 EES submissions received by Planning Panels Victoria</li> <li>• Key submission themes included design, individual land acquisition and access, environmental impacts, Doreen Business Precinct and traffic and transport justifications for the project</li> <li>• Directions hearing took place on 27 October and there were 51 participants</li> <li>• Panel hearings will take place between 30 November and 16 December</li> <li>• Submitters will have the opportunity to present their submission to the panel and MRPV will need to respond to submissions made during the exhibition</li> <li>• After the panel hearings the Inquiry and Advisory Committee will make a recommendation to the Minister for Planning within 40 business days</li> <li>• We expect the Minister to make a recommendation on the project by mid-2021</li> </ul> <p>FC presented an update on ongoing project works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utility service proving continuing to 30 November</li> <li>• Arborist assessments 7 November</li> <li>• Feature surveys and geotechnical investigations starting 16 November</li> <li>• All investigations to feed into the functional design and detailed design</li> </ul> <p>JJ – Is the current design subject to further investigations and could dramatically change?</p> <p>FC – MRPV has already undertaken previous detailed assessments to guide design. These are additional assessment to fill in some minor gaps. We're pretty confident with the current information.</p> <p>JY – What were the findings from the arborist assessments?</p> <p>TH – MRPV hasn't received those results as yet. The assessments were trying to understand the root structure of the two River Red Gum trees. We're hoping to get the arboriculture assessment results back in the next few weeks.</p> <p>FC – The focus was to find roots to the west and to the south of those trees. Last time they went out they were unable to get through the pavement to complete their assessment. This time they've been able to do some saw-cutting and get more detailed information.</p> <p>BM concerned replanting is not sufficient to counteract mature tree removals because it takes significant time for planted trees to mature and establish.</p> <p>TH – Valid point. It's not just about replanting. Yes, replanting is one part, but the other component is what we can do with the design to reduce the number of trees we need to remove through installation of retaining walls, road and path alignment changes, establishing no-go zones. Purchasing offsets and looking at no net loss to mitigate against tree removal is another approach we take. Also challenging our contractors to avoid and minimise through design alterations and construction techniques.</p> <p>BM – Cumulative effect on biodiversity, including the Swift Parrot and other bird life not calculated in the EES and should be calculated.</p> <p>TH – Our lead ecologist is preparing a witness statement. As part of that statement they'll cover that cumulative impact.</p>



Agenda item	Discussion summary
Item 4 – Local matters	<p>RW – Concerned that improved traffic flow wasn't listed as a priority in Nillumbik Council's EES submission. The submission also stated a preference for design Option C for the Bridge Inn Road intersection.</p> <p>LS – When we briefed Nillumbik Council, we heard loud and clear about protecting the two significant trees. Option C had a smaller intersection footprint than Option B. Potential better outcome for the oval at the Doreen Recreation Reserve. Minimal impact on the Doreen Business Precinct. Option C retained some of the significant trees on Bridge Inn Road. Council in favour of the road upgrade overall, all options make significant improvements to traffic flow.</p> <p>BM – The Doreen Business Precinct is new and should be acquired to accommodate Whittlesea traffic. Why is there no design that showed the intersection impacting on the west side of Yan Yean Road?</p> <p>CC – We had many options before we got to the three viable options that were brought to the community.</p> <p>FC – North west and south west options were explored and deemed not feasible due to the unacceptable high cost to acquire commercial properties, impact to local business and the presence of high voltage power lines.</p>
Item 5 – Other business	<p>JJ – Spoke to a concerned resident about the wide shoulder design proposed between Laurie Street and Bannons Lane and undertook a site assessment.</p> <p>CC – We're aware of the resident's concerns. They would like to be able to reverse their caravan into their property. We've met with the resident on multiple occasions and committed to looking at how far we can take the wide shoulder across their property. Design constraints are utility services in the area, as well as the new dedicated left turn lane in to Bannons Lane and U-turn provision at the Bannons Lane intersection impacting on available space to continue the wide shoulder across the entire property frontage. For now the current design does service his driveway and our traffic modelling has determined the movement partially in the dedicated left turn lane would be safe.</p> <p>JJ – Thought large vehicles would be able to U-turn at the signalised Bannons Lane intersection but can see that the U-turn at Bannons Lane is only suitable for passenger vehicles. Was under the impression that all vehicles would be able to do a U-turn Bannons Lane.</p> <p>CC – Was this much earlier on in the design process or is this a commitment the current project team made at some point?</p> <p>JY – We brought this up early on in the process that we would need to be able to do a U-turn into the Yarrambat Horse &amp; Pony Club.</p> <p>CC – We can only apologise that the design evolved since 2018 and this change wasn't flagged specifically with you. All the upgraded intersections will facilitate passenger vehicle U-turns. The Jorgensen Avenue jug handle will also facilitate large vehicle U-turns. The two roundabouts at Heard Avenue and Youngs Road will facilitate large and heavy vehicle U-turns. Additional large and heavy vehicle U-turns are also being explored on Bridge Inn Road and Doctors Gully Road.</p> <p>JJ – Doesn't think this will be sufficient for the number of vehicles coming out of Yarrambat Park. The Council EES submission requests the entrance to Yarrambat Park be moved to Jorgensen Avenue. This wouldn't work as you'll never be able to get floats out of Yarrambat Park.</p> <p>JY – Why can't a new entrance be created on Jorgensen Avenue? Is the reason it wasn't supported because you couldn't go through Parks Victoria land?</p>

Agenda item	Discussion summary
	<p>FC – Parks Victoria’s vision is to make this a significant sporting precinct. They believe that by extending their carpark this will create an island effect.</p> <p>LS – It’s on Nillumbik Council land, but Whittlesea Council and Parks Victoria aren’t supportive of this option. We’re supporting providing access via Bannons Lane without impacting Diamond Valley Archers. Currently proposal of left in, left out is not satisfactory to Nillumbik Council.</p> <p>CC – These issues were covered off in multiple EES submissions so will be addressed through the EES process. The Public Hearing starts at the end of the month.</p> <p>RW – In relation to Bridge Inn Road, what option will be selected or is that still to be confirmed?</p> <p>CC – We’ve put forward our preferred option, but others have alternative preferences that they’ll speak to when presenting their submission at the Public Hearing. The outcome will be determined through the EES process. Option B is MRPV’s preferred option. After the Public Hearing concludes, the IAC have 40 business days to put together a report to be sent to Minister for Planning. The Minister for Planning will consider the report along with all of the submissions and will make a determination.</p>
Item 6 – Close	<p>CC – Next meeting scheduled for the first week in January 2021 but many of us might be away. Should we meet on 11 January 2021 instead?</p> <p>Group agreed on 11 January 2021 for next CRG meeting. RW may be unable to attend. CC offered for RW to send a surrogate in his place. RW might be able to dial in from his holiday house.</p> <p><i>Meeting concluded 7.55pm</i></p>

#### Actions – new

#	Action	Owner/s	Due
3.1	Rationale behind design at Bannons Lane and Jorgensen Avenue, as opposed to signalised intersection at Yarrambat Park or alternative design options	FC	11 Jan 2021

#### Actions – outstanding

#	Action	Owner/s	Due
2.2	Confirm approximately how many metres west the fence will be constructed along Yan Yean Road in front of Yarrambat Park	FC	11 Jan 2021
2.4	Re-invite a Whittlesea Council representative to attend the 11 January 2021 Community Reference Group meeting to speak to local matters	CC	11 Jan 2021