



# Appendix A



Tables A.1–A.4 summarise and respond to submissions received during the public exhibition of the *Project Assessment Report* (for further information see [www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/gallery/project\\_assessment\\_report](http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/gallery/project_assessment_report)).

**Table A.1. Local government submissions**

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
<b>City of Charles Sturt (CCS)</b>		
LGS001.1	<p>Council in principal supports this project and its benefits to the wider community, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduced rat-running in the local street network due to increased traffic efficiency along South Road and along Port Road, Grange Road and Manton Street near South Road</li> <li>• improved road safety at intersections due to grade separation: of larger cross metropolitan traffic flows from other traffic flows; of intersections of South Road with Port Road and Grange Road; and of the rail line</li> <li>• improved pedestrian facilities along South Road as existing paths are located very close to high volumes of traffic and large vehicles</li> <li>• improved cyclist facilities along South Road as the existing travel lanes are narrow and not safe for cyclists</li> <li>• safe crossing of South Road by Outer Harbor 'Greenway' shared-use cycling and walking route connecting adjacent suburbs to the city and Outer Harbor</li> <li>• upgraded public lighting, resulting in improved night time personal safety and urban amenity</li> <li>• economic benefits to the region with construction bringing 480 new employees to the site.</li> </ul>	Noted
LGS001.2	<p>Noted improvements on the previous concept include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintaining connections between South Road and majority of local street network to minimise resident detours and their impact on other local streets</li> <li>• a shortened and lowered train overpass, returning to grade before the existing Queen Street–Elizabeth Street level crossing, minimising visual impact and amenity disturbance to local residents</li> <li>• changes to Hurtle Street access to South Road to reduce traffic volume increases on Hurtle Street.</li> </ul>	Noted

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
LGS001.3	<p>To further improve local amenity, access and safety, table the following 31 requests to be considered for incorporation into the project.</p> <p>Existing access points for pedestrians at Grange Road, Port Road, Hawker Street, the PAC south of Hawker Street and Torrens Road are maintained. The new shared use facility adjacent the rail line is a necessary addition to the pedestrian network. Locations of and access to bus stops is to be further investigated.</p> <p><i>Request: Council officers work with DPTI officers to ensure that east–west permeability and access for pedestrians and cyclists is sufficient so as not to divide communities. It is important to maintain the current proposed number of crossing points and provide adequate access to bus stops.</i></p>	<p>DPTI is aware of Council and local community concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist access across the North–South Corridor and the need to provide safe access to bus stops. DPTI will work with Council officers to ensure bus stops are appropriately located and can be easily accessed by the community.</p>
LGS001.4	<p>Existing access points for cyclists at Grange Road, Port Road and Torrens Road are maintained and improved. Council has a desire for an off-road shared-use path across South Road at Port Road.</p> <p><i>Request: That an off-road, shared use path be incorporated on Port Road, to enable recreational cyclists to cross South Road safely.</i></p>	<p>On-road cycling facilities will be incorporated into the design. An off-road shared-use path that crosses South Road is not appropriate at this location given the current concept and busy nature of the intersection. Other nearby off-road facilities include River Torrens Linear Park and Outer Harbor Greenway.</p>
LGS001.5	<p>It is unclear how cyclists are accommodated at the Hurtle Street–Hawker Street intersection. These streets form part of the Bikedirect route.</p> <p><i>Request: That a safe, convenient cyclist crossing facility across South Road at Hurtle–Hawker Street is included as part of the intersection design.</i></p>	<p>Crossing provisions for cyclists will be incorporated at Hurtle Street and Hawker Street during the detailed design process.</p>
LGS001.6	<p>The River Torrens Linear Park shared use path (northern side of river) crosses South Road at an underpass. The underpass requires upgrading to meet currently standards. CCS has not undertaken this work due to impending works by DPTI in this region.</p> <p><i>Request: That upgrade / renewal of the River Torrens Linear Park path underpass be included in the project scope.</i></p>	<p>DPTI recognises the importance of the underpass for connectivity across the North–South Corridor for the local community and for the wider community as part of the River Torrens Linear Park.</p> <p>Only the western side of the underpass is proposed to be altered as part of the scope of the Torrens Road to River Torrens project.</p> <p>There is potential for a joint project between Council and DPTI to upgrade the River Torrens Linear Park bridge underpass at South Road.</p>
LGS001.7	<p>The previous South Road upgrade concept included an off-road shared use path extending along the western side of the new South Road. The current concept has removed this facility and instead shows on-road bicycle lanes along some of the surface road section of South Road. It is unclear whether the on-road bicycle lanes will extend for the entire length of South Road. Both commuter and recreational cycling facilities should</p>	<p>South of Port Road, there is insufficient road reserve for an off-road path. On-road bicycle lanes will be included along the entire length of the project. There is potentially space available in the corridor for an off-road shared use path to be included north of Port Road. It will be considered in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>be included in the project.</p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI officers continue to work with Council officers and residents with a view to incorporate both commuter and recreational cycling facilities, including along/adjacent South Road.</i></p>	
LGS001.8	<p>A shared use cycling and walking footbridge over the river at the end of McDonnell Ave, West Hindmarsh is suggested as an option, subject to both CCS and the City of West Torrens taking joint responsibility for the new facility. A new bridge would be well used as the South Road bridge over the River Torrens is not well suited for pedestrian and cycle traffic. A new shared use bridge would aid bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the area and provide improved access to the new brickwork shopping precinct, benefiting the local community.</p> <p><i>Request: Full consideration to life-cycle cost and projected use of a new bridge be undertaken, before Council considers taking shared ownership of a new facility.</i></p>	<p>Noted. DPTI is continuing to work with the CSS and the City of West Torrens to ensure that agreement is reached by all parties involved.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3. West Hindmarsh access.</p>
LGS001.9	<p>An on-road local bicycle link along McDonnell Avenue, Bertie Street, Bond Street, Albemarle Street, Port Road and Queen Street, linking the River Torrens Linear Park shared use path to the Greenway shared use path, using local area traffic management and line-marked 'sharrow' treatments [shared lane markings] is proposed as an option. This is a slight change to the current Bikedirect network.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council staff continue to work with DPTI to enable safe transit for recreational cyclists, connecting Croydon and the Greenway cycling route to the River Torrens Linear Park path via a shared use path and/or a local road cycling network and associated local area traffic management.</i></p>	<p>DPTI and Council staff will work together to determine the best local road route to link the River Torrens Linear Park and the Outer Harbor Greenway for recreational cyclists.</p>
LGS001.10	<p>DPTI is proposing to create an additional north bound lane on parts of Park Terrace, north of Port Road, in part to accommodate additional anticipated traffic during the South Road upgrade construction phase. Park Terrace accommodates in the order of 46,000 vehicles per day. Bowden Urban Village (BUV), located adjacent to this road, will add 2,400 dwellings over the life of the project. The City of Adelaide, in association with Renewal SA, proposes to upgrade the western Park Lands opposite the BUV site, in part to cater for some recreational and leisure needs of BUV occupants.</p> <p>Currently, access to the Park Lands across Park Terrace is via a pedestrian actuated crossing (PAC) south of the rail level crossing and Port Road/Park Terrace intersection, or via Park</p>	<p>Park Terrace is expected to carry additional traffic during construction of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project.</p> <p>Park Terrace will be upgraded to three lanes in each direction through narrowing the centre median to increase the capacity for through vehicle movements.</p> <p>An unsignalised pedestrian crossing facility will be constructed on Park Terrace between Fourth Street and Fifth Street. Existing pedestrian crossing facilities are also available adjacent the Outer Harbor rail line and at the western side of the existing shared used path underpass at the Park Terrace overbridge.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Terrace underpass (either side of rail corridor). The distance from the rail crossing PAC to Park Terrace underpass is over 500 metres. The 'widening' of Park Terrace should be the catalyst for improving access to/from the western Park Lands and residential areas to the west. This could either be in the form of an additional PAC (somewhere between the rail level crossing and Park Terrace underpass) and/or improvements to the Park Terrace shared use underpass (western side), and connections to the local street network along Ninth Street in Bowden. The eastern side of Park Terrace underpass is currently being upgraded (including widening, new lighting and improved access to War Memorial Drive) through Gawler Greenway project improvements.</p> <p><i>Request: That improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities over Park Terrace be included in the project scope to connect the Park Lands and Bowden Urban Village, via either a PAC or improvements to the western side of the existing shared use underpass.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That the on-road bicycle lanes in both directions on Park Terrace be maintained.</i></p>	<p>Installing a new pedestrian actuated crossing on Park Terrace is not supported at this time as it would reduce the capacity benefits from the upgrade for through vehicle traffic.</p> <p>On-road bicycle lanes will be provided in both directions along the full length of Park Terrace.</p>
LGS001.11	<p>Some movements are planned to be closed to and from local streets and South Road. The predicted increase in traffic volumes on alternative routes as a result of these closures should be considered and any required local area traffic management implemented in consultation with CCS staff.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers continue to work with DPTI to minimise negative impacts on the local street network and determine appropriate traffic calming measures for inclusion in the project.</i></p>	<p>DPTI will work with Council officers to minimise impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate local traffic management treatments.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications</p>
LGS001.12	<p>On side roads perpendicular to South Road, some driveways will now be situated in close proximity to the corner with the new South Road alignment. To ensure safety at these driveways, there must be a safe distance between the driveway and the new alignment of the surface road.</p> <p><i>Request: That a minimum of 6 metres be maintained between the tangent point of the side road and the edge of each driveway.</i></p>	<p>DPTI is aware of this requirement and individual accesses will be assessed on a site-specific basis during the detailed design phase.</p>
LGS001.13	<p>Access changes are planned at all Croydon local street intersections with South Road. This will have significant impacts on local traffic patterns in the Croydon and West Croydon areas. Ellen Street is predicted to carry additional traffic; along some sections an approximate 50% increase to current volumes. Improved traffic management, particularly at the intersections of Ellen Street with Hurtle Street and Dartmouth Street should be considered.</p>	<p>Potential to provide a U-turn will be further investigated as the design for the South Road/Port Road intersection is refined.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Queen Street and Elizabeth Street current traffic volumes above the desirable limit for a local access street, are also anticipated to increase.</p> <p>A U-turn facility to provide left turn access into Croydon for southbound motorists on South Road is being investigated. A U-turn facility would greatly improve access for local residents, and reduce the impacts of additional traffic on Ellen Street, Queen Street and Elizabeth Street.</p> <p><i>Request: That a measure to reduce impact on Ellen Street, Queen Street and Elizabeth Street by providing an alternative access into Croydon for southbound motorists (e.g. via a U-turn facility) is included in the project.</i></p>	
LGS001.14	<p>Hurtle Street is to become the only street with right turn access onto South Road from the Croydon/ West Croydon area.</p> <p><i>Request: That Hurtle Street residents be invited to participate in discussions on the impact to local traffic and ways to minimise any reduction in local amenity caused by additional traffic.</i></p>	<p>DPTI will continue to provide opportunities for community involvement and feedback on specific project elements during the life of the project.</p> <p>Community engagement activities will help to achieve a balanced approach and a better outcome for the entire Croydon local area.</p>
LGS001.15	<p>It has been observed that some drivers use Rosetta Street, West Croydon as an alternative to South Road. The number of drivers choosing to take this route is likely to increase during the South Road construction period.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers continue to work with DPTI officers to determine suitable local area traffic management in anticipation of additional traffic on Rosetta Street, West Croydon during the construction period.</i></p>	<p>Traffic will be encouraged to remain on the arterial road network through upgrades to the surrounding arterial road network and travel time information signs along alternative routes.</p>
LGS001.16	<p>Access changes are planned at the intersections of South Road with Ridley Street, Rose Street, Coglin Street, Susan Street and Adam Street in Hindmarsh.</p> <p>The Industrial Land Study (2008) prepared for CCS identified the area in the north-eastern corner of the Port Road/South Road intersection as a prime industrial area. It contains a number of significant operations, including Molnar Engineering, Industrial Engineers and Springmakers, Alsco, Holcim and has a heavy reliance on vehicle access from Port Road via Coglin Street in particular. The concern is that the South Road upgrade and associated changes to Port Road and Coglin Street will compromise access to this industrial node.</p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI's investigations ensure any changes to the road network will not result in a tendency for industrial traffic to permeate through adjacent residential areas because of constrained access arrangements to these industrial precincts.</i></p>	<p>Traffic will still be able to turn both left and right into Coglin Street.</p> <p>The Port Road median crossovers are proposed to be converted to one-way traffic only. Traffic will still be able to exit at Coglin Street onto Port Road and then U-turn at Anne Street to access the Port Road/South Road intersection. Vehicles will then be able to continue straight along Port Road or turn in either direction along South Road.</p> <p>These access changes at Coglin and Anne Streets will improve safety for road users.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.6 Hindmarsh access.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
LGS001.17	<p>Access changes are planned at the intersections of South Road with Bond Street and Hindmarsh Avenue in West Hindmarsh. Currently, residents can make a right turn onto South Road to head south, via Hindmarsh Avenue.</p> <p>A safe and clear new access for residents of West Hindmarsh to head south along South Road is required. The Project Assessment Report states that the Community Liaison Group has chosen a one way local road bridge across the River Torrens at McDonnell Street as their preferred option to improve access for West Hindmarsh residents. This may result in rat running through the local street network and further investigation into this option is required before decisions are made. Further consideration of the alternative options, particularly new traffic signals on Grange Road, or a new U turn facility on South Road, is required.</p> <p><i>Request: That a viable route for West Hindmarsh resident to access South Road and travel in a southerly direction be included in the project.</i></p>	<p>A U-turn provision at Grange Road traffic signals will be provided to facilitate travel in a southerly direction from West Hindmarsh.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p>
LGS001.18	<p>Access changes are planned at all Ridleyton local street intersections with South Road, with the exception of Hawker Street, which will maintain full, signalised access. This will have significant impacts on the local traffic patterns in the Ridleyton and Brompton areas, and increase traffic volumes on Hawker Street as well as connecting streets such as Wood Avenue.</p> <p>It has been observed that some drivers use Coglin Street and Chief Street, Brompton as an alternative to South Road. The number of drivers choosing to take these routes is likely to increase during the South Road construction period.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers continue to work with DTPI officers to determine suitable local area traffic management during the construction period in anticipation of additional traffic on Coglin Street and Chief Street, Brompton.</i></p>	<p>DPTI will continue to work with Council to determine the best local area traffic management treatments for local roads in the vicinity.</p> <p>Traffic will be encouraged to remain on the arterial road network during construction. Variable message signs installed on the broader arterial road network will show traveller information messages and advice on construction impacts.</p>
LGS001.19	<p>It is noted that access will be closed to Lamont Street (west) and Tait Street will no longer have a right turn to/from South Road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
LGS001.20	<p>Modifications to improve the layout and capacity of the Port Road/South Road intersection have resulted in the two minor right turn movements being banned at the intersection, and drivers being required to use U-turn facilities along Port Road. The benefits and justification for this decision require further explanation.</p> <p><i>Request: That further justification be provided as to the need for two right turns to be banned at South</i></p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>The bridge deck at the South Road/Port Road intersection will be designed such that it can be widened in the future, should the intersection layout be modified.</p>



Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p><i>Road/Port Road and drivers to use U-turn facilities.</i></p> <p><i>Request: It is desirable to maintain the option of installing a tramline along Port Road as well as a shared-use path within the Port Road median.</i></p>	
LGS001.21	<p>Car parking is at a premium in this district and local business relies on car parking availability. Three of the public car parking areas currently housed within the Port Road median would be removed in the current design.</p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI determine Port Road median car parking utilisation and ensure that an adequate number of spaces are maintained in the vicinity both during construction and following project completion.</i></p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.4 Port Road median parking.
LGS001.22	<p>CCS has a shortage of public open space in this area. There is an opportunity for suitably located, appropriately sized parcels of land to be converted to usable public open space.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers continue to work with DPTI officers to discuss opportunities for creating public open space, landscaped areas, pocket parks and/or detention basins with any remaining land and meet with the CLG and interested members of the public to discuss options for open space and placement/location of sound walls.</i></p>	See Supplement Section 3.3.2 Use of surplus land for new open space areas, and Section 3.3.3. Community park, corner of William Street and Elizabeth Street.
LGS001.23	<p>The current proposal includes a reduced height rail overpass with an embankment rather than an elevated structure. Further consultation is proposed with residents of Euston Terrace and Day Terrace on treatment of the embankment wall.</p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers work with DPTI officers and local residents to determine appropriate landscaping for the embankments.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers be involved in discussions about verge planting choices and clearances from travel lanes for ease of maintenance by Council officers following asset hand-over.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That Council officers and DPTI officers further discuss tree ownership, new tree planting and ongoing maintenance of trees and verges. Approvals for tree removals are still to be sought.</i></p>	See Supplement Section 3.2.6 Rail overpass workshop (urban design) and Section 3.3.1 Urban design of Outer Harbor rail overpass. CCS has been notified of potential tree impacts.
LGS001.24	<p><i>Request: The project shall comply with the CCS Development Guidelines for stormwater flow and detention requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI continue to consult with CCS officers regarding stormwater infrastructure design and construction. Any stormwater infrastructure to be handed over to Council shall be constructed to</i></p>	DPTI is working with Council officers and the T2T Alliance in all aspects of stormwater management.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p><i>CCS satisfaction.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That stormwater management, including the operation and management of a new pump station constructed to drain the underpass, shall be the responsibility of DPTI.</i></p>	
LGS001.25	<p>CCS's 'Water proofing the West' project has a River Torrens diversion system that conveys river water through South Road and Port Road to St Clair wetlands and Old Port Road wetlands respectively.</p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI at all times ensures that the diversion is not interrupted during construction of the Torrens to Torrens project. The project team shall discuss options with CCS staff and, if required, construct alternative infrastructure to ensure continued operation of the River Torrens transfer.</i></p> <p><i>Request: That DPTI officers have discussions with Council officers on care, control, maintenance and management of proposed stormwater detention reserves, if such infrastructure is to be handed over to CCS.</i></p>	Noted.
LGS001.26	<p>A traffic and transportation management plan is to be developed and implemented during construction. It is envisaged that major freight traffic will use Park Terrace as an alternative and that two lanes of traffic will be maintained in both directions along South Road during peak times to minimise delays and disruption to drivers as much as possible.</p> <p>Due to likely reduced speed limit, it is anticipated that some drivers will still make detours through the local street network to avoid the construction zone. This can cause disturbance to local residents and reduce local amenity. Local area traffic management is to be implemented where required to deter this behaviour.</p> <p><i>Request: Staff will continue to work with DPTI to identify and plan to minimise impacts during construction on the adjacent local street network.</i></p>	<p>Traffic will be encouraged to remain on the arterial road network through upgrades to the surrounding arterial road network and travel time information signs along alternative routes.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.</p>
LGS001.27	<p>Drivers rat-running through Beverley, Allenby Gardens and Flinders Park to avoid the East Avenue, Grange Road and Holbrooks Road signals has been a subject of resident complaints in the past. This problem is likely to be exacerbated with drivers avoiding South Road during construction works.</p> <p>Holbrooks Road, Kilkenny Road, David Terrace and Regency Road will also have increased traffic volumes during the construction period as they provide an alternative, north–south route to South</p>	<p>Upgrades on alternative routes to relieve additional congestion during construction have been investigated. Capacity improvements identified on James Congdon Drive, Park Terrace, Fitzroy Terrace and Torrens Road will be implemented for the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Road. Increased volumes are anticipated, albeit to a lesser extent, on Findon Road, Woodville Road, Cheltenham Parade, Tapleys Hill Road, West Lakes Boulevard and Clarke Terrace. Delays to drivers are likely to be experienced on CBD radial routes along Grange Road, Port Road and Torrens Road.</p> <p><i>Request: That modifications be made at East Avenue, Grange Road, Holbrooks Road signals, East Avenue and Port Road signals, Kilkenny Road and Port Road signals, and David Terrace, Regency Road and Torrens Road signals to achieve greater efficiency and cater for an increased demand by drivers avoiding South Road during the construction period. That consideration be given to modifications at other intersections throughout the arterial road network in order to improve network efficiency, reduce delays and reduce rat-running through the local street network.</i></p>	
City of West Torrens		
LGS002.1	<p>Loss of right turns at the Adam Street junction with the new South Road surface road. The Project Assessment Report (PAR) envisages that the loss of the right turn opportunity would be compensated by removing right turn prohibitions in South Road at the intersection with Manton Street–Grange Road at the traffic signals. That is, the current right turn drivers using Adam Street would divert to the intersection of South Road/Manton Street–Grange Road to make these turns. However, in the event that the right turn prohibitions were found to be required again due to traffic flow reasons, it is unclear what the impact would be on these right turners. For instance, increased traffic may use West Thebarton Road to Port Road, if right turns are not able to be accommodated at the intersection of South Road/Manton Street–Grange Road.</p>	<p>A review of origin-destination data for vehicles turning right into Adam Street currently indicates that a large proportion of the traffic are through movements with destinations north of Regency Road. At the completion of this project and subsequent sections of the North–South Corridor, this through traffic is expected to remain on the free-flow road and continue to exit at Regency Road or Grand Junction Road. Additionally, with the upgrade and improved prioritisation of the inner ring route (James Congdon Drive–Port Road–Park Terrace), some of this through traffic may turn right before Adam Street and reduce right turn demand at Adam Street in the future.</p> <p>With the access changes, existing right turn movements entering Adam Street to access the local area are expected to divert to the signalised intersection of South Road/Manton Street–Grange Road. With lower volumes expected on the surface road, this intersection is expected to have sufficient capacity to cater for right turn movement into the future. Reinstating the existing peak hour ban is unlikely.</p>
LGS002.2	<p>Loss of local street access in the West Hindmarsh area to South Road where right turns to the south would now be restricted. The PAR stated that 6 options were considered during discussions with the Community Liaison Group. One of these options is to enable a U-turn facility to be provided in the South Road surface road, south of the</p>	<p>A new bridge across the River Torrens will link West Hindmarsh with Torrensville for pedestrians and cyclists. A one-way road bridge will not be constructed.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Manton Street–Grange Road intersection. Another option noted in the report is a road bridge link between MacDonnell Avenue or Barrpowell Street in West Hindmarsh to Jervois Street (and Ashwin Parade) in Torrensville. It is noted that this new road bridge link option to Jervois Street has already been included in PAR Table 14.6 Hindmarsh Avenue, despite Council previously advising DPTI that a southbound road bridge link is not supported by the City of West Torrens due to the potentially adverse impacts of more traffic using Ashwin Parade and the flow-on to other local streets to the south. DPTI has also been advised previously by the Administration that Jervois Street has been leased to Cochrane's and this section of Jervois Street, which is intended to form the southbound road link for traffic generated in the West Hindmarsh area, is not conducive to use by significantly more traffic due to the lease constraints and the number of B-Doubles that frequently access the driveways on both sides of the street as part of the Cochrane's operations. Having regard to previous Council's view on the matter, DPTI should instead focus on the other options for improving access for West Hindmarsh, such as the U-turn facility.</p>	
LGS002.3	<p>The proposal for a pedestrian footbridge across the River Torrens and connecting to MacDonnell Avenue would be supported from a pedestrian and cyclist accessibility perspective. It would also provide opportunity for local West Hindmarsh residents to make use of the retail/commercial facilities at the Brickworks site. Indeed, this would fit in very well with the proposed designation of MacDonnell Avenue as a cycle friendly link to the north of the river, as identified in the PAR.</p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.
LGS002.4	<p>In the City of West Torrens' portion of the project, east–west pedestrian and cyclist linkages across South Road would be readily available via: River Torrens shared use path; traffic signals at South Road/Ashwin Parade–West Thebarton Road; and existing pedestrian signal near Bennett Street. Accessibility would therefore not be reduced for these users in the current TRRT project.</p>	Noted.
LGS002.5	<p>At the Port Road/South Road surface intersection, U-turns are proposed for those drivers on South Road wishing to proceed in the direction of the city or Port Adelaide. This is a somewhat unusual arrangement as, in a conventional intersection arrangement, all right turns would be permitted at the intersection itself. However, it is assumed that this U-turn arrangement is considered to be necessary to maintain reasonable operating conditions at the intersection. A northbound driver</p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	on South Road would be required to turn left onto Port Road and then U-turn (under signal control) back towards the city. If this movement is perceived to be circuitous and time wasting, there may be some implication to roads to the south such as West Thebarton Road. However, if right turns are permitted from South Road into Manton Street, it would be more likely that traffic would divert to Manton Street rather than West Thebarton Road. The risk of impact to West Thebarton Road should be small.	
LGS002.6	Weber Street is currently restricted to left in/left out, due to the current median in South Road. The TRRT project would not alter this arrangement, so no impact is envisaged.	Access will continue to be left in/left out at Weber Street.
LGS002.7	As part of consultation with DPTI on the South Road/Ashwin Parade–West Thebarton Road intersection upgrade, the current South Road median opening at Bennett Street would be retained. The TRRT project would also maintain this arrangement so no impact is envisaged.	All turning movements will be retained at the South Road/Bennett Street intersection.
LGS002.8	Thebarton Oval is an important community facility in the project area. However, this is not acknowledged in greater detail in PAR Section 8.2.5 Module C. Games at the oval generate significant seasonal traffic and parking demands.	
LGS002.9	Unlike the Gallipoli Underpass project, the PAR does not provide any traffic impact projections for the local access changes that would result from the project. Given that some local access streets would be closed and modified to left in/left out only, it is uncertain if there would be impacts arising from traffic diversion. Given that the TRRT project only extends for a short distance into the City of West Torrens, the potential traffic diversion issue is not apparent. For other councils, such as the City of Charles Sturt, a traffic impact analysis by DPTI may be beneficial.	DPTI is continuing to work with the City of Charles Sturt to address changes to traffic movements in the local area as a result of modifying access as part of the project.  No changes are proposed to local road access in the City of West Torrens.
LGS002.10	As part of the Brickworks development approval, access for the loading areas of the development and for the existing market site would rely on a crossover being provided to South Road, adjacent to the River Torrens bridge. The location and layout of this driveway and crossover was previously agreed to in discussions between the developer, Council and DPTI. It is unclear if any changes are proposed to this previously agreed arrangement. Council would be concerned if in future access is restricted to the existing market site or Brickworks loading area, due to the lack of suitable alternative access arrangements.	No changes have been made to the agreed access arrangement. DPTI is investigating alternative access arrangements should the North–South Corridor non-stop motorway be extended in the future.
LGS002.11	No reference has been made to the Brickworks site and proposed Jervois Street road bridge when	A new bridge for pedestrians and cyclists across the River Torrens will link West

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	summarising key issues identified through briefings held with both Elected Members and officers from Council, the City of Charles Sturt and City of Port Adelaide Enfield.	Hindmarsh with Torrensville. This will improve access to the redeveloped Brickworks site.  See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.
LGS002.12	A lack of reference to Thebarton Oval and the Bioscience precinct when referencing landscape and urban character of the area from Grange Road–Manton Street to Ashley Street.	Thebarton Oval is not directly referenced in the landscape and urban character text for Module C as it was considered to be part of the wider Kings Reserve community and open space area on the western side of South Road.  Thebarton Bioscience precinct is not considered to have a unique landscape and urban design character that visually distinguishes it from the commercial and industrial area on the eastern side of South Road.
LGS002.13	A lack of reference, as local heritage places, to the air raid shelter at the corner of Ashley Street and South Road, Thebarton Oval Grandstand and the Brickworks Kiln. In relation to the Brickworks Kiln, the importance of managing the vibration levels through the construction period and post-construction.	The air raid shelter on the corner of Ashley Street and South Road is considered to be beyond the project area so heritage details were not provided in the PAR.  Thebarton Oval Grandstand is highlighted in blue in Figure 10.1 of the PAR. No further heritage details were provided as it will not be directly or indirectly affected by the project.  The 'former Hoffman brick kiln and chimney' (the Brickworks kiln) is referenced on page 143 of the PAR. Vibration will be managed throughout construction. Due to the distance between the kiln and any road/bridge construction works, vibration levels are not expected to cause any structural damage to the kiln.
<b>City of Charles Sturt Hindmarsh Ward Councillor</b>		
LGS003.1	There need to be right hand turns from Port Road onto South Road in both directions.	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
LGS003.2	There are serious concerns that the proposed 'U-turns' in the middle of the Port Road median strip will encourage 'rat-running' through surrounding suburbs in an effort to avoid the Port Road/South Road intersection.	Drivers are expected to continue to use the redirected right turn at South Road/Port Road intersection following the upgrade. Even with longer travel distance, significant travel time improvements are expected for trips between Ashwin Parade and Chief Street via the upgraded South Road/Port Road intersection following completion of the project.  With no right turn access into the local road network from the surface road, combined with the improved operation of the South Road/Port Road intersection, the potential for rat-running through the local road network is low.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
LGS003.3	The shared pathway attached to the rail overpass needs to continue straight ahead (east) towards the city without the need to negotiate the convoluted DDA pedestrian access ramp.	DPTI intends to continue the greenway path within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road through to Coglin Street.  See Supplement Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway.
LGS003.4	Ridleyton residents travelling north on South Road have no way of turning right from South Road to access their homes in Ridleyton.	Drivers travelling north along South Road are able to access the Ridleyton local area via right turn movements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• using the redirected U-turn at South Road/Port Road intersection and then entering the local area at Coglin Street</li> <li>• at the signalised intersection of South Road/Hawker Street</li> <li>• at the signalised intersection of South Road/Torrens Road and then entering the local area at Wright Street or Blight Street.</li> </ul>
LGS003.5	Provision must be made for the continuation of the tram service down the centre median strip of Port Road to service local business precincts.	The bridge deck at the South Road/Port Road intersection will be designed such that it can be widened in the future, should the intersection layout need to be modified.

Table A.2. State government submissions

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
<b>Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources</b>		
SGS001.1	<p>The project would provide significant opportunities to embed best practice water sensitive urban design (WSUD), generally as design features. The Project Assessment Report (PAR) indicates that WSUD would be utilised, subject to available space; however, it defers consideration to the detailed design phase. Best practice WSUD/stormwater management, and the incorporation of leading WSUD features, should occur at the concept and design phases of the project to ensure a strategic, integrated, multi-functional approach. The project should have regard to the state government's WSUD policy approved by cabinet in 2013:</p> <p><a href="http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/Home/Full_news_events_listing/News_Events_Listing/131101-water-urban-policy">www.environment.sa.gov.au/Home/Full_news_events_listing/News_Events_Listing/131101-water-urban-policy</a>.</p>	<p>Water sensitive urban design elements will be incorporated into the project wherever possible, particularly through the creation of a number of detention basins on surplus land within and adjacent to the road corridor.</p>
SGS001.2	<p>If a new well is required, a well construction permit is required from DEWNR, as per Section 127 (3) of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (NRM Act). Furthermore, section 144 of the NRM Act requires the occupier of the land on which a well is situated to ensure that the well (including the casing, lining and screen of the well and any mechanism used to cap the well) is properly maintained and/or decommissioned. Information on specific wells can be obtained from <a href="http://www.waterconnect.sa.gov.au">www.waterconnect.sa.gov.au</a>. For information on well construction permit applications, contact DEWNR on 8735 1134 or visit:</p> <p><a href="http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/licences-and-permits/water-licence-and-permit-forms">www.environment.sa.gov.au/licences-and-permits/water-licence-and-permit-forms</a>.</p>	Noted.
SGS001.3	<p>Prescription of groundwater resources in the Adelaide Plains Prescribed Wells Area requires that where there is a proposal to take groundwater (such as for dewatering) or where there is any existing take of groundwater (other than for stock and domestic purposes), to apply for a water licence and allocation from DEWNR – contact Adelaide Customer Services Team on 8463 6876 or visit:</p> <p><a href="http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/managing-natural-resources/water-use/water-">www.environment.sa.gov.au/managing-natural-resources/water-use/water-</a></p>	Noted.



Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<a href="#">planning/water-licences-and-permits.</a>	
SGS001.4	<p>It is not clear what aquifer the 'variable groundwater depths' are referring to. It is assumed it is referring to the shallow Quaternary aquifer, but this should be clarified. The state groundwater database has recorded water levels only for the unconfined shallow 1st Quaternary aquifer to 2006, namely approximately 5–12 metres below ground level). Therefore the data is not recent and further investigations of current water levels should occur before construction.</p>	<p>Additional assessments including a significant amount of drilling have been undertaken for this project over the last 18 months. For the length of the lowered road, approximately Hindmarsh Avenue, Hindmarsh to Henry Street, Croydon, the groundwater level is in the depth range of 11–13 metres for the Q1 aquifer. Shallow perched water was rarely encountered in more sandy soils. The proposed excavation depth is in the order of 8 metres so no groundwater inflow is expected. Wells installed and measured over the last few years indicate that the water level varies in the vicinity of +/- 0.5 metres seasonally. DEWNR was engaged to study the long-term fluctuations of the water level in the vicinity of the project. The draft report to DPTI indicates that, in the long term, anticipated groundwater level is expected to reduce from its present level.</p>
SGS001.5	<p>This section states that no permanent dewatering infrastructure will be required, However, as there is no recent data on the water levels in the unconfined shallow Q1 aquifer (as above), further investigations of current water levels should occur before construction, and higher than expected groundwater levels should be considered as a potential risk to the project in the CEMP. This risk is acknowledged to a degree in 17.5.2.</p>	<p>See response to SGS001.4.</p>
SGS001.6	<p>DEWNR (State Heritage Unit) is particularly interested in any potential impact of the Torrens Road to River Torrens project on the State heritage-listed Hindmarsh Cemetery and Sexton's Cottage, 32 Adam Street, Hindmarsh – the western boundary of which is located immediately adjacent to South Road, just north of the bridge over the River Torrens. It is noted that Table 10.1 indicates no impact on this State Heritage Place, as it is assumed the widening of South Road will be to the west.</p> <p>Notwithstanding any mitigation measures identified in Section 10.4 of the PAR, DEWNR (State Heritage Unit) requests that during the design and construction phases of the Torrens Road to River Torrens project, the project managers consult with conservation architects at DEWNR (State Heritage Unit) to ensure there are no adverse effects on the state heritage values of the Hindmarsh Cemetery and Sexton's Cottage. It should be noted that this project could materially affect the</p>	<p>Widening will occur to the west of the existing South Road in the vicinity of the State heritage-listed Hindmarsh Cemetery and therefore will not directly impact on the site. Some footpath improvement works may occur adjacent to the site and if so, measures will be taken to minimise any impact to boundary vegetation. Given its separation distance from the project, Sexton's cottage is not expected to be affected.</p> <p>The project team has already consulted with conservation architects at DEWNR (State Heritage Unit) and will continue to do so during the next phases of the project.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	heritage value of the place, including its context.	
SGS001.7	Section 11.1.4 refers to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, whereas section 15.2.1 refers to the Minister for the Environment. The latter is the Minister's current title.	Noted.
<b>Environment Protection Authority</b>		
SGS002.1	<p>The project has the potential to emit pollutants during the construction and operation phases. During construction the major concern would be dust emissions. During operations the local air quality would be impacted by vehicle emissions.</p> <p>Recommendation: The EPA supports the proposal to prepare a detailed Construction Environment Management Plan.</p>	Noted.
SGS002.2	Detailed air quality impact assessment report and predicted pollutant concentrations contours be made available as part of the PAR. The preliminary air quality assessment report has not been provided as part of this PAR and it is important to verify model assumptions.	During the detailed design phase of the project, air quality impact assessment studies will be undertaken on the final design to understand the effects of the project. Liaison with the EPA will be undertaken and include discussion on assumptions used for the modelling and pollutant concentration contours.
SGS002.3	Air quality impact assessment from the operational phase of the project was undertaken using CAL3QHCR model. CAL3QHCR is a line source dispersion model available CALRoads and is an accepted dispersion model to predict pollutant impact from major road sources that should be used for assessing air quality impact during the detailed design phase of the project.	Noted. CAL3QHCR will be used for modelling during the detailed design phase.
SGS002.4	<p>The outcome of air quality impact assessment presented here confirms that emissions during the operation phase will meet the Ambient Air Quality NEPM limits for pollutants.</p> <p>It is important to review the previous air quality impact assessment to verify model assumptions and review pollutant concentration contours especially at 10–50 metres distance from the road and assess against Ambient Air Quality NEPM limits.</p> <p>Air quality impact assessment modelling should also continue during the detailed design phase of the project, especially assessing air quality impact from traffic flow of non-stop lowered road section.</p>	See response to SGS002.2.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
SGS002.5	<p>Air quality studies undertaken by project team (11 August–12 November) confirmed that background concentrations used are conservative in nature.</p> <p>Details about the monitoring methods used should be provided. Monitoring should be undertaken during construction and operation phase to manage any off-site impacts and to validate model predictions.</p>	<p>See response to SGS002.2.</p> <p>Air quality will be monitored during construction to identify and manage off-site impacts.</p>
SGS002.6	<p>The main concern during construction of this project would be dust (as PM10 and total suspended particles as nuisance dust).</p> <p>The EPA supports the proposal to prepare a detailed construction environment management plan, which should be prepared and approved before commencement of construction, including use of air quality monitoring devices to manage impact.</p>	<p>Noted. Air quality during construction will be managed through implementation of a Construction Environment Management Plan.</p>
SGS002.7	<p>It is noted that 'piling (for underpass wall structure)' would likely use 'continuous flight auger method'. Piling is capable of having a significant vibration impact on the surrounding area (depending on the proximity of nearby structures and geology of the area).</p> <p>Consideration should be given to using lower impact piling methods (such as continuous flight auger method) where vibration may affect nearby structures.</p>	<p>The lower vibratory piling method (continuous flight auger) is the preferred construction method for the project.</p> <p>Vibration impacts during construction will be managed through implementation of a Construction Environment Management Plan.</p>
SGS002.8	<p>Table 9.1 should specify the time periods applicable to 'Day' and 'Night' respectively.</p> <p>Include text in the table or accompanying text specifying the 'Day' and 'Night' periods as 7:00am to 10:00pm and 10:00pm to 7:00am respectively (see Section 3.2.1, Road traffic noise guidelines (DPTI 2007).</p>	<p>In line with DPTI's RTNG, the time periods applicable to the project for the operational noise assessment are:</p> <p>Day: 7:00am to 10:00pm</p> <p>Night: 10:00pm to 7:00am</p>
SGS002.9	<p>The 'upgraded existing rail line' criteria from Table 9.2 is applicable to the proposed project.</p> <p><i>Recommendation: include text clarifying this.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p>
SGS002.10	<p>The listed policy and legislative requirements for operational noise do not mention the Environment Protection (Noise) Policy 2007. Where stormwater pumps or other infrastructure are proposed, these elements of the project would be required to meet the appropriate</p>	<p>Noted. Where stormwater pumps or other infrastructure are to be installed, the provisions of the Environment Protection (Noise) Policy 2007 would apply.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>provisions of the Environment Protection (Noise) Policy 2007.</p> <p>If such infrastructure is to be constructed, include text outlining the legislative requirements for these components of the project.</p>	
SGS002.11	<p>Australian Standard AS2670.2-1990: Evaluation of human exposure to whole body vibration – continuous and shock-induced vibration in buildings (1 to 80 Hz) is an appropriate standard to be used for assessment of the operational vibration impacts of the project.</p>	Noted.
SGS002.12	<p>Tables 9.4 and 9.5 list vibration criteria in terms of velocity (peak particle velocity, or PPV). It is preferable to use acceleration criteria/measurements where possible. AS2670.2-1990 provides both acceleration and velocity criteria.</p> <p>Amend the tables and any measurement methodologies to use acceleration measurements/criteria (unless the specified standard provides only velocity criteria).</p>	<p>Peak particle velocity (PPV) is the preferred assessment unit given that it is the common unit across both the standards adopted for this project (i.e. AS2670.2 and DIN 4150-3). Furthermore, commonly available measurement equipment specifically used for the measurement of ground vibration uses geophones (velocity transducers) rather than accelerometers. This allows a direct comparison of the measurement results with the vibration criteria.</p>
SGS002.13	<p>The listed standard (DIN 4150-3 Effects of vibration on structures) is a commonly used standard in the absence of an equivalent Australian Standard and is appropriate for structural damage considerations.</p>	Noted.
SGS002.14	<p>Noise emission from the road may be influenced by many factors, some of which may not be adequately accounted for by a single 24-hour period of noise monitoring. As existing noise levels are used to calibrate the model (which in turn estimates the existing noise level at sensitive receivers which would likely be used to determine the appropriate noise criteria under the RTNG's), it is possible that the model may over- or under-estimate existing noise levels, leading to incorrect criteria.</p> <p>Provide additional detail regarding development of the noise model.</p>	<p>The calibration of the noise model will rely not only on the measured logger data. All noise logger data will be analysed in a statistical manner to form an indicative understanding of pre-project noise conditions. This information will be used to compare with measurement/modelling expectations developed from experiences across a range of projects to note any 'out of order' anomalies. The final calibration factors adopted for the noise model will generally take a conservative approach.</p>
SGS002.15	<p>The stated existing rail vibration levels in Table 9.9 exceed the perception criteria. Furthermore, it is unclear from Figure 9.1 where the measurements were taken, or whether the location is representative of the existing vibration levels at the project site.</p>	<p>The rail vibration monitoring location was adjacent the rail bridge on Euston Terrace/ Rosetta Street, West Croydon where Rosetta Street travels under the rail corridor. This location is incorrectly shown on Figure 9.1 in the PAR. This location was chosen to provide an insight to the future potential vibration associated with a rail bridge (structure).</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
SGS002.16	<p>Why were AADT flows for the year 2021 selected for modelling? The Rail Noise Guidelines consider an 'indicative future scenario' as being 10 years after the opening of a new project. As the project is predicted to open in 2018, the predicted noise levels may be exceeded within less than three years after project opening.</p> <p>Consider using more conservative traffic flows for designing noise barriers and other mitigation measures to 'future proof' the project.</p>	<p>The annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes are associated with road traffic. The 2021 volumes have been used as the 'on opening scenario' with the 'future scenario' being the 2031 traffic volumes. The 2021 and 2031 volumes have been selected for noise modelling as these are consistent with DPTI's traffic model. It is anticipated that the 2021 traffic noise levels will drive the required noise mitigation as there is more traffic on the surface roads than under the 2031 scenario. Noise modelling during detailed design will look at both the 2021 and 2031 scenarios.</p>
SGS002.17	<p>Noise modelling undertaken to date considers only the noise impact from the road without mitigation (such as noise barriers). It would be preferable if the modelling considered the noise impact including the effect of noise barriers and the like indicative of those likely to be installed at the construction phase, in addition to the report providing details of the heights, method of construction etc. likely to be necessary to achieve the required noise reductions.</p> <p>It is assumed that such analysis will be undertaken at a later date.</p>	<p>Further noise modelling and any necessary mitigation will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>
SGS002.18	<p>The contours show significant numbers of dwellings within the 55 dB(A) contour, as well as significant dwellings within the 65 dB(A) contour. As the noise criteria in accordance with the RTNG's is based on the current exposure (resulting in a criteria 'range'), no analysis has been undertaken as to what criteria would apply to dwellings within the relevant contours nor the level of attenuation required or whether the required level of attenuation would be achievable. It is noted, however, that the RTNG's 'package 5' provides the option to purchase the dwelling in circumstances where the predicted noise level is 8 dB(A) above the criteria and 8 dB(A) above the pre-existing noise level.</p> <p>It is assumed that such analysis will be undertaken at a later date.</p>	<p>Further noise modelling and any necessary mitigation will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>
SGS002.19	<p>It is not clear what is meant by the locations quoted in Table 9.10.</p>	<p>The road traffic vibration predictions represent a project layout similar to the conditions found at Gallipoli Underpass, Kurrulita Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on the footpath adjacent to a surface (at-grade) road (without a bordering lowered road)</li> <li>• on the footpath of a surface road on conjunction</li> </ul>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
		<p>with (with a bordering lowered road)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• between a surface road and a lowered road.</li> </ul>
SGS002.20	<p>The statement 'The preliminary noise assessment indicates future rail noise will achieve the 'upgrade existing rail line' criteria at the nearest dwellings subject to implementation of acoustic treatment measures' requires further clarification. It implies compliance with the criteria without implementation of what might potentially be quite significant mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Section 9.4.2 of the PAR identifies that the upgraded existing rail criteria in the EPA's Guidelines for the assessment of noise from rail infrastructure, will be achieved at the nearest dwellings with the installation of acoustic insulation on a rail 'upstand' as part of the rail overpass structure. Further rail noise modelling and any necessary mitigation will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>
SGS002.21	<p>Noise barriers should be constructed as close as practicable to the noise source to maximise their effect for the greatest number of noise sensitive receivers (i.e. including those located further back from the road than the first row of dwellings).</p> <p><i>Recommendation: Seek to locate barriers as close as practicable to the roadway during the detailed design phase.</i></p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers.</p> <p>DPTI acknowledges that it is desirable to construct noise barriers as close as practicable to the noise source. However, the final location of noise barriers will be determined by a number of competing factors including the location of property boundaries, the desire of property owners to have/not have a noise barrier on their boundary, special considerations for heritage properties, CPTED issues and the desire to create areas of safe usable community open space and landscaping within the road reserve.</p>
SGS002.22	<p>Acoustic treatment of buildings is not preferred by EPA, and should be approached as a last resort to noise mitigation.</p> <p>DPTI should seek to minimise the noise impact of the project during the detailed design phase by source and transmission path mitigation options in preference to building treatments, including location of the roadway, selection of low-noise pavements, installation of effective noise barriers etc.</p>	<p>It is DPTI's preference to undertake any necessary noise mitigation through controlling noise along the source and transmission paths. However, these mitigation options may not be reasonable nor practicable to achieve the required levels of mitigation. In a dense urban environment like the project area where the road boundary also forms the property boundary, the extent and effectiveness of noise treatment needs to be balanced with issues such as local access requirements and amenity (i.e. appropriate barrier heights). Where noise targets cannot be achieved using controls along the source and transmission paths, then acoustic treatment of buildings will considered.</p>
SGS002.23	<p>Penetrations and 'gaps' in the proposed noise barriers should be minimised as far as practicable to maximise the effectiveness of the barrier. Ongoing maintenance should ensure that gaps do not form and that the materials used (where applicable) are not allowed to degrade where such degradation would reduce the effectiveness of the barrier.</p>	Noted.
SGS002.24	<p>The measures listed in Section 9.4.3 of the PAR seem to form the basis of an effective CNVMP.</p>	Noted.
SGS002.25	<p>'The ASC NEPM has been adopted by the SA EPA as an EPP under section 28A of</p>	Noted.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>the EP Act'</p> <p>Please note that from 16 May 2014 the EPA expects that all new assessment work will be carried out in accordance with the amended NEPM (see: <a href="http://www.epa.sa.gov.au/xstd_files/Site%20contamination/Information%20sheet/info_asc_nepm.pdf">www.epa.sa.gov.au/xstd_files/Site%20contamination/Information%20sheet/info_asc_nepm.pdf</a>)</p> <p>The NEPM is not yet an EPP under the Environment Protection Act 1993.</p>	
SGS002.26	<p>No specific mention of requirement pursuant to S83A of the <i>Environment Protection Act 1993</i></p> <p>Amend section to include Section 83A: requires an owner or occupier of a site and a site contamination auditor or a site contamination consultant who is engaged for the purpose of making determinations or assessments in relation to contamination is required to notify the EPA as soon as reasonably practicable after becoming aware of the existence of site contamination at the site or in the vicinity of the site that affects or threatens water occurring underground water.</p>	Noted. This is a requirement of the <i>Environment Protection Act 1993</i> .
SGS002.27	The EPA notes that on-site investigations will be undertaken during detailed design.	Noted.
SGS002.28	<p>The EPA notes that a contamination management plan will be prepared to supplement the CEMP.</p> <p>The CEMP has not been reviewed by the EPA.</p>	The Construction Environmental Management Plan will be developed by the T2T Alliance. It is DPTI's understanding that unless specified as a condition in a Development Approval Notification or EPA licence, it is not a requirement that the EPA reviews the CEMP.
SGS002.29	There is no discussion presented in the document concerning the River Torrens, the potential for a new bridge or any works occurring across the river or on either bank of the river. If construction is to occur near the Torrens River, measures to be used to protect the river during the construction phase should be included in the sediment erosion and drainage management plan and construction environment management plan.	Management and mitigation measures for working in or over waters (such as the River Torrens) will be included in a soil erosion and drainage management plan.
SGS002.30	<p>Stormwater in the lowered road is proposed to be collected in storage chambers (sumps) and pumped into the existing stormwater network.</p> <p>Should a spill or car crash occur in the lowered section of the road, what means will be included to prevent these</p>	<p>The storage chambers have hydro carbon detectors which will shut off.</p> <p>Storage chambers will pump stormwater to detention basins before entering the stormwater system. Detention basin outlets will be able to be sandbagged if required.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	contaminants (mainly hydrocarbons) from entering the sumps and the stormwater system?	
SGS002.31	<p>Opportunities for providing detention basins within the corridor are also being explored.</p> <p>The figure on p 25 of the Executive Summary suggests ample space in the median strip for the incorporation of WSUD elements to help treat the stormwater before it is discharged to the existing stormwater network. These could possibly include rain gardens or bio-retention swales. The EPA supports the inclusion of WSUD elements in this project.</p>	<p>Water sensitive urban design elements will be incorporated into the project wherever possible, particularly through creation of a number of detention basins on surplus land within and adjacent to the road corridor.</p> <p>In future, the non-stop road could likely be extended further north (see response to PS049.2) and will be located in the wide median area shown on p 25 of the PAR Executive Summary. Any WSUD measures included in this area would therefore be temporary. DPTI believes it would be more beneficial to focus on permanent WSUD elements than on temporary ones.</p>
SGS002.32	<p>Preliminary investigations to determine the depth of groundwaters show conditions along the alignment are variable, with the shallowest groundwater levels (less than 10 metres deep) expected north of Torrens Road.</p> <p>Is groundwater less than 8–12 m below the surface throughout the year or do levels fluctuate with groundwater being closer to the surface during winter? If the levels may be closer to the surface then dewatering may need to occur. Means of dealing with this water and during and/or post construction will then need to be considered.</p>	See response to SGS001.4.
<b>Zero Waste SA</b>		
SGS003.1	From a waste management and materials consumption perspective, the key points of concern to Zero Waste SA (waste minimisation and maximising recycling/reuse), along with relevant DPTI and EPA policies and guidelines, have been identified in the PAR. It is also pleasing to see that salvage opportunities will be provided to the public.	Noted.
<b>Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation</b>		
SGS004.1	Please be aware in this area there are various Aboriginal groups, organisations, traditional owners that may have an interest in the project.	Noted.



**Table A.3. Representative body submissions**

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
<b>Business SA</b>		
RBS001.1	<p>Business SA has already provided in principle support for continued redevelopment of the North–South Corridor in its 2014 Charter for a More Prosperous South Australia. In the Charter we recommended that the State Government prioritise the remaining infrastructure to achieve a seamless North–South Corridor through Adelaide which will not only benefit city commuters, but will be critical to improving export freight corridors.</p> <p>The Torrens Road to River Torrens upgrade is forecast to cost taxpayers \$896 million. Given this substantial investment at a time of limited fiscal capacity, it is essential that the project be designed to deliver maximum economic benefit to South Australia. Business SA accepts that there are many homes and businesses impacted by the redevelopment of South Road but the means by which to accommodate those parties must be relative to the broader economic benefits of the project for South Australia.</p>	Noted.
RBS001.2	<p>Business SA accepts that many residents and businesses throughout the entire North–South Corridor will be inconvenienced by not being able to turn right onto South Road as each stage is redeveloped but no one is suggesting that right hand turns should be made available except where there needs to be overpasses for key arterial roads.</p> <p>If the State Government is of the view that the Hurtle–Hawker Street intersection needs to flow both ways onto South Road, then provisions need to be made for an overpass. It is not acceptable to introduce a stop onto a new free flowing transport corridor which comes at a significant expense to taxpayers.</p> <p>There will also be an ongoing cost to transport companies from increased wear and tear on vehicles from having to stop at this intersection, not to mention reduced fuel efficiency.</p>	See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.
RBS001.3	Business SA notes that vehicles using the redeveloped South Road will not be able to make a right hand turn onto Port Road. While this is somewhat impractical, we have received assurances from DPTI that traffic lights will be sequenced such that vehicles, including B-Doubles, will be no worse off in turning left onto Port Road, and doing a U-turn, than they would have been turning right onto Port Road in the	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>first place.</p> <p>Business SA accepts DPTI's assurances but stresses that it is still not an ideal situation to be having trucks, particularly B-Doubles, undertaking U-turns on Port Road.</p>	
<b>SA Freight Council</b>		
RBS002.1	SAFC takes this opportunity to congratulate both the State and Commonwealth governments on progressing this project of significance to the South Australian freight and logistics industry as well as the community more generally.	Noted.
RBS002.2	This project promises to alleviate the delays associated with what industry views as some of the worst sections of road along the North–South Corridor of metropolitan Adelaide, and SAFC expects that both industry and the community can expect to accrue economic, social and environmental benefits arising from reduced congestion as a result of construction of a non-stop North–South Corridor.	Noted.
RBS002.3	SAFC also applauds the Prime Minister's commitment to upgrade the whole North–South Corridor over the next decade and the partnership arrangements that the Commonwealth and South Australian governments are entering into to achieve that end. Moreover, SAFC encourages both governments to allocate the necessary funding as soon as practicable so as to achieve this laudable objective.	Noted.
RBS002.4	<p>Nonetheless, SAFC takes this opportunity to highlight that the current Project Plan for the Torrens to Torrens element of the project incorporates 2 intersections within the project boundaries, namely Torrens Road itself, as well as the Hawker Street intersection and expresses its disappointment that these intersections have not been grade separated to facilitate free-flowing movements.</p> <p>The early allocation of funds to address the stop-start nature of these 2 intersections and northwards towards Regency Road would benefit all users to assist the Australian and South Australian governments to achieve their vision for a free flowing North–South Corridor.</p>	<p>See Supplement section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>The upgrade of the Torrens Road/South Road intersection has been included as part of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project. The ultimate grade separation of this intersection will be carried out as part of future North-South Corridor projects, subject to funding.</p>
RBS002.5	Similarly, the Ashwin Avenue intersection at the southern end of the project would also benefit from grade separation and SAFC again urges the early allocation of funds to allow this element of the project to proceed southwards.	The Ashwin Parade intersection upgrade was included in the project scope to ensure efficient access to and from the project area. The intersection design will be reviewed as part of a future stage of the North–South Corridor south of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
RBS002.6	While the inability to turn right from South Road onto Port Road will cause some inconvenience it is not considered to be a major inefficiency at this time. Nonetheless, this solution is less than optimal and should be avoided whenever possible for future projects along the corridor.	See Supplement section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
RBS002.7	SAFC applauds the safe facilities for cyclists and pedestrians along the upgraded element of the project, as well as the project components that accommodate the future need to expand the North–South corridor beyond the current works area.	Noted.
RBS002.8	SAFC encourages the incorporation of indented bus bays and the banning of on-street parking along the upgraded corridor, including on the surface roads.	Noted.
RBS002.9	SAFC notes that a ‘minor’ upgrade of James Congdon drive is incorporated into the Torrens to Torrens project and highlights that we understand that there is some demand for high productivity vehicle access (26 metre B-Doubles at higher mass limits) on this corridor through to the Thebarton area which should be accommodated through the planned program of works. Indeed, so as to plan for the potential future heavy vehicle access, accommodation of PBS3 level vehicles would be appropriate.	The design will ensure safe use by restricted access vehicles if used for this purpose in the future.
RBS002.10	SAFC reiterates that the overall efficiency and efficacy of the freight transport and logistics industry has broad implications for the well-being of all South Australians. SAFC believes that an efficient, effective, internationally competitive, multi-modal, state-wide freight system is essential to enabling the state to achieve the social and economic future it demands. A fundamental objective is provision of relevant, timely and accessible transport infrastructure and this project will make a positive contribution towards the achievement of that objective.	Noted.
<b>RAA</b>		
RBS003.1	RAA has long advocated for a free flowing North–South Corridor, and the proposed works from Torrens Road to the River Torrens (T2T) is another step towards achieving this. RAA appreciates and acknowledges the briefing provided by departmental staff on the complexities of this design.	Noted.
RBS003.2	The T2T section of South Road is one of the most congested sections of road in South Australia, with RAA’s 2013 travel time survey speeds along South Road during the morning	Noted.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>peak, between Torrens Road and Port Road averaging just 9 km/h. This makes it the fourth slowest section of road on the metropolitan arterial network. It took 11 minutes to traverse this 1.6 km section of road which, in part, was due to being held up at the level crossing before Port Road. The vehicle was stationary for 64% of this time. Movement of heavy vehicles across lanes also causes congestion. The proximity of stobie poles to the road in combination with the camber of the surface means that larger vehicles cannot use the nearside lane along this stretch of South Road.</p> <p>RAA is supportive of the T2T upgrade – by eliminating the need for a level crossing and providing adequate space for heavy vehicles, travel times and efficiency should dramatically improve.</p> <p>RAA monitors average speeds in relation to a minimum acceptable level of service which, in this case, would be an average speed of 30 km/h: the Torrens to Port Road section should take just over 3 minutes to traverse, as opposed to the 11 minutes it currently takes.</p>	
RBS003.3	<p>The current design is considerably different from the original concept designs released in 2013; RAA considers the revised design as appearing intuitive for road users with less design complexity, incorporating the existing Croydon substation site has provided the additional benefit of reduced costs.</p> <p>Development of a free flowing North–South Corridor in sections is a long and complex task, T2T demonstrates elements of future proofing the design by allowing space for the on and off ramp of the next stage of the South Road corridor development.</p> <p>While the removal of right turns may seem counter intuitive to many, if traffic modelling has indicated there to be minimal demand, the probability of lower crash rates along this corridor as the turn right conflicts are removed and fewer intersections have to be negotiated will be a positive safety benefit.</p> <p>RAA supports the separation of through traffic to create a non-stop free flowing road system. We welcome the gains from the lowering of the continuous road allowing for higher permitted speed limits on that road ideally to 80–90 km/h.</p> <p>Revised concept designs have removed the ability to turn right from South Road onto Port Road with what appears to be the removal of</p>	Noted.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>road lanes at grade level from the 2013 concept design. DPTI have indicated traffic volumes turning right were low and the proposed alternatives are therefore considered to be sufficient. Notwithstanding, RAA seeks assurance that the traffic volumes calculated will not add any additional or undue pressure on Port Road as a result.</p> <p>It appears an extra left turning lane has been added providing two lanes at each left turn. RAA supports the proposed U-turn for north- and southbound traffic to turn onto Port Road as it reduces delays at the intersection of South Road and Port Road for both motorists and pedestrians.</p>	
RBS003.4	The number of smaller roads connecting with South Road via left-in and left-out turns may at times cause distraction.	There is no direct access between the lowered road and local roads. The South Road surface road performs the same function as other metropolitan arterial roads, in that it provides the necessary access between properties within suburbs and the rest of Adelaide via these local road connections. The detailed design process will ensure that these local road connections are designed appropriately.
RBS003.5	RAA has concerns over the possible congestion point at the northbound at-grade section of South Rd between Port Road and Cedar Street where a single lane caters for merging vehicles intending to turn right into Hawker Street; under current design there is only the equivalent road length of two blocks to transition across the two other lanes to the east.	<p>Detailed design will ensure the road layout caters for traffic merging and weaving appropriately.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p>
RBS003.6	RAA acknowledges that changes to the original 2013 concept design have saved the government and ultimately the taxpayer through a work around to moving the Croydon substation. What is not clear is the capacity of the substation into the future, and if there will be any impact on future growth and the location of the new T2T road corridor.	DPTI is not aware of any future plans from SAPN to increase the size of the substation.
RBS003.7	It is positive to note that this major infrastructure project offers some green space given back to the community on the western side of South Road between Port Road and Torrens Road.	Noted.
RBS003.8	<p>Separating rail from road provides improved continuous travel for road users; the proposed overpass is a positive element of T2T. Reducing the length of the overpass from the original design concepts will also reduce the visual impact of the structure, improving overall aesthetics.</p> <p>RAA acknowledges that not all rail intersections</p>	The grade separation of Queen and Coglin Streets is not within the Torrens Road to River Torrens project scope. DPTI has been investigating changed traffic conditions on the local road network resulting from the project and liaising with local council on potential mitigation measures. DPTI intends to release an LATM study in early 2015 which will address the traffic calming measures to be implemented on the

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	can be removed from grade; the concept design though identifies both Queen Street and Coglein Street will remain at-grade. What modelling has occurred to anticipate changing traffic patterns and the immediate impact on surrounding streets?	local road network.
RBS003.9	<p>Adequate infrastructure provisions for vulnerable road users continue to be a key concern for RAA. The proposed pedestrian and cyclist overpass is a key element in protecting this segment of road users.</p> <p>The biggest barrier for people who do not currently cycle is safety, RAA advocates for all major infrastructure projects to include facilities for safe cycling participation. The proposed T2T provides opportunity for cyclists to connect with the Torrens Valley Bike Way, providing improved connective infrastructure. Continuous bike tracks across metropolitan Adelaide are required; it is positive to see the T2T design provides this at grade level. The inclusion of pedestrian and cycle access in the rail overpass is welcomed and it is expected this will be well utilised.</p>	Noted.
	RAA is unable to ascertain from the T2T PAR and flyover, if all properties with bike lanes in front will continue to have off-street parking. Parking alternatives are not always available and this level of detail is important for any holistic assessment of the project.	There will be no on-street parking on the South Road surface road.
RBS003.10	There appear to be limited opportunities for pedestrians to cross South Road, north of the rail line. Consideration by DPTI of additional safe crossing options in this vicinity is encouraged to ensure residents are not inadvertently isolated or placed in danger when navigating a road crossing.	See Supplement Section 2.1.1 Pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street.
RBS003.11	<p>Parking is essential for existing businesses. Integration of kerbside bicycle lanes and the removal of some median strip parking from Port Road at the Rose Street overlap is of concern. In reviewing the area at this section of Port Road there are limited alternative parking options, with no on-street Port Road parking (city bound) available in an area that appears to be industrial in nature and the westbound (shop front businesses) on-street parking conflicting with bike lane infrastructure.</p> <p>Any loss of kerb side parking will require alternative parking provisions to ensure existing businesses are not disadvantaged into the future.</p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.4 Port Road median car parking.
RBS003.12	When designing any major infrastructure project	Noted.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>it is important to engage the community, our members contact us regularly to determine what is happening on the roads to assess any potential personal impacts on their daily commute. RAA appreciates the time taken by you to brief us on the project and we look forward to this continuing throughout the project to ensure we have up to date information.</p> <p>Both State and Commonwealth governments have committed to the North–South Corridor; RAA encourages ongoing dialogue on how the remaining sections of South Road will be upgraded to meet the 10 year promise.</p>	
<b>Port Adelaide Bicycle User Group (BUG)</b>		
RBS004.1	<p>Outer Harbor Greenway:</p> <p>Provisions for carrying the Outer Harbor Greenway across South Road appear reasonable, with a proposed shared-use pathway (SUP) over the proposed rail overpass.</p> <p>However, the BUG notes that a ‘dog-leg’ access ramp is proposed for the eastern end of this bikeway overpass down to Mclnnes Street, adjacent to its exit to South Road. We consider this design inadequate for the access functions required on this eastern side of South Road.</p> <p>We understand that room is also available adjacent to the east-side rail reserve for an additional, longer, straight and probably lower-angle entry and exit ramp extending towards Coglin Street. We would strongly advise this additional ramp be included in the final plan.</p> <p>While we understand the local access function of the dog-leg Mclnnes Street ramp, particularly to the extent that it provides for bicycle access to and from the area adjacent to South Road, the ramp extending towards Coglin Street will be far more convenient and accessible for less familiar, less experienced and perhaps less able bicycle users approaching along the greenway from the Park Lands and the Bowden-Brompton precinct.</p> <p>This more direct form of access will be an important consideration for commuters – likely to be the greenway’s main day-to-day users – as well enhancing potential for tourism and bicycle visitation along the route. A straight and continuous access ramp to the east and parallel with the rail reserve is also far more in keeping with the notion of an accessible, continuous and unimpeded ‘bikeway’.</p> <p>At the western side of the SUP overpass ramp, we understand that the point where the</p>	<p>DPTI intends to continue the greenway path within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road through to Coglin Street.</p> <p>This will require construction of an overpass access ramp within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road and another ramp down to South Road at Mclnnes Street to cater for users wanting to access the local area.</p> <p>As the rail overpass will be a shared use pedestrian/cyclist facility, the design of all ramps will be dependent on achieving the necessary gradients to meet Disability Discrimination Act requirements within the space available. CPTED principles will also be considered in the design of the overpass and ramps.</p> <p>The overpass pedestrian bridge and ramp design will be refined further during the detailed design phase and will reflect the urban design theme developed for all infrastructure elements within the corridor.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>descending path reaches road level is yet to be determined. We are told that the ramp could finish between a point close to South Rd (at about where #7–8 Day Tce currently are) or closer to the Elizabeth St level crossing. We would encourage use of as long a ramp design as possible to reduce the angle of ascent (and descent).</p> <p>We are also aware of several different design options for the SUP's exit to the roadway on Days Tce. We note the rather abrupt 'right-angle' ramp used at the greenway access pathway immediately to the west of Cheltenham Parade provides a somewhat unsatisfactory exit on to Buller Tce, particularly with the greatly increased bicycle traffic likely to be seen when the greenway is finally open. This exit appears to be unnecessarily abrupt with little to signal the presence of bicycle users to motorists and little opportunity for bicycle riders to gather in any sort of 'refuge' on either side of the roadway. We would strongly encourage that such issues be carefully considered in the terminating of both the eastern and western overpass SUP ramps.</p> <p><i>The BUG would strongly advise the provision of an additional straight and continuous access ramp on the eastern side of the South Road SUP overpass. On the western side we would recommend the use of as long a ramp design as possible to reduce the angle of ascent (and descent).</i></p> <p><i>We would strongly encourage careful consideration of safety issues (particularly with regards to safe access, refuge and sightline provisions) in the terminating of both the eastern and western overpass SUP ramps.</i></p>	
RBS004.2	<p>Bicycle access along South Road:</p> <p>While we are assured that the project will provide continuous on-road bike lanes along South Road, the BUG is concerned that off-road provision for both walking and bicycle access along South Road has not been included in the Concept Plan. This appears to be a significant omission given the relatively minor investments involved, the high degree of 'community severance' entailed, and the ongoing health and social benefits that such walking and bicycle access would provide.</p> <p>Continuous off-road pathways on both sides of South Road – at least through the Torrens-to-Torrens Project area - would reduce the degree of 'community severance' inevitably experienced by local communities, particularly for children,</p>	<p>Improved cycling and pedestrian facilities will be provided through a combination of upgraded footpaths and on-road or off-road bike paths. It is unlikely that off-road shared use paths will be able to be provided for the full extent of the project area. Additional land will not be acquired for these purposes.</p>



Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>families, the elderly and the less able. Given the expense and scale of the project and its clear impact on the local communities, we have been surprised that consideration of off-road provision has not been seen as an essential element of the Concept Plan rather than something to be considered at the level of subsequent 'detailed design' planning. The BUG considers that active mobility ought to be a fundamental aspect of the Concept Plan with its own chapter-heading and priority, and not an 'extra' that may or may not be dealt with at a later phase.</p> <p>We understand that the acquisition of properties to widen the current South Rd route will inevitably provide sections of unused area alongside the roadway. Unfortunately, on the current plan these areas are not continuous. Where they do exist, they offer possibilities for off-road SUPs linking at least adjacent streets and suburbs fronting on to South Road.</p> <p><i>We recommend that ensuring SUP linkages wherever possible be considered an 'essential priority'! Such off-road pathways will redress community isolation and severance to some degree, facilitating linkages between adjacent streets and communities.</i></p> <p><i>We would also recommend that further consideration should be given to opportunities to remedy the lack of continuity between off-road reserve space along the length of South Road unless there is good reason to do otherwise. This may of course require further land acquisition or some redesign of the roadway but we consider the accruing benefits to active mobility to be well worth the extra cost and effort involved.</i></p> <p><i>The BUG recommends that effective use of active mobility be cited as a fundamental consideration within the Concept Design of the Torrens-to-Torrens Project. It should not an 'extra' to be dealt with at a later phase of planning.</i></p> <p><i>We recommend that further consideration should be given to opportunities to remedy the lack of continuity between off-road reserve space along the length of South Road unless there is good reason to do otherwise. Those opportunities for of-road SUP access that do exist should be utilised wherever possible.</i></p>	
RBS004.3	<p>Active rail crossings:</p> <p>The advent of a continuous Outer Harbor Greenway seems likely to open up major access</p>	<p>The Queen Street–Elizabeth Street level crossing and the Coglin Street level crossing are within the immediate vicinity of the rail overpass of South Road; however, grade separation of</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>opportunities for less able riders and for people with disabilities. Because access to the greenway from the southern aspect involves crossing the Outer Harbor rail line, there is a strong rationale for ensuring that all current at-grade pedestrian (and bike/wheel chair/‘gopher’) rail crossings along its length be converted to ‘active’ crossings with servo-controlled gateways linked to the rail system’s signalling system. These are designed to increased safety for ‘wheeled’ access to and from station precincts and are of proven benefit in particular for PT users in wheelchairs and those using mobility devices. We also note the increasing use of larger ‘transport’ bicycles which find regular mazes difficult to negotiate.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends that – for the sections of greenway adjacent to the Torrens-to-Torrens Project – provision of such active crossings be considered in the final design stage of planning.</i></p>	<p>these crossings is excluded from the project scope.</p> <p>Should these level crossings be altered, modifications to the pedestrian mazes will need to be considered.</p>
RBS004.4	<p><b>Bike lane design – Continuity:</b></p> <p>Given their proximity to ‘continuous’, heavy and high-speed traffic we would strongly suggest that the South Road bike lanes be both continuous (including through intersections) and as wide as possible.</p> <p>Unfortunately, we note that on both the project’s website animation and on the map of the concept plan design there appear to be no on-road bike lanes on the section of South Road to the north of points roughly coincident with the descent of the central lanes below grade. The bike lanes seem to disappear at points between Paget and Hythe streets on the eastern side and (on the map) between William and Henry streets to the west. This seems to contradict the information given to BUG representatives indicating that the bike lanes would run continuously through the project area.</p> <p>In fact we note that on the map provided to the BUG there are no bike lanes shown beyond this point until the junction with Torrens Road is reached approximately 300 metres to the north! At one point in the animation a bicycle user is shown riding south adjacent to the Hawker Street junction with no bike lanes in sight!</p> <p>Perhaps the most alarming aspect of this apparent anomaly is the disappearance of the west-side bike lane at what appears to be a merging slip lane, where two north-heading at-grade lanes merge into one and then join two that ascend from below grade. Given the multiple vehicle manoeuvres likely to be</p>	<p>Continuous on-road cycle lanes will be provided for the full extent of the project area.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>occurring at this point, the absence of the bike lane creates a very hazardous situation for the bicycle user also forced to share this single lane.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends that the South Road bike lanes be both continuous (including through intersections) and as wide as possible. It is not acceptable in 2014 to have 'disappearing' bike lanes for hundreds of metres along a heavily used and high-speed 'continuous' arterial route such as South Road.</i></p>	
RBS004.5	<p>Bike lane design – Bike lane separation:</p> <p>It is highly desirable that bike lanes on South Road be 'separated' in some physical manner from road lanes. As a minimum provision we suggest use of a marked 'buffer' strip of some sort such as the painted diagonal strip installed between bike and car lane on the southern side of the Jervois Bridge at Port Adelaide.</p> <p>Where the roadway or traffic speeds will present particular hazards for bicycle users (e.g. higher-volumes and speeds, heavy vehicle presence, merging vehicle lanes) this separation needs to be physically more significant.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends opportunities for 'enhanced bike-lane separation' of bicycle and vehicle traffic be carefully considered.</i></p>	<p>Separation of on-road cycle lanes and traffic lanes will be considered during the detailed design phase of the project.</p>
RBS004.6	<p>Bicycle access during construction:</p> <p>Because bicycle access to Day Terrace at the junction adjacent to South Road will be compromised during construction of the SUP Overpass, we suggest that measures be taken to improve temporary bicycle provisions on Port Road from a point West of Elizabeth St to the Parkland's bike routes during the Project.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends careful consideration of opportunities for alternative greenway provisions via Port Road during construction of the South Road SUP overpass.</i></p>	<p>DPTI proposes to install a temporary Outer Harbor Greenway detour during construction which will introduce a separated bike lane outbound on Port Road and temporary shared use path along the western verge/footpath of South Road.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway.</p>
RBS004.7	<p>Temporary South Road BPA crossing:</p> <p>In late 2013 Transport Minister Koutsantonis undertook to provide a temporary bicycle and pedestrian actuated crossing (BPAC) of South Road during construction of the overpass SUP. We note that this undertaking is not acknowledged in the Concept Plan. While we understand that there may be significant difficulties in meeting this undertaking, we believe that it remains an important strategy for fostering access to and ongoing use of the greenway such as it currently exists over the</p>	<p>As part of the project, the Outer Harbor Greenway will be carried across South Road via a new overpass.</p> <p>The Torrens Road to River Torrens Project is on schedule with the major works contract awarded in the second quarter of 2015 and the project due for completion by the end of 2018. It is therefore not proposed to construct an interim bicycle/pedestrian actuated crossing (BPAC). Potential detour routes for the greenway around South Road construction site are being investigated.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>course of the project.</p> <p>Given Minister Koutsantonis' undertaking on this matter, we would like to see the possibility of a temporary BAPC acknowledged and considered. We can provide correspondence from the Minister's office if required.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway.</p>
RBS004.8	<p>Right turns for bicycle users:</p> <p>Right turns off South Road onto Torrens, Port and Grange roads (and vice versa) appear to present significant hazards to bicycle users as currently drawn in the Concept Plan. We recommend that specific consideration be given to bicycle users on or approaching Torrens, Port and Grange roads and wishing to turn right at the major intersections shown on the plan.</p> <p>At these major crossroads there appear to be no specific provisions for bicycle users wanting to make such turns leaving them to either turn from the left-hand bike lane across traffic or position themselves in a right turning lane and then ride back across following traffic after their turn. Given the multiple turning and traffic lanes involved and likelihood of heavy traffic, commonly used provisions such as 'forward located bike boxes' and coloured bike-turn lanes may well be inappropriate, particularly where right-lane bicycle turns onto South Road are concerned.</p> <p>We note the UK's recommendations regarding such right-hand turns on multi-lane roads (see extract and figure below).</p> <p><i>'Box turns' or 'Stay left-to-go-right'</i></p> <p><i>Box turns should be used on larger signalised junction to facilitate right turning cyclists.</i></p> <p><i>Cyclists stay to the left of the approach, move into a stacking area at the mouth of the side or cross road, and wait for the green phase. This arrangement avoids right turning cyclists having to weave across busy traffic lanes, or getting stuck between opposing streams of traffic in a junction. It also permits straight ahead cyclists to continue along the main road unobstructed.</i></p> <p><i>Box turns are recommended in any or all of the following circumstances:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Where the speed and volume of traffic requires segregated cycle facilities</i></li> <li>• <i>Where there are more than one traffic lane in the same direction</i></li> <li>• <i>Where weaving or uncontrolled crossings are</i></li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This proposal has been provided to the T2T Alliance for consideration and possible inclusion in the design.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p><i>unsuitable</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To provide a right hand turn for cyclists at junctions where vehicular traffic is not permitted to turn right. etc etc'</i></li> </ul> <p>These box-turns appear similar to the 'hook turns' already used by some experienced Adelaide bicycle users.</p> <p>Alternatively, the simple addition of large green 'sensored' bike-boxes to the front of the waiting cars at these intersections (see below) may well be sufficient to enable the hook-turning bicycle user plenty of room to position themselves safely for the manoeuvre.</p> <p>We would like to see consideration of an arrangement such as used by the UK or its Austroads-recommended equivalent, or one involving large and prominent on-road bike refuges or 'staging' areas in addressing security for right-turning bicycle users at these intersections. The multiple turning lanes involved (and subsequent need to cross multiple traffic lanes) clearly present specific safety challenges. We note that it may well be most useful to provide bicycle-actuated button arrangements with the bicycle refuges suggested.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends that a high priority be given to specific provision for safe right-hand bicycle turns at all intersections along the Torrens-to-Torrens Project, especially for bicycle users turning right off South Road (and crossing multiple traffic lanes).</i></p> <p><i>We recommend that there be careful consideration and implementation of a best-practice approach from Australia and elsewhere.</i></p>	
RBS004.9	<p>Proposed southern link – Hindmarsh to Croydon:</p> <p>The BUG would strongly support the Concept Plan's proposed alternative on and off-road route across the Torrens River and through West Hindmarsh to a point adjacent to Elizabeth St in Croydon. We would strongly encourage a high level of design and development for this route similar to or greater than that which has been applied to the greenway route.</p> <p>This additional north–south route will give the residents of Torrensville and Hindmarsh secure access to the greenway. This bicycle route will also – to some degree – reduce the isolation imposed on local communities by the redeveloped South Road. Torrens-to-Torrens will be a major project which will be with us for the next century, and will set a standard for the</p>	Noted.

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>remainder of South Road's redevelopment. We believe related bicycle infrastructure should be designed and developed to the highest possible level and consistent with the standards applied to the overall project.</p> <p><i>The BUG recommends that this proposed north-south access bikeway as well as cycling infrastructure throughout the project generally be designed and developed to the highest possible level, consistent with the standards applied to the overall project.</i></p>	
<b>City of Charles Sturt Bicycle User Group (BUG)</b>		
RBS005.1	<p>In composing this submission I have found it rather difficult to extract the necessary information from the published materials. Trying to examine the proposal from a cyclist's point of view has been frustrating, with much of the material claiming 'better cycling facilities' but not a lot of concrete evidence for such. Rather, looking at the documents and animation, it appears to me that cyclists are not being given the consideration they are due.</p>	<p>Noted. For additional information, See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access, Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway, and responses to RBS004.</p>
RBS005.2	<p>South Road currently presents a very unpleasant cycling environment, so much so that it is evidentially infrequently used. Its significance for cyclists is more as a barrier than a route, though if you pick your time and place it can be quite successfully negotiated in both iterations.</p> <p>For many of the 24 hours of every day this most arterial of Adelaide's roads is easily crossed, formally or not. There are so many interruptions to the flow of traffic – the very generation of this project – that the current 'barrier' that South Road represents is only a fraction of what is proposed to replace it.</p> <p>The proposal under consideration will deliver both a more cyclable route and a more formidable barrier to cross; giving with one hand and taking away with the other, but in such a way that from a bicycle user's standpoint the less desirable is delivered and the more desirable withheld.</p>	<p>On-road cycle lanes will be provided for the full extent of the project area. East–west connectivity for cyclists will be provided in a safe manner at defined locations.</p>
RBS005.3	<p>The project will make opportunistic crossings of South Road impossible. Only 5 specified and limited crossing points will be available, which constitutes a severe imposition on the otherwise organic and opportunistic north-west–south-east flow of cyclists.</p> <p>Most particularly, the Hawker Street–Hurtle Street intersection, which is a prominent part of</p>	<p>East–west connectivity for cyclists will be provided in a safe manner at defined locations.</p> <p>Provision for east–west cyclist movements will be incorporated into the design of the Hawker Street–Hurtle Street intersection.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>the 'BikeDirect' network and badly in need of an upgrade, has been re-engineered with total disregard for its importance to cyclists. Rather, given the unavoidable restrictions a lowered road imposes for both motorists and cyclists, the importance of this route is further emphasised and the need for its remediation increased.</p> <p>The new plan dedicates Hurtle St as a right hand turn to exit Croydon, with no apparent exceptions. As it is an important north–south link in the Bikedirect network, I expect cyclists will still wish to use it; however, under this proposal negotiating it in either direction will require some illegal and possibly dangerous behaviour.</p> <p>The existing arrangement is not much better, and certainly no more legal, but design is about finding better ways of doing things and inclusivity is a key to acceptably good design. Similarly, good design processes should analyse what already occurs and build on existing desirable behaviour.</p> <p>Hawker–Hurtle is an important part of the Bikedirect network and should be redesigned from a cyclist's perspective to provide a continuous, safe and convenient – prioritised even – north-west–south-east link. This is important. Not to do so will lead to confusion and illegal behaviour by cyclists, and through no fault of their own I would argue.</p>	
RBS005.4	<p>The elevated rail crossing features a zig-zag ramp on the southern side, which I would suggest is not a cycle friendly bit of infrastructure. Better to end gracefully at Coglin St with a ramp similar to that on the northern side (although you could argue for both). Ending at this point also provides cyclists with an opportunity to cross the rail line at grade, close to the more active part of the Port Rd commercial district.</p>	<p>See response to RBS004.1</p> <p>DPTI intends to continue the greenway path within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road through to Coglin Street.</p> <p>An access ramp will also be provided to South Road to cater for users wanting to access the local area.</p>
RBS005.5	<p>Cutting down on the possibilities of crossing South Rd must be met by increasing the possibilities of parallel travel until the appropriate crossing point becomes available. Some mention is made of this in the text, but not much appears to have been developed beyond idle conjecture. I would like to see more evidence of this being taken seriously.</p>	<p>Further community engagement activities will be undertaken relating to cycle path treatments to link the River Torrens Linear Park to the Outer Harbor Greenway.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p>
RBS005.6	<p>The construction of a bridge at the end of McDonnell Ave is the major gain for cyclists in this development (which will complement the Holland St bridge, currently being renovated) and I would be very disappointed if it were not to go ahead. As evidenced, work would also need</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Submission number	Issue summary	Response
	to be done to realign the Bikedirect route to and from it, as well as better crossings for both Grange and Port roads, but it is this sort of facility that makes sense for cyclists and helps keep them off major roads.	
RBS005.7	I am unsure as to whether or how integration of the Torrens Linear Path is being considered, but I would suggest that, like Hawker–Hurtle, the importance of this crossing point is elevated by the nature of the T2T proposal as well as its proximity to McDonnell Ave and the Brickworks redevelopment. I understand that the existing path under the Taylor Bridge is slated for upgrade and trust the design team will make full advantage of this.	The importance of the underpass for connectivity across the North–South Corridor for the local community and for the wider community as part of the River Torrens Linear Park is recognised.  Only the western side of the underpass is proposed to be altered as part of the scope of the Torrens Road to River Torrens project.  There is potential for a joint project between Council and DPTI to upgrade the River Torrens Linear Park bridge underpass at South Road.
RBS005.8	As the surface road will be the same capacity as the existing road, but carrying much less traffic, it may become more appealing for cyclists and I see that on-road bicycle lanes are proposed in recognition of this. The lanes appear to extend for about the length of the 'undergrounding', but then disappear in the merging traffic, a most unsatisfactory situation.	On-road cycle lanes will be provided for the full extent of the project area.
RBS005.9	With the widening of the Taylor Bridge, a good argument exists to extend the bike lanes to the south over the bridge and then make links to the Brickworks development and the streets on the southern side of the river. Then at least the bike lanes have some degree of connection to the rest of the cycle network.	Noted. On-road cycle lanes will continue through on Taylors Bridge over the River Torrens.
RBS005.10	Similarly, the numerous street closures should be signed and engineered as bicycle friendly – closing a street makes it more attractive for cycling, and there is no good reason to exclude cyclists in most cases. Some of these, for example Elizabeth St/Cedar Ave, could provide a convenient exit from the disappearing bike lane and merging traffic lanes ahead.	Connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists will be considered where local roads no longer connect to South Road for vehicles.
RBS005.11	I am concerned that design for cycling is not sufficiently prioritised in this project. It creates an enormous gash in the inner city landscape and presents unnecessarily difficult barriers to cycling and non-motorised mobility. The project has a lot to offer cyclists by way of parallel routes and better 'feeder' infrastructure, but the needs of bicycle users must be given equal priority and designed in from the beginning.	Noted.



Table A.4. Public submissions

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
<b>PS001</b>		
PS001.1	Concerned that project will disallow drivers from turning right onto Port Road from South Road. Believe time will be wasted and that congestion will occur with drivers lining up to perform a U-turn to head in the direction they wish to travel.	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
<b>PS002</b>		
PS002.1	Savings from retaining substation in its existing location should be dedicated to bicycle infrastructure. Very little money is dedicated in every budget for cyclists and \$30 million could build great infrastructure for commuters cycling and encourage more to do so. It is unfair and embarrassing when the government is willing to spend \$1.5 billion for roads and yet cyclists don't even get \$10 million.	<p>The State Government supports cycling and aims to double the number of people cycling in South Australia by 2020 and is investing in cycling infrastructure to improve cycling networks in South Australia. This includes arterial road bicycle facilities and funding partnerships with local government to provide cycling improvements on local roads.</p> <p>Highlights for 2013–14 included the completion of Stage 3 of the Amy Gillett Bikeway, the completion of major works for the Marino Rocks Greenway in Black Forest, Goodwood and Wayville, and linking Port Adelaide with the city along the Outer Harbor Greenway route, in conjunction with the Renewal SA Our Port project. Additionally, State Government in partnership with councils will deliver the Braund Road and Beulah Road Bike Boulevards.</p>
<b>PS003</b>		
PS003.1	Concerned that the streets that now connect to South Road will be closed and made into dead end streets, making kerbside rubbish collection from wheelie bins difficult. Hopes that there will be sufficient room at the end of these closed streets to turn heavy vehicles around.	The detailed design process will ensure that adequate access for service vehicles is provided in the local network.
<b>PS004</b>		
PS004.1	Concerned with loss of right turns onto Port Road. If a right turn lane cannot be provided, an exit ramp should be built to allow a right turn. Believes that no right turn will only create more traffic congestion trying to get onto Port Road.  The existing cut through to cross over Port Road fills up with cars in peak hour so that you either hold up the right hand lane on Port Road or you drive further down Port Road to find a cut through that's not already congested with traffic.	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>The proposed design will avoid right turning traffic blocking through movements at the South Road/Port Road intersection and limit the potential for vehicles to cut through the local road network to turn right.</p>
<b>PS005</b>		
PS005.1	Concerned that the project will not be completed to Regency Road. The bottle neck now is Regency Road/South Road.	The Australian and South Australian governments are committed to delivering a dedicated non-stop North–South Corridor.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Query as to why additional properties are not being purchased so that the project can be completed once, not in 5 years once Torrens to Torrens is finished.	Almost 50 km of the North–South Corridor is complete with a program to eliminate the worst bottlenecks already underway. The timing of the delivery and property acquisitions on the final sections is subject to detailed planning and funding allocations.
<b>PS006</b>		
PS006.1	Concerned that banning the right hand turn at Port Road will cause problems.	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
<b>PS007</b>		
PS007.1	<p>Concern regarding noise and vibration.</p> <p>When I purchased my new home more than 20 years ago, it was a dream come true, there was never any sign of what was to come, the only future upgrade to South Rd was between Port and Torrens roads.</p> <p>My once quiet home is now unable to cope with the additional noise from the traffic after the property next door was removed. It was not built to withstand the noise from a main road, it has no insulation in the walls and the bedrooms are all side on to South Road.</p> <p>The roof shakes and the windows rattle and there is now a constant noise which sounds like rain.</p> <p>The nights and early mornings are the worst with a constant flow of heavy trucks to brake up the short quiet periods and then that becoming constant drone of brakes and engine noise around 6am.</p> <p>The department's website has great images of the new road and I'm happy that the road is being upgraded but there is little report about the homes removed, the results of families who had to move away from their friends, the area the loved, the schools and child care.</p> <p>The people who remain now have to live with the fact that their homes are going to be worth far less than they expected and are now not the investment they were hoping for to secure their future and having to cope with the changes to their lives from the added noise.</p> <p>In the new road plan the only side road for my area with access to South Road will be my street so the new sound wall (in the future) will stop at my front yard allowing the traffic noise to affect not only the sides but the front of my home as well.</p> <p>Your department makes the rules about</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.</p> <p>Where noise barriers do not meet the target noise levels, such as in the case of local access openings, architectural house treatments and property fencing will be considered as necessary to mitigate noise.</p> <p>We are concerned about the wellbeing of those affected by the project and are trying to work with the community to minimise impacts wherever possible.</p> <p>Those requiring support to cope with the changes will be offered and provided assistance with counselling. People requiring additional support would be referred to the appropriate agencies and are encouraged to contact the project information line on 1300 794 899.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.5.1 Property values.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>compensation and I'm sure there are regulations and standards regarding noise but I also know that those standards are also a guide to what the minimum requirements are and I'm sure there will be no funding put aside for going above the required limits to help with the homes left behind.</p> <p>There has never been anyone from your department willing to talk about the loss of property value, help with noise barriers in the home such as double glazing, high front fences etc or inspect my property for any pre-damage which may occur from tunnelling.</p> <p>I know your department doesn't compensate for property value loss, not like the UK and many other places around the world, but I would like to have a quiet home to live in when the upgrade is complete if you're able to help that would be terrific.</p>	
<b>PS008</b>		
PS008.1	<p>Query as to why there is a set of traffic lights right at the start of the south-bound underpass? The Hurtle Street–Hawker Street intersection looks messy and was better as per the previous revision where it was combined.</p>	<p>The Hurtle Street–Hawker Street intersection layout was changed as a result of community feedback. See response to PS015 for further detail.</p> <p>Also see Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p>
PS008.2	<p>Why wasn't property acquired from Ashwin Pde to Hindmarsh Ave on the western side as it looks congested there?</p>	<p>This section will be addressed in future stages of the North–South Corridor.</p>
PS008.3	<p>Are there plans to run trams all the way down Port Road in the future? The new Port Road/South Road intersection does nothing to suggest there will be, is that in future planning?</p>	<p>The draft <i>Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i> released in 2013 identified the conversion of the Outer Harbor train line to deliver a new tram service to Outer Harbor and Grange and new tram lines to West Lakes and Semaphore.</p> <p>The bridge deck at the South Road/Port Road intersection will be designed such that it can be widened in the future, should the intersection layout be modified.</p>
<b>PS009</b>		
PS009.1	<p>Concerned that such an expensive upgrade does and not allow right turns at Port Road.</p> <p>General concern about right turns being taken away at traffic lights in the wider Adelaide traffic network.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
<b>PS010</b>		
PS010.1	<p>I would question saving \$30 million to remove the power station, you are talking about putting in a U-turn section on a continuous stretch of</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	road. Would this not contradict the strategy behind what you're actually trying to achieve. Do not make the same mistake as the one way freeway and have to spend millions of dollar moving the power station a few years down the track. Think of the expansion and how many lives are being put at risk for doing a U-turn at a busy intersection. Stick to plan A.	
<b>PS011</b>		
PS011.1	<p>Concerned that the current design documents do not identify the benefits, or design considerations of a long overpass or grade change that would also alleviate the significant delays to S–N traffic on the Park Terrace–Port Road city ring route.</p> <p>Please ensure for public record we are informed as to plans that allow the short overpass to be lengthened later to ensure the ring route also benefits for no crossing and therefore will alleviate delays for Park Tce and Port Road.</p> <p>The Gawler Line is suitably catered for by a road bridge, yet a few hundred metres down the road the same Park Tce road users on an advertised city by-pass ring route must suffer the dual track Outer Harbor rail line crossing.</p> <p>My colleagues and I car pool via Port Road from West Lakes daily and experience regularly cars and heavy vehicles 'stuck' blocking the city bound Port road 'up track' due to the Outer Harbor rail line crossing located on Park Tce, Bowden.</p> <p>Conveniently, this has been excluded from drawings/impressions but should not be excluded from the justifications and later initiatives that are optioned for future projects (e.g. electrification).</p>	Both the short and long overpass options, both begin just west of Coglin Street, are equally compatible with a future grade separation of the Outer Harbor line at Park Terrace.
<b>PS012</b>		
PS012.1	<p>Query as to why has the shared bike path been removed from the design? Why are there parts on the video where the on road bike lane ends or is non-existent? I would also like to know why most cyclists have to stop at each intersection and not have a lane to ride under the streets like how the cars are allowed to in this new design. I don't think this new design is taking people who commute by bicycle seriously. This design doesn't look like it is encouraging anyone to ride a bicycle which would mean less cars on the road, reducing congestion for freight trucks.</p> <p>Please reconsider the design to take cyclists into</p>	<p>A shared use path is proposed within the project area to the north of Port Road. South of Port Road, there is insufficient space within the road corridor to continue the shared use path. A possible on-road cyclist friendly route connecting Outer Harbor Greenway with the River Torrens Linear Park is being investigated with Council as an alternative. See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p> <p>On-road cycle lanes will be provided for the full length of the project area.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	consideration as no one is going to commute by bicycle if good infrastructure is not provided.	
<b>PS013</b>		
PS013.1	You need to rethink this. It can be done a lot cheaper and quicker, and better.	Submission does not include any discussion or consideration of project cost estimates, construction programs, consideration of constructability, impacts for maintaining traffic flows on South Road, or a cost benefit analysis.
	<p>Why are you going to so much trouble over this when all you need is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a rail bridge at Ridleyton to go over South Road</li> <li>2. a bridge for Grange Road to go over South Road and meet up with Port Road in the median strip</li> <li>3. a subway on Port Road for the up and down tracks to go under South Road</li> <li>4. a subway on Torrens Road to go under South Road</li> <li>5. a loop around the substation to feed Port Road from South Road to the city and some other similar feeders</li> </ol> <p>South Road stays at the same level right through as the north–south corridor.</p> <p>Cheap, quick to construct, and you can do it without any traffic lights.</p> <p>You don't need \$1 billion, you can do it for next to nothing, relatively speaking.</p>	See response to PS013.1.
	Concept sketch provided for Port Road subway and Grange Road bridge to Port Road.	See response to PS013.1.
	Concept sketch provided for Hawker Street subway under South Road.	See response to PS013.1.
	Concept sketch provided for Pym Street subway and mini cloverleaf.	See response to PS013.1.
	Concept sketch provided for Torrens Road subway.	See response to PS013.1.
	Concept sketch provided for Regency Road subway.	See response to PS013.1.
	<p>South Road straight through, no traffic lights from Port Wakefield Road to West Thebarton Road.</p> <p>Cloverleaf loops can be small if ramp speed is 40 kmh, and still be big enough for a B-double.</p> <p>Your 12 lanes wide plan will create a bottleneck at each end of it and a traffic jam causing chaos.</p>	See response to PS013.1.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Right turn lanes into side streets still possible, using a median strip in the middle.</p> <p>Two (or three) lanes each direction is all you need, there will be no traffic lights by using a cloverleaf design.</p> <p>The traffic will flow freely from Port Wakefield Road to West Thebarton Road.</p>	
PS014		
PS014.1	<p>I do not believe you can have a major intersection like that without the being able to turn right onto Port Road</p> <p>Could it be widened a bit further? It must be able to be designed in some how.</p> <p>A lot of traffic is going to be travelling along South Road either way and want to turn right at that point/intersection to Port Road. Not having the turning input at the time of initial construction seems to be an easy way out now, but I can see it creating major issues later and costs when it is realised it needed to happen. (it would be like building a 1-way road).</p> <p>Suggest to maybe build over the underpass to create a lane for turning right or make one lane straight ahead, one turning. Better to do it now rather than later.</p> <p>The Anzac Hwy Gallipoli Bridge works fine, set it up the same way with turn right lanes.</p> <p>In general the new design looks good in principal and allowing the left out from either side seems a good option.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
PS014.2	<p>This new design is a lot more boring than the original design, can they look to build more architectural interest into it again as the original design had.</p>	<p>The urban design elements shown in the PAR are initial concept designs.</p> <p>DPTI has recently developed an Urban Design Framework for the whole North–South Corridor. The intention is that the urban design outcome for the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project is consistent with and complementary to other projects that have been or will be constructed along the North–South Corridor.</p> <p>The final urban design outcome for the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project will differ significantly and have more architectural detailing than has been shown in the PAR. It will be developed by the T2T Alliance designers with targeted input from the local community and Council officers where relevant.</p>
PS014.3	<p>With the shortening of the rail overpass, will Croydon Station be upgraded still?</p>	<p>An upgrade of Croydon Station is not currently being considered as part of the Torrens Road to</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>This is in major need of upgrading, should be something like the Oaklands Railway Station and I assume it would have been costed in the original designs.</p> <p>Given this is becoming such a popular destination for the cafes and park for children, I think it should be considered still as a major improvement the area.</p>	<p>River Torrens Project.</p> <p>The draft <i>Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i> proposes a future conversion from diesel heavy rail (passenger trains) to electrified light rail (trams) along the Outer Harbor rail line. Croydon Station would need to be upgraded in future in order to accommodate electrified light rail.</p>
<b>PS015</b>		
	<p>Current modified design is a great improvement on the original and I am very happy with the way it is laid out, I only wish to add some constructive criticism.</p> <p>The section between Torrens Road and Hawker Street should be constructed as a lowered road now, as opposed to later on. This would have the following benefits:</p> <p>a) North–south traffic will not be delayed by the Hawker St intersection/pedestrian crossing, as they can use the lowered road instead. This will improve the efficiency of the Hawker Street intersection for other road users. North–south traffic will also benefit from a full non-stop section of road from Torrens Road to Ashwin Parade, approx 500 m longer than the current design.</p> <p>b) The reduced traffic on the surface South Rd means a full access intersection at Hawker–Hurtle Sts would again be possible if needed.</p> <p>c) The section of South Road from Hawker St to Torrens does not need to be 're-done' when Stage 3 (Torrens Rd–Regency Rd) is constructed. As it stands, this section will need the current entry/exit to the lowered road removed, new on/off ramps constructed, the Hawker St intersection and PedX to be replaced with bridges, the central median to be excavated, and the surface road to be reduced from 3 to 2 lanes in each direction at a later date.</p> <p>This will all need to be constructed during the current plan, and then re-done at a later date. I think it is a much wiser, less disruptive and long-term cheaper option to do all the above mentioned work now, therefore doing it only once. When the lowered road is extended, only the Torrens Road intersection needs to be redone, instead of approximately 1 km as the current plan would require.</p> <p>I am not proposing anything 'new' as such, as</p>	<p>Noted. See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>Through consultation with the community, access to right out only at Hurtle Street is deliberately limited to reduce the potential of non-local use to travel through the Croydon local road network, as well as to share the load with other local roads for traffic entering into the Croydon area. The signalised right turn out from Hurtle Street provides a controlled location to head south from the local area and distribute redirected movements from the local area.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>I'm sure all this work is planned to be done in the long term anyway, I just would like to suggest it all be done now, rather than later, to avoid doing things twice. (The Southern Exy is a perfect example of this).</p>	
<b>PS016</b>		
	<p>I have been trying to close road access to South Road from William Street off of Elizabeth Street for 25 years. Locals in immediate street (Elizabeth Street) want this.</p> <p>It has been a rat run from/to Port Road down William Street and Elizabeth Street.</p> <p>Now that no homes will be in that area no need for this section of Road to exist.</p> <p>We want the new fence to continue across William Street (to stop noise &amp; access).</p> <p>The new park can go right across to existing church to form a larger garden area.</p> <p>The church people I have spoken too agree with this as they wish to develop this area into a more people friendly space.</p> <p>If homes in Elizabeth Street (on east side) are still to go, please ensure land will be used as a park and not changed to future homes. I do not see any reason why new noise fencing cannot be built before road developed.</p> <p>I have contacted you before, about fencing position across road (William Street) and your new plan does not help us in Elizabeth Street.</p> <p>At the moment with some homes already demolished noise just travels down to Elizabeth Street via William Street.</p> <p>There are plenty of other road access options for other Croydon residents.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon.</p>
<b>PS017</b>		
PS017.1	<p>As an interested party in the upgrade of South road in the above mention project, I am writing in response to the letter that we have received in the mail from you today.</p> <p>We have viewed the new plans for the upgrade that are on the DPTI website and have a few issues with the proposed amendments. Firstly let me say that my husband and I are completely in agreement for the upgrade of South Road and believe that it is long past due, however the new proposed plans will have a significant effect on our property, which, had we know 4 ½ years ago</p>	<p>The original concept design was modified to position the northbound carriageway closer to the western side of the corridor. This will enable the intended future extension of the non-stop road without the need to relocate this carriageway in future.</p> <p>The current design maintains selected turning movements at local roads and enables positioning of noise barriers and services so they do not need to be relocated for the future extension of the non-stop road.</p>



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>would have altered the purchase of our property.</p> <p>The original plans released mid last year were in concurrence with the information we were given when we purchased our property e.g. the house behind us would be demolished, with a retaining wall built and an easement/bike trail built between our property and the road (similar to that at the Anzac highway project). From the new proposal the retaining wall/our back fence will now be directly on South Road. To further exasperate the issue, Bedford Street aligning our property appears to be one of only a few openings to South Road on the western side and the only two way opening for the north eastern corner of Croydon, which will further increase the noise to our property.</p>	
PS017.2	<p>There are currently four roads which open onto South Road between Hawker Street and Torrens Road on the western side, those being Hurtle Street, Bedford Street, Dartmouth Street and Scottia Street. As the proposal now show Hurtle Street as being designed to allow for a right turn onto South Road only, it appears that Bedford Street will remain the only two way entrance for South Road and the only road to remain open for traffic entering Croydon from South Road past Hawker Street.</p> <p>Bedford Street will then become the main exit for traffic through this section of Croydon wishing to head north onto South Road. We are unable to see the benefit in this when Bedford Street is a no through road onto Ellen Street, causing traffic to have to flow up and down St Lawrence Avenue. This is a small street with lots of families with small children, ourselves included. We could see more benefit in leaving the Dartmouth entrance open when this has a flow through to and from Ellen Street, and we would like to know why this was not considered to be a viable option.</p>	<p>Currently both Bedford Street and Dartmouth Street provide access between South Road and the north-eastern section of Croydon. Both streets cross St Lawrence Avenue, with Dartmouth Street continuing across Ellen Street while Bedford Street is closed immediately east of Ellen Street.</p> <p>Maintaining left in/left out access at Dartmouth Street will potentially encourage non-local traffic to use Dartmouth Street and Ellen Street to avoid any delay associated with the signalised intersection at South Road and Torrens Road, whereas Bedford Street/St Lawrence Street/Dartmouth Street/Ellen Street forms a more indirect route and is less likely to attract through traffic, therefore performing its primary function to service local access.</p> <p>In either case, redirected traffic from Bedford Street or Dartmouth Street would need to travel along St Lawrence Avenue to access the road that remains open to South Road.</p>
PS017.3	<p>Earlier this year we received planning approval from the council to add an extension to our property, due to start by the end of this year. This is now in limbo as the current proposal will have a significant effect the value of our property, to which point we will have to reconsider the whole extension, our ability to live here as a growing family and the current value of our property as a whole. The letter we received from the Department for Transport energy and Infrastructure within the Form 1 at the purchase of our property advised that it would not be affected by the metropolitan Adelaide Road</p>	See Supplement Section 3.5.1 Property values.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Widening plan, and although our property will not be affected by physical encroachment, the new proposed plans will have a significant effect on the marketable value of our property.</p> <p>Could you please advise how we should proceed with the above mentioned concerns that we have with the new proposed plans and the effect that this will have on our family home.</p>	
PS018		
PS018.1	<p>No right turn onto Port Road from South Road is ridiculous. The traffic on Port Road city bound in the morning bottlenecks at the intersection of Port Road/Park Terrace as bad as it does at the Port Road/South Road intersection. Adding intending right turning traffic onto Port Road will cause traffic mayhem, not to mention a hazard from motorists trying to cross three lanes of traffic to turn right. Don't waste money on doing a half job that will need to be rectified, these are two very busy roads.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
PS019		
PS019.1	<p>We are residents on McDonnell Ave and have two concerns we would like to flag with you after viewing the latest designs;</p> <p>Turning south onto the new roads, the solutions mooted appears not to be included/funded?</p> <p>We currently enjoy access both north and south from Hindmarsh Ave and this will be reduced as part of the design. It is very difficult to turn right onto Grange Rd from West Hindmarsh and can't see traffic flow getting any better on Grange Rd post completion.</p> <p>We support the project but we need to have included a proper solution on how we exit our suburb and proceed south bound on south road in a safe fashion. My suggestion would be a right hand filter lane from McDonnell to allow safe merging of traffic into the east bound Grange flow.</p> <p>The current designs could potentially create a real problem for us that need to head south and needs proper addressing and what ever the solutions is it must be part of the project scope.</p>	<p>A U-turn provision at Grange Road traffic signals will be provided to facilitate travel in a southerly direction from West Hindmarsh.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p> <p>A right turn filter lane from McDonnell Avenue that provides a merge with eastbound Grange Road traffic would restrict access at Bertie Street to left in/left out only and conflict with the lengthened right turn lane on Grange Road to turn onto South Road.</p>
PS019.2	<p>The previous plans showed a foot bridge at the end of McDonnell Ave an idea we support and is needed as foot traffic over the south road bridge is an unpleasant experience with trucks hurtling towards you on a corner and the nearest foot bridge west along the river is some distance. It appears the project has dropped this foot bridge</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	in the latest designs, which is disappointing. For a project this size it would be a minor cost I would imagine and encourage people to cycle/walk. We would encourage consideration be given to bringing this back into scope the way it was originally pitched to us.	
<b>PS020</b>		
PS020.1	In principle as residents of Henry St Croydon, just doors away from houses that are now being prepared for demolition, we are not at all opposed to the improvement of the area and support a better traffic management strategy for all road users and in particular South Rd.	Noted.
PS020.2	With the illustrated/planned upgrade all current traffic obstructions to traffic flow will still be in place barring the train line which will be present but over the roadway? How will this represent good traffic flow between Grange Rd and Torrens Rd when all the same stops and starts are still in effect?	<p>The proposed upgrade will provide a 3 km non-stop section of roadway (incorporating the 2 km lowered road) between Torrens Road, Renown Park and Ashwin Parade, Torrensville. A surface road will run adjacent to the lowered road to provide access to the local area and to turning movements at the signalised intersections of Port Road and Grange Road.</p> <p>Through vehicles using the lowered road will experience travel time savings with non-stop traffic flow. Vehicles using the surface road should also experience reduced travel times with the signals operating more efficiently as a high proportion of South Road traffic will be using the lowered road.</p>
PS020.3	Ensure that there is a turn right option from South Road into Hurtle Street for southward heading traffic so that local environment residents have logical and practical entry into their own suburb.	All turning movements were initially proposed at the Hurtle Street intersection. Following concerns from individual community members and the Community Liaison Group regarding increased traffic movements on Hurtle Street, access was modified to right turn out only. Right turn out at Hurtle Street, together with left in/left out at other local roads and right turn in access via Torrens Road and Ellen Street, provides sufficient access to the local area.
PS020.4	Consider why there is a need for a two lane service road included? There seems little enough actual space to include 3 lanes of traffic within the tunnel? The proposal indicates 10 lanes of actual traffic in some places, including extra spaces for 'green' zones. It seems highly unlikely this can physically be accommodated given the land that has been acquired?	The South Road surface road performs the same function as other arterial roads within the metropolitan road network. It provides access to the local road network and properties that continue to front South Road, particularly on the eastern side, and connects South Road to the east-west arterial roads. The design will provide for efficient traffic flow along the surface road and is able to be accommodated within the project corridor.
PS020.5	Ensure that a turn right option onto Port Rd heading South then West is enabled as it will provide a further traffic block to north south	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	traffic. This option exists in the South Road/Anzac Highway upgrade we cannot understand the reasoning for omitting this option?	
PS020.6	Why can there not be a foot bridge considered to go over South Road to connect foot traffic to the local supermarket on the eastern side of South Rd? It seems a poor use of financial resources to continue the obstruction with yet another stop light to restrict traffic flow? Either a foot bridge or a combined walkway tunnel under the road further along South Rd would be a suitable option? More northern residents should be able to cross at Hurtle St/Hawker St lights instead?	See Supplement Sections 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access and 2.1.3. Pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street.
PS020.7	Could you please provide more information about the sound barriers that are intended as we are very close to the new roadway now that 4 houses are removed or in the process of being removed?	See Supplement Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers.
PS020.8	What is planned for the excess land that sits between the sound barriers and the existing residential areas? Is that just open garden area?	<p>See Supplement Sections 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design, and 3.3.2 Use of surplus land for new open space areas and Figures 3.4-6.</p> <p>Acquired land that is surplus to requirements will be used for a number of different purposes.</p> <p>Some areas may be retained within the road corridor and landscaped to provide the community with open green space. Detention basins and pumping stations to manage stormwater may also be located on land within the road corridor.</p> <p>A small landscaped community park is proposed to be located opposite St Barnabas Church at the intersection of William Street and Elizabeth Street, Croydon.</p> <p>Small parcels of surplus land may be amalgamated and sold as development sites.</p>
<b>PS021</b>		
PS021.1	As a resident Croydon, we are not at all opposed of the improvements of the South Road corridor, but we cannot be separated from the Bowden/Ridleyton area with the current proposed upgrade. Our current thoroughfare between Croydon and Bowden/Ridleyton is through Hawker St, which is accessible through the South Rd turn off. This allows us access the Bus stop which my children catch each morning to go to schools, the Foodland shopping centre, bike lanes around the Bowden area, accesses to the City and parks lands, but with the upgrade,	<p>Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group worked with the project team on resolving local access issues. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.</p> <p>Vehicle access between Croydon and the Bowden-Ridleyton area is able to continue via Hawker Street. For travel from Croydon, drivers</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	would mean a change of lifestyle rather than a direction detour.	<p>can turn left from the local area at Robert Street, Henry Street, William Street and Harriet Street, then merge across and turn right into Hawker Street at the signals.</p> <p>Pedestrian connectivity linking Croydon with Bowden-Ridleyton area across South Road is provided at the signalised Hawker Street/Hurtle Street intersection</p>
PS021.2	Consideration to be taken to allow accesses into Hawker Street for locals living in Croydon, for the reasons stated above. Either accesses from South Road into Hawker Street or preferably through Hurtle Street into Hawker Street, allowing only local traffic onto Hawker Street.	All turning movements were initially proposed at the Hurtle Street intersection. Following concerns from individual community members and the Community Liaison Group regarding increased traffic movements on Hurtle Street, access was modified to right turn out only. Right turn out at Hurtle Street, together with left in/left out at other local roads and right turn in access via Torrens Road and Ellen Street, provides sufficient access to the local area.
PS021.3	Ensure that a turn right option onto Port Road heading South then West is enabled as it will provide a further traffic block to north south traffic. This option exists in the South Road / Anzac Highway upgrade we cannot understand the reasoning for omitting this option?	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
PS021.4	Why can there not be a foot bridge considered to go over South Road to connect foot traffic to the local supermarket (Foodland) on the eastern side of South Road? It seems a poor use of financial resources to continue the obstruction with yet another stop light to restrict traffic flow? Either a foot bridge or a combined walkway tunnel under the road further along South Road would be a suitable option?	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p>
PS021.5	Consideration for another foot bridge near Grange Road South Road intersection, allowing for traffic to Hindmarsh stadium during the soccer season. Currently you have lots of people crossing this intersection during the activities at Hindmarsh, with this new upgrade it would be more of a safety hazard with the increase of lanes through this area.	The road width at the South Road/Grange Road intersection has increased substantially, however the number of lanes northbound is unchanged and only one additional lane is proposed on the southbound approach. The pedestrian movements across South Road are likely to occur in two stages, with pedestrians storing in the centre median. The detailed design will include adequate space for pedestrians to wait in the centre median.
PS021.6	Could you please provide more information about the sound barriers that are intended as we are very close to the new roadway now that 4 houses are removed or in the process of being removed?	See <i>Supplement</i> Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers.
PS021.7	What is planned for the excess land that sits between the sound barriers and the existing residential areas? Is that just open garden area?	See <i>Supplement</i> Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design, Figures 3.4-6. See response to PS020.8.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
<b>PS022</b>		
PS022.1	<p>Our proposal is that road access to William Street from the South Road northbound surface road be closed to cars. The church will be the only occupiers of property in that section of William Road (between Elizabeth St and South Road), and we are hoping to redevelop our frontage with an open garden, and a 'cul de sac' that allows for parking and being more amenable for pedestrians would be a much better option.</p> <p>As it is, a number of cars leave Port Road at Queen Street, and shoot through Elizabeth Street and turn into William Street as a back route short cut, turning left into South Road (heading north). We would much prefer to close this opening.</p> <p>The church is has been significantly developed to create community space that we hope to make available for appropriate use by the wider Croydon community. Having some open space over the road will enhance this, but a cul de sac with some options for parking has the potential to link us up well with what is planned (as we understand it). Indeed, combined with an open garden in front of the church, it would be a great location for a playground in the park area.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon, and Section 3.3.3 Community park, corner William Street and Elizabeth Street</p>
PS022.2	<p>St Barnabas is a historic building identified by the Council within the heritage precinct. It will become the closest building in William Street to South Road. The building is already showing some signs of structural stress with cracks at various points. We had this assessed by an engineer some 18 months ago, and received the 'go ahead' before commencing our renewal project.</p> <p>We are concerned that the projected vibrations associated with construction (beyond normal stability expectations) may impact on a fragile historic building. Please advise us on how we may have this investigated from your end, and what steps may be taken to mitigate the impact of the anticipated vibration associated with construction.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.4 Property condition assessments.</p>
PS022.3	<p>St Barnabas has been dependent on street parking in William Street – this is now significantly reduced. Are there options to redevelop this part of William Street to enhance further parking (angle parking?).</p>	<p>On-street parking spaces will be reduced on William Street with the proposed upgrade. DPTI will work with Council to review parking in this area.</p>
PS022.4	<p>South Road will be significantly closer to St Barnabas Hall and Church. Could we have further information on the proposed noise</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers, and Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design,</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	mitigation wall: what height, and where located?	Figures 3.4–3.6.
PS022.5	We are planning to renovate and extend our residence in Elizabeth Street, Croydon, in the near future. However, we have concerns about the impact of construction (especially night construction) on this residence - as we understand it, there will be nothing between this house (on the western side of Elizabeth Street) and the worksite between Elizabeth Street and South Road.	See PAR Section 9 Noise and vibration and Section 16 Air quality.
PS022.6	We would like further information and assurances on efforts to reduce the impact of the construction project on this adjoining suburban street before relocating a young family into this residence (together with associated renovation costs, with a view to its longer term market value).	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration and Section 3.7.1 Dust management.
PS022.7	What will be the best way to explore these questions further? Are we able to visit the site office, or perhaps have an on site consultation?	For more information or to provide your thoughts/seek feedback from the project team call 1300 794 899 or email <a href="mailto:DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au">DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au</a> and make an appointment to meet with a project team member. We are happy to meet either on site or at the project site office.
PS022.8	We must say we like the concept plans and general proposals around this project, and appreciate the efforts made to ensure genuine community consultation. It is in that spirit we make the proposal and raise the questions above.	Noted.
<b>PS023</b>		
PS023.1	<p>I think the plan is very good except that the road/trench does not continue under the Torrens Road. I understand funds may be the issue; however, I think it should be costed and made public just how much extra it would cost to run the trench a few more hundred metres underground to Torrens Road.</p> <p>The current Grange Road and Port Road bottlenecks will just move to Torrens Road.</p> <p>Similarly with the Darlington project. I can't understand that after spending a combined some \$1.5 billion on these 2 major projects why isn't there the foresight to continue the trenches under Torrens Road and Ayliffes Road respectively to do the job properly.</p> <p>Can you please estimate the cost of the extra 100–200 metre trenches for both projects and let the public know?</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>The upgrade of the Torrens Road/South Road intersection has been included as part of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project. The ultimate grade separation of this intersection will be carried out as part of future North-South Corridor projects, subject to funding.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
<b>PS024</b>		
PS024.1	<p>Sound barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• solid construction – tilt up concrete or comparable</li> <li>• colour – tint concrete to sandstone colour rather than grey</li> <li>• design – to reflect local community, history and architecture</li> <li>• incorporate building materials taken from properties along this section.</li> <li>• simulate houses and retails shops that were originally along this section of South Road ('relief' or etched into concrete walls)</li> </ul> <p>These elements are important to remind the community and road users that this area is a suburb; with people living alongside a major route and that it is also a community.</p> <p>Can the barriers be installed before major construction to enable local communities to reclaim and re-vegetate the sections facing the local community. The demolition sites are unsightly and remediation needs to take place immediately or soon after the houses have been taken down so that local community can regain back what is left of their local neighbourhood.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers, and Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design.</p>
PS024.2	<p>PAC to Foodland (west–east pedestrian traffic)</p> <p>Proposed location – though timed to synchronise with Hawker Street lights will mean large trucks are required to stop only a few metres from Hawker Street. Appears to defeat the purpose of the apparent focus on 'time saving' by not having all turns at Port Road/South Road intersection.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing over South Road should be over the lowered section/dual height section of the South Road – halfway between the Hawker–Hurtle intersection and raised train overpass at Day Terrace.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p>
PS024.3	<p>Port Road/South Road</p> <p>Proposed – traffic can only turn into South Road and can't turn out of South Road.</p> <p>Proposed – 'loop roads' along Port Road to allow traffic to travel west (from South Road, north) or travel to the city (from South Road, south)</p> <p>The argument for this is that it will reduce time spent at the intersection while waiting for full</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>sequence of lights and turns are executed. However the loop road option requires a 'travel west from South Road – north' vehicle to wait for three sets of lights before reconnecting with Port Road.</p> <p>This is unacceptable as it will create more congestion on Port Road, particularly at 'peak hour' and simply transfer any congestion issues to Port Road and therefore is not a strategic traffic flow solution for the whole area. It is short term, reactive and appears to be very 'unplanned'.</p> <p>If all turns can be accommodated at Anzac Highway and South Road intersection (image below) then why are restricted turns deemed necessary for Port Road and South Road intersection?</p> <p>South Road will only be carrying 'local traffic' and therefore wait times should be less than they currently are at this intersection now, The rationale for restricted turns and 'loop roads' is flawed and unsatisfactory.</p>	
PS024.4	<p>Traffic flows and retaining connectivity between all suburbs affected by South Road upgrade.</p> <p>How do I travel from Grange Road to Hawker Street? The difficulty is for vehicles travelling north from Grange Road along South Road and how they can turn right into Ridleyton at Hawker Street (is this possible as it is not clear from the maps and staff at the Open Day were unsure about this turn) If it is possible to turn right at Hawker Street, then it seems traffic will have to first merge with traffic coming up to ground level from the underpass and then change lanes across to the turn right lane in a very short distance (as the underpass emerges just after Cedar Avenue which is very close to Hawker Street). This would seem to be a very difficult and possibly dangerous manoeuvre. If I have understood this correctly then is it possible for the underpass to finish after Hawker Street? Otherwise large trucks and north–south bound traffic will have to slow down sufficiently to enable the traffic to merge.</p>	<p>Vehicle access from Grange Road and Hawker Street will be via the surface road and then merge across and turn right into Hawker Street at the signals.</p>
PS024.5	<p>Can I cross Port Road as is currently possible or will I be forced to use the 'loop road' to reconnect with South Road on the southern side of Port Road? The simulations are not clear, or is this something that is still for further planning consideration?</p>	<p>All movements will continue to be provided at the South Road/Port Road intersection, with through movements along South Road continuing across Port Road as per current operation. Only the right turn movements from South Road will be redirected to use the U-turn provisions on Port Road.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
PS024.6	The needs and access for residents living in suburbs from Brompton and Ridleyton to Grange and Findon need to be considered in the South Road planning and traffic flows. The history of these suburbs is that many European families moved into these suburbs in the 1950s and 1960s. These residents have extended family, children and grandchildren living in adjacent suburbs and maintaining connectivity and access is important. This is particularly important for families with ageing parents who provide care on daily basis.	Noted.
PS024.7	Ensuring access over South Road for cars, pedestrians and cyclists between the Croydon community and the suburbs of Bowden, Brompton is a vital part of the upgrade planning. These suburbs are already 'divided' to some extent and this should not be increased due to barriers such as walls, poorly located crossings, and complex exit and entry options.	Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues and connectivity. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations along alternative routes, and east–west travel occurs at major road intersections. The location of pedestrian connections continues to be reviewed as the design is further developed.  See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.
PS024.8	Traffic management and noise control measures need to be implemented and monitored now and during the construction phase.	Council and DPTI will work together to minimise impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate traffic management treatments.  See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS024.9	Local Council needs to take a more proactive role together with DPTI and local residents, in order to achieve a satisfactory outcome for all parties as far as re-invigoration and remediation of the local community.	Regular meetings are held with key staff from the City of Charles Sturt and the City of West Torrens to address issues and concerns as they arise.
PS024.10	While we appreciate that the Project Team is tasked to deliver a solution for South Road, it is imperative that the 'big picture' is not lost and all decisions and traffic flows are considered. For example access into Ridleyton from the south and west, access into Grange Road from the north and other scenarios.	Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues and connectivity.
PS024.11	I understand that the previous concept allowed for the lowered road to rise to 'at grade' (normal road level) between Hawker Street and Torrens Road. Yet, now the plan proposes for the lowered/dual section of the road top finish two blocks away from Hawker Street –	See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>approximately opposite Cedar Avenue and Paget Street.</p> <p>As previously identified this creates problems turning right into Hawker Street as well as issues associated with pedestrian crossings, stopping heavy traffic at crossings at two points (Hawker Street intersection and at the pedestrian actuated crossing near Foodland) – all defeating the supposed time savings at Port Rd/South Rd intersection.</p> <p>My recommendation is that you return to your original concept and extend the lowered road beyond Hawker Street. I am confident this would reduce many of the access issues currently identified between Croydon and Ridleyton, allow traffic to turn into Hawker Street more easily and not frustrate drivers by making them stop twice in such a short distance on the South Road 'carriage way' (as described above).</p>	
PS024.12	<p>The current plan virtually 'landlocks' residents in Croydon and Ridleyton and beyond. Ridleyton residents can only travel east easily. Croydon residents can only travel north and west easily/efficiently.</p> <p>Residents in all the affected suburbs need to be able to access the city's two major hospitals (QEH and RAH) yet the current plan does not allow for this to happen without 'back-tracking', 'rat-running' and travelling extra distances and for additional time to do so.</p>	<p>Southbound movements from Croydon can occur via a right turn at the signalised Hawker Street–Hurtle Street intersection. All existing turning movements to and from Hawker Street, Ridleyton, will still be able to occur at this location.</p>
PS024.13	<p>Another frustration – Driving from the city along Port Road – according to the concept plan you can't turn right into Coglein Street as this is where the 'loop' road ends, which seems to restrict access to Coglein Street.</p>	<p>Right turn movements from Port Road into Coglein Street will still be able to be undertaken.</p>
PS024.14	<p>These decisions and the subsequent impact means that many minor roads will become 'rat runs' for drivers to find their way home and to navigate between streets and local suburbs.</p> <p>Queen St, which is a narrow street in Croydon will become a 'rat run' as will Miner Street off Port Road, Tait Street in Renown Park and Ellen Street in Croydon. All these are narrow streets (usually one car at a time, parking on one side only).</p> <p>This will result in Council having to manage traffic issues not of their making with road closures and traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Once again I ask that planners and engineers comprehensively examine the effect these</p>	<p>Road traffic congestion will be significantly reduced upon completion of the project, minimising the attractiveness of rat-running.</p> <p>DPTI is working with Council officers to identify any local road modifications required to offset the impact of predicted changed traffic conditions on the local network.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>decisions will have on residents and the City of Charles Sturt as Council will ultimately be left attempting to remedy the consequences of a number of decisions your department is about to make.</p>	
<b>PS026</b>		
PS026.1	<p>I do agree that South Road, between Regency and Grange Road/Ashwin Parade, needs a substantial upgrade. However, I do not agree at all with the scope of the current project design.</p> <p>It is a fact that the more roads you provide and the more bitumen you lay down the more traffic you will attract. The statistics about the anticipated traffic increase from 50,000 vehicles per day to some 130,000 per day speaks for itself.</p> <p>I believe that this project design has only ever been concerned with the increase of vehicles and never looked at how to limit or reduce peak hour and normal traffic movement. There is no vision of sustainability in this design.</p>	<p>The need for a non-stop North–South Corridor in Adelaide is driven by population growth and transport requirements for access to industrial/business precincts and Adelaide’s planned employment areas.</p> <p>Project objectives include improving travel time reliability and vehicle operating costs along the corridor, as well as improving accessibility for drivers, public transport, pedestrians and cyclists while delivering a solution with positive net benefits for South Australia.</p> <p>The proposed upgrade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improves network reliability and accessibility for businesses, with the project negating the need for traffic to use other parts of the network during both peak and inter-peak periods of the day</li> <li>• reduces travel times on the key bus routes of Grange Road and Port Road</li> <li>• promotes active transport through inclusion of bicycle lanes on the surface road, shared use paths and an on-road bicycle route in the local road network</li> <li>• provides pedestrian/cyclist connectivity at signalised intersections and other key locations across the North–South Corridor.</li> </ul>
PS026.2	<p>I am aware that the Federal Government will only fund road works and not public transport. This is clearly evident in this project. However this should not dictate a project with such a big impact as this.</p>	<p>Improving public transport services was considered in the development of this project. Bus services will benefit through improving reliability and travel time along the North–South Corridor, together with reduced delays at the signalised intersections for east-west movements.</p>
PS026.3	<p>The overall width of a future South Road, 6 lanes in an underpass and up to 7 lanes as a surface road. This adds up to 13 lanes of traffic from a previous 4 lane road – the intersection of Port and South Road is completely over designed. 13 lanes of South Road will meet 11 lanes of Port Road. The possibility of a right turn into South Road is taken away and replaced with a left turn and a U-turn section on Port Road. This in return will completely destroy the wooded median strip of Port Road and a possible future</p>	<p>The signalised intersections have been designed to cater for the predicted 2031 traffic volumes to ensure all structures are designed to the ultimate layout and eliminate the need for rework in the future.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>Vegetation removal will be required from the Port Road median to accommodate the new intersection layout. Where room permits, new</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	corridor for a tram extension from the city to Port Adelaide or West Lakes. It will also turn this intersection into a hot bitumen nightmare, no more trees, no more shade, just bitumen.	trees and understorey vegetation will be planted within remaining areas of the Port Road median and new, widened verge areas introduced to offset vegetation that will be removed.
PS026.4	The Grange and South Road intersection is not far behind in size and traffic increase. At least the possibility to turn right from South Road is retained.	Noted.
PS026.5	The intersections at Hawker Street/South Road and Torrens Road/South Road will be turned into absolute bottlenecks. 10 or more lanes will have to merge back into 4 lanes until the next stage of the project. This will be a traffic nightmare for a long time coming, if not forever. I have not seen any proposal, let alone funding, for the upgrade of South Road from Torrens Road to Regency Road. The same situation will be causing traffic chaos at the Ashwin Parade end of this 'grandiose' Torrens to Torrens project. Personally I cannot see South Road being widened to that scope all the way to Darlington, nor would I want it to happen.	<p>The Australian and South Australian governments are committed to delivering a dedicated non-stop North–South Corridor, with almost 50 km already completed and a program to eliminate the worst bottlenecks underway.</p> <p>With a staged approach required for the delivery of such a large project, transitioning back to the current alignment will cause some level of disruption to traffic flow.</p> <p>The timing of the delivery on the final sections, including Torrens Road to Regency Road, is subject to detailed planning and funding allocations.</p>
PS026.6	<p>We might be stuck in the future with a very expensive, over the top designed and built 3.7 km of South Road, only to get stuck in traffic jams at either end of it.</p> <p>I believe the money would be much better spent on a less ambitious but more continuous version of South Road linking up to Regency Road and Anzac Highway.</p>	The Australian and South Australian governments are committed to delivering a dedicated non-stop North–South Corridor.
PS026.7	<p>The impact on properties adjacent to the new road project is enormous. The width of the new South Road and the anticipated traffic volumes will make property values fall and also reduce the quality of living standard. Perhaps the residents who had to move out and whose dwellings were demolished are the lucky ones.</p> <p>Air and noise pollution will worsen considerably, especially near the new intersections like Port and South Road.</p> <p>Personally, I cannot see that South Road will be widened in the same manner all the way to Darlington. Again, we might end up the dummies in a short vision project.</p>	See <i>Supplement</i> Section 3.5.1 Property values, and Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS026.8	<p>Very simply, looking at this project design, I believe that none of the above issues have had consideration at all.</p> <p>More traffic equals more greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>More bitumen equals hotter surfaces, equals</p>	<p>A greenhouse gas assessment was undertaken for the operational phase of the project and is provided in Chapter 19 of the PAR.</p> <p>Landscaping will be installed along the corridor to offset vegetation that is removed. See Figures 3.4–3.7 of the Supplement Report.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>higher temperatures.</p> <p>Less trees equals less shade and less oxygen.</p> <p>Forever increasing the volume of vehicle traffic is absolutely unsustainable for the future.</p> <p>I think we will have to rethink and plan much smarter than shown here.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider the scope of this project and go back to the drawing board.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.4 Vegetation.</p>
PS026.9	<p>Once this road has been built, it will be there for a long time to come. Other cities in the world are removing their inner-city highways because they have realised that they do not solve traffic congestion, but rather add to it. We need to learn from other cities' mistakes rather than repeating them!</p> <p>I think that we should plan for a future with less cars, more public transport, safer bike ways and people in mind.</p>	<p>The Australian and South Australian governments are committed to delivering a dedicated non-stop North–South Corridor.</p> <p>See <i>The Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i> at <a href="http://www.transportplan.sa.gov.au">www.transportplan.sa.gov.au</a> for a comprehensive and integrated plan for land use, infrastructure and transport for South Australia for the coming 30 years.</p>
<b>PS027</b>		
PS027.1	<p>We are very keen that the church at St Barnabas serves the local community in Croydon and is used by members of the local community. This aim would be greatly helped by two factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. developing the land opposite the church, adjacent to Elizabeth St as a community space</li> <li>2. blocking access to William Street from South Road and creating a cul de sac with car park for the church and community space.</li> </ol> <p>These measures would create a safe and open space around the church building that would enhance the sense of community in the area. I realise that this would increase traffic flow on Henry and Robert streets but I personally think that the benefits would outweigh the costs.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon, and Section 3.3.3 Community park, corner William Street and Elizabeth Street.</p>
<b>PS028</b>		
PS028.1	<p>As you are aware, there is a newly renovated church on the corner of William Street and Elizabeth Street. I am part of the congregation at this church and, as such, very interested in the planning taking place.</p> <p>The plans currently have William Street as a possible exit point off South Road. I would like to make a pledge to have this changed. The church is a family space and we anticipate more children will be regularly attending. Given that there will be a park across the road from the church, it would be safe to assume that children will be crossing the road often. I would like for</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon, and Section 3.3.3 Community park, corner William Street and Elizabeth Street.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>this to be a safe environment where children can play without the added stress of a busy road.</p> <p>In addition the church facilities will be made available for the wider general community to use. Having William St closed off between Elizabeth St and South Rd would make the park more available for the community to use in conjunction with the church.</p>	
<b>PS029</b>		
PS029.1	<p>I am excited to see the South Road upgrade going ahead, I am writing in regards to William Street which is one of the streets that the improved South Road will span. I live near this area and am involved in the local church (St Barnabas) and thoroughly enjoy the Elizabeth Street cafés.</p> <p>I believe that blocking William Street at the South Road entry would reduce through traffic down both William and Elizabeth Street. As St Barnabas church has just been redeveloped and Elizabeth Street is starting to take off this could be a great way to create a community space and increase the attractiveness of this area for families with children.</p>	See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon, and Section 3.3.3 Community park, corner William Street and Elizabeth Street
<b>PS030</b>		
PS030.1	<p>I wish to express my concerns regarding the revised plan for the Torrens to Torrens, South Road upgrade.</p> <p>I have reviewed the revised project plan for the Torrens to Torrens, South Road upgrade, and generally feel that the original plan was much better. In considering the revised plan, I have tried to put aside and personal self-interest and come up with ideas affecting the whole community. I have listed below specific concerns and suggestions.</p>	Noted.
PS030.2	<p>I feel that the original proposal for the elevated station at Croydon, with the resulting removal of the Elizabeth–Queens street rail crossing is the best option for the following reasons:</p> <p>The elevated rail line (initial proposal) will allow for easy flow of traffic along Queen Street and Elizabeth Street to and from Port Road. The existing crossing is very busy and often results in traffic queued along Queen Street due to train traffic, with the resultant noise and exhaust gasses. This is surely detracting from the alfresco dining on the trendy cafés in the area. With access from the Croydon area onto South Road restricted to access to a service road, I</p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	would expect additional traffic to be using both the Queens Street access to Port Road and the Hurtle Street access to South Road. The last thing we need is additional traffic passing through this area.	
PS030.3	The Croydon Playground should be redeveloped to include some off-street parking, which is a significant issue in the area. The area under the elevated station (South of Queen Street) as per the original proposal could also be redeveloped for off-street parking to assist with parking for the station, the Queen Street–Elizabeth Street traders and the Croydon Playground. Traffic flowing easily through this area would enhance the alfresco environment and encourage local trade. The reduction in pollution around the playground and cafés must be much better for the children and patrons for the local trade. Easy pedestrian access from Elizabeth to Queen streets will enhance the local ambience and improve linkage to the redeveloped shops in the old Godfrey's area, the new dentist, the gym and any future business in this area.	Parking along Queen Street and in the vicinity of the rail crossing and playground is a long standing issue for Council. There is a need to achieve a balance between the parking needs of the local businesses and access for the wider Croydon residents.
PS030.4	I have further concerns regarding the revised plan to retain the Croydon Station in its current location with a much steeper gradient on the train line to and from the train overpass for South Road. I have not been able to confirm this but I believe the steeper gradient will exclude some if not all of the 'Heritage' rail stock used for special events. i.e. No more Red Hen special days. No more (occasional) steam trains on this line. While these special events only occur occasionally, I feel this simply supports the original proposal.	Preliminary investigations indicate that the gradient of the proposed rail overpass will accommodate old rolling stock, such as Redhens. The rail overpass would not necessarily preclude the use of other heritage trains, as it can be bypassed on the Rosewater Loop that runs between Port Junction and Gillman.
PS030.5	In short, I feel that the original proposal regarding the elevated station with no rail crossing needed at Elizabeth and Queen streets would be much more beneficial to the community and to the local traders.	Noted.
PS030.6	Electricity substation relocation  The original proposal included relocation of the Croydon electricity substation. I feel that the revised proposal to retain the substation where it currently is situation is detrimental if it prevents 'normal' traffic flow through the Port Road, South Road intersection. i.e. No right turns from South Road onto Port road SIGNIFICANTLY detracts from the upgrade. Surely if you are going to spend such huge sums of money on the project we do not want a less than perfect solution at this intersection that would only need to be fixed	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road right turn movements.



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	at a later date when traffic increases.	
PS030.7	<p>Hawker Street –Hurtle Street/South Road intersection</p> <p>Unfortunately I do not have access to all of the details regarding the original proposal but I believe that the 'Main South Road' was to go under this intersection. The revised, current proposal results in an additional set of traffic lights on the main South Road which I feel is unacceptable. Off course, if the current plan is for a Torrens to Hawker Street upgrade, then the community should be advised of this. I feel the extra lights on South Road plus the no right turn onto Port Road significantly detract from the original plan. Assuming funding is available, then these two issues should be fixed.</p>	See Supplement Section 2.1 Possible extension beyond Hawker Street.
<b>PS031</b>		
PS031.1	<p>I would like to raise some concerns about the proposed footbridge/one way local road at the end of McDonnell Avenue, West Hindmarsh. I attended the recent information day for the Torrens to Torrens Project. I raised my concern on the day and was informed that the community wanted the bridge. Also on page 16 of the Project Assessment Report it states that the project team has continually met with community groups to discuss the bridge. I was also told that the bridge will give better access to Kings Reserve, from the northern side of the Torrens. The community on the northern side of the Torrens has approx. 5 green sites to use. I cannot see how a bridge will give access to the reserve, especially as the 'Woolworths Brickworks' development will not create any shorter or easier access.</p> <p>Can you please let me know the following: What is the membership of the Community Liaison Group?</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p> <p>Membership of the Planning Phase Community Liaison Group and meeting minutes can be accessed at:  <a href="http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes">www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes</a></p> <p>Or see Appendix B for CLG membership and meeting minutes.</p>
PS031.2	Has the project team spoken to any residents at the river end of McDonnell Ave?	<p>The concept of one-way road bridge advocated by the community was a topic of conversation at both of the 'street corner meetings' held in West Hindmarsh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 November 2014 Cator Street/Bond Street, West Hindmarsh</li> <li>• 11 November 2014 Gawler Avenue/Jervois Avenue, West Hindmarsh</li> </ul> <p>The pedestrian bridge over the River Torrens was raised by residents of West Hindmarsh at the Community Open Day held on 26 July 2014, following the release of the PAR.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
PS031.3	What correspondence has been sent to residents in the area informing them of the proposed bridge?	The proposal to construct a pedestrian bridge was included in the PAR.
PS031.4	What future communication plan will involve information to residents about the bridge?	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p> <p>A Pedestrian and Cyclist Advisory Committee (PACAC) will be established in early 2015. Please check the project website regularly for more details.</p> <p>If you would like to be involved in the PACAC, please email the project team at <a href="mailto:dpti.T2T@sa.gov.au">dpti.T2T@sa.gov.au</a> to register your interest.</p>
PS031.5	What evidence/data does the project team have that can support a bridge being built?	See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.
<b>PS032</b>		
PS032.1	<p>We have been in support of this upgrade since first proposed in 2005 along with the Gallipoli Underpass at the time and are excited it is now proceeding.</p> <p>Our main reason in writing this submission is our concern with the current concept design and impacts of traffic access/flow on Harriet Street in particular. The concept drawing does indicate a potential for traffic to exit the main lowered road and enter Harriet Street directly. This will create an opportunity for these vehicles to use Harriet Street as a pathway to other parts of Croydon, Torrens Road or as another access to Croydon if the access roads intended are not used in turn greatly increasing traffic and noise on Harriet Street which is currently closed to South Road. Harriet Street has become the first accessible street to this traffic in the latest concept drawings.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street and Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon.</p> <p>Under the new concept design vehicles will only be able to gain access to and from Harriet Street with left in and out only to and from South Road surface Road.</p> <p>DPTI will continue to work together with Council to minimise impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate traffic management treatments.</p>
PS032.2	<p>Can the following options be considered:</p> <p>Moving the access to Harriet Street closer to Cedar Avenue enabling shared access to the Service road from Cedar and Harriet – left in/left out. This will also help those on Cedar access South Road without having to drive around their block via Harriet Street and remove the opportunity for the main South Road flow of traffic to access Harriet Street.</p>	See response PS032.1
PS032.3	Extending the road barrier on the lowered section of South Road to prevent the main traffic entering Harriet St directly – access to vehicles on the service road only?	See response PS032.1
PS032.4	Given the significant savings made with now not having to re-locate the power station on the	See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	corner of South and Port Road and the reduction of length to the rail overpass is there an opportunity to continue the lowered roadway at least beneath Hurtle St? The whole idea of a 'non-stop corridor ' is to reduce the need to stop at traffic lights and I find it difficult to understand how this large project worth near on \$1 billion will not address the fact there will be a pedestrian crossing, intersection at Hurtle St and intersection at Torrens Road all less than 900 metres apart? Being able to accomplish this now will save having to do this in future at what are likely to be higher costs and also address the concerns I have regarding Harriet St.	
PS032.5	Finally, I would like to know how the residents of Harriet St were consulted about the recent changes to the plans – I understand there were local groups who consulted on our behalf during the planning stages but no communication was received by us as residents from or during these meetings. Were there any representatives who actually live on Harriet Street participating?	Membership of the Planning Phase Community Liaison Group and meeting minutes can be accessed at: <a href="http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes">www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes</a>  Or see Appendix B for CLG membership and meeting minutes.
<b>PS033</b>		
PS033.1	The South Rd upgrade has to happen – that road is a shocker. Unfortunately, it makes sense to line up Hurtle St with Hawker St (although I think this idea has been canned now?). Thus the concern for Hurtle St is obviously the increase in traffic. The way to disperse traffic is to put in a cul-de-sac. I am dumbfounded as to why this has not been the only option from the start. This should be somewhere near the start of the journey into Croydon or West Croydon. The sooner the cul-de-sac, the sooner the traffic is dispersed, the sooner the traffic situation is the same as it was before and thus eliminating any concerns. This should be either at Ellen St or Brown St. One street north already has a cul-de-sac at Ellen St – why is that out of interest?	See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.
<b>PS034</b>		
PS034.1	Firstly, it seems that in the need to create a non-stop North–South freight corridor, the planners have forgotten that we live here – we are a community that is already to some extent divided by South Road – the proposal will now effectively ensure that east and west will only meet through lengthy convoluted routes.	Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.
PS034.2	Port Road/South Road intersection – right hand turns.	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>In your current proposal, traffic can no longer turn right out of South Road onto Port Road. Your proposed solution – ‘loop roads’ along Port Road to allow traffic to travel west (from South Road – north) or travel to the city (from South Road – south) makes no sense and will cause more traffic issues.</p> <p>The argument for this change (put to us by DPTI officers at the Open Day) is that it will reduce time spent at the intersection while waiting for full sequence of lights and to enable turns to be executed. However, the loop road option requires travelling in the opposite direction along Port Road in order to execute a turn to go where one needs to go – it seems to me that vehicles will still have to wait for three sets of lights before reconnecting with the correct direction along Port Road.</p>	
PS034.3	<p>Also what happens at Coglin St? The extent of loop road seems to impact on traffic exiting Coglin Street? Will residents and businesses still be able to cross over Port Road to travel towards to South Road at the Coglin St exit? On your display it looks like only left turns will be available at Coglin St – if that is the case then you have basically trapped the community of Ridleyton/Brompton in their suburb and will have difficulty getting out or in from this section of South/Port roads.</p>	<p>All turning movements into Coglin Street will still be possible.</p> <p>Traffic will be still able to exit at Coglin Street onto Port Road and then U-turn at Anne Street to access the Port Road/South Road intersection. Vehicles are then able to continue straight along Port Road or turn in either direction along South Road.</p> <p>Access changes at the Port Road/Coglin Street junction will improve safety for road users by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removing uncontrolled right turn movement from Coglin Street across three lanes of traffic, reducing the potential for right angle crashes on the inbound carriageway of Port Road</li> <li>• providing a right turn lane on Port Road for vehicles entering Coglin Street to increase available storage and improve the efficiency for outbound Port Road traffic by reducing interaction between through and turning vehicles</li> <li>• reducing the potential of short stacking across the Port Road median with drivers of articulated vehicles exiting Coglin Street crossing during the South Road traffic phase misjudging the available storage in the median and blocking the median traffic lane on Port Road (observed on a number of occasions during the latest turning count at this location)</li> <li>• reducing the number of conflict points at the Port Road/Coglin Street junction.</li> </ul>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
PS034.4	<p>This whole loop road idea is to me and others living in this area just another example of how you have forgotten that this solution should be about the communities that live here as well as the need to move freight and workers. It is a ludicrous solution – it will create more congestion on Port Road, particularly at ‘peak hour’ and simply transfer any congestion issues to Port Road and therefore is not a strategic traffic flow solution for the whole area. It is short term, reactive and appears to be very ‘unplanned’.</p>	<p>Right turn traffic will need to travel a greater distance; however, with the upgraded intersection and a high proportion of South Road traffic using the lowered road, this traffic will not be disadvantaged.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
PS034.5	<p>If all turns can be accommodated at Anzac Highway and South Road intersection, then why is it necessary to restrict right hand turns at the Port Road and South Road intersection?</p> <p>South Road at grade will be carrying only ‘local traffic’ and therefore wait times should be less than they currently are at this intersection now. The rationale for restricted turns and the ‘loop roads’ is flawed and unsatisfactory.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
PS034.6	<p>Access to Foodland/Croydon Station and Queen St (west–east pedestrian and car traffic)</p> <p>Proposed location – though apparently timed to synchronise with Hawker Street lights will mean large trucks are required to stop only a few metres from Hawker Street. Has anyone noticed how many trucks currently do not stop at Hawker Street when the light changes to red? We have and always wait before we enter the intersection from Hawker into South just in case a truck is going to keep coming.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street and Supplement Section 2.1.2 pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street</p>
PS034.7	<p>Our access from Ridleyton/Brompton to Queen Street and Croydon Railway station have been obliterated; as has the access to the Foodland for those living in Croydon.</p> <p>We need another crossover road (local foot and car traffic only) between the rail line and Paget St.the problem would be alleviated if the underpass entrance/exit is moved past Hawker St. Perhaps then, even two shared use (one-way car traffic) bridges could be installed between rail line and Hawker St instead; with one bridge leading cars to Croydon and the other leading cars to Ridleyton, with pedestrians going in both directions.</p>	<p>Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues. Vehicle access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.</p> <p>The proposed access arrangements focus on delivering a balanced outcome for all road users and members of the community in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cyclist movements between Croydon and the Ridleyton/Brompton area are provided for at signalised intersections at Port Road, Hurtle Street–Hawker Street and Torrens Road. The proposed signalised pedestrian crossing just south of Hawker Street will be</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
		<p>replaced with a bridge across the lowered road. A shared use path will also be provided as part of the rail overpass, linking Queen Street and Croydon railway station with McInnes Street.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street.</p>
PS034.8	<p>Traffic flows and retaining connectivity between all suburbs affected by South Road upgrade</p> <p>Ingress and egress from Hawker Street: It was unclear from the Open Day as staff feedback varied from the interpretation of the red dot on the plan and what is possible – requires clarification.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>The current design provides for all turning movements between South Road surface Road and Hawker Street.</p> <p>Only the right turn out is provided at Hurtle Street, with no connection to Hawker Street for vehicles.</p> <p>Cyclist provisions will be included to connect Hawker Street and Hurtle Street.</p>
PS034.9	<p>How do I travel from Grange Road to Hawker Street? The issues here is that traffic coming back along South Road heading north to turn right into the Ridleyton/ Brompton area will have to go up to and perform a right turn at Hawker St – if it is possible, it is not clear from the graphic display. If it is possible to turn right, then traffic will have to first merge with traffic coming up to ground level from the underpass and then somehow change lanes across to the right turning lane – all this in the space of only a small distance as the underpass comes out just after Cedar, so very close to Hawker anyway.</p> <p>If this is the way it has to be, then that underpass has to come out after Hawker St – SA drivers are notorious for not allowing merging traffic in...can you imagine trucks letting anyone through, not to mention do you imagine them slowing down enough to stop at Hawker St intersection – we have issue now regarding trucks that don't stop on light change.</p>	<p>Currently, vehicle access from Grange Road and Hawker Street will be via the surface road and then merge across and turn right into Hawker Street at the signals.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p>
PS034.10	<p>We need a right turn at Port Road, which will alleviate the problems further up for those of us heading north to our homes in Brompton/ Ridleyton. This will enable us to use a safer route via Cogliin St to enter our suburbs than have to deal with merging traffic and the stress associated with it – especially as the distance to Hawker St from the merging lane is very short – or do we end up at Torrens Road before we can safely enter the right turning lane.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>Alternatively, drivers are able to continue on South Road and turn right at Hawker Street, or turn right onto Torrens Road.</p>
PS034.11	<p>The needs and access for residents living in suburbs from Brompton and Ridleyton to Grange and Findon needs to be considered in the South</p>	<p>Existing east–west access across South Road will change as a result of the project.</p> <p>Maintaining appropriate east–west connectivity</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Road planning and traffic flows. The history of these suburbs is that many European families moved into these suburbs in the 1950s and 1960s. These residents have extended family, children and grandchildren living in adjacent suburbs and maintaining connectivity and access is important. This is particularly important for families with ageing parents who need to be provided with care on daily basis. This current plan will force us to find lengthy alternate routes to and from our homes when visiting or caring for relatives who live on the western side of South Road (Seaton, Findon, Fulham etc).</p>	<p>for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists at major intersections has been a key objective of the project.</p> <p>An additional shared use pedestrian/cyclist crossing over South Road will be provided at the rail overpass as part of the Outer Harbor Greenway.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street.</p> <p>Travel patterns will need to be modified to accommodate the new access arrangements.</p>
PS034.12	<p>While I appreciate that the Project Team is tasked to deliver a solution for South Road, it is imperative that the 'big picture' is not lost and all decisions and traffic flows considered.</p> <p>This plan should be as much about the communities that live there as the traffic flows through the area. Currently it is not.</p>	<p>Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues and connectivity.</p> <p>Membership of the Planning Phase Community Liaison Group and meeting minutes can be accessed at:  <a href="http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes">www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t/community_consultation/references_agendas_and_meeting_minutes</a></p> <p>Or see Appendix B for CLG membership and meeting minutes.</p>
<b>PS035</b>		
PS035.1	<p>Croydon Railway Station – if it remains open, traffic will increase as it will be the most direct exit from the Croydon suburb, this will exacerbate the issues with traffic already experienced especially from the Islamic College and the local cafes in Elizabeth Street. The through traffic coming from the area will also be increased because of the inability to turn right onto South Road and the traffic entering the suburb from Hawker Street and increased left turns into the area.</p>	<p>Traffic volumes are expected to increase along Queen Street–Elizabeth Street with the changes to local access. Council and DPTI will work together to minimise impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate traffic management treatments.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.</p> <p>With improved traffic flow on the surrounding arterial roads following the upgrade, non-local traffic using the Croydon road network is expected to reduce.</p>
PS035.2	<p>Lack of consultation of the people who live in the eastern end of Day Terrace occurred because prior to the change of the design of the rail overpass these residents were happy with the closure of the rail station at ground level and the extensive landscaping and improved amenity. As closure is not now occurring, there will be less amenity for the residents at the eastern end of Day Terrace and the continual increase in traffic along the street avoiding being stopped at</p>	<p>Further investigations have identified that that the short rail option is the preferred design and, as such, the need to upgrade the rail station is outside the project scope.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	the crossing.	
PS035.3	As a cyclist who rides to the North Adelaide Aquatic Centre in order to swim there three times a week in the morning, I applaud the inclusion of a bike trail on the train overpass which will allow me to cross South Road easily and safely, something I have not been able to do for years. However, the eastern end of the overpass with its three (?) narrow 90 degree bends is not a cycleway at all but a pedestrian crossing! If the intention is that this is a cycleway, albeit a shared one with pedestrians, it must end with a smooth exit which will not require cyclists to dismount and manoeuvre their bicycles around the 90 degree right angle bends as we have to do when using the current pedestrian crossing at either the South Road or Queen Street rail crossing.	DPTI intends to continue the greenway path within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road through to Coglein Street.  An access ramp will also be provided to South Road to cater for users wanting to access the local area.
PS035.4	The proposed U-turn west of the Port/South Road intersection will make the Queen Street entrance/exit onto Port Road even more difficult than it is now. At the moment if I wish to head either east or south of my home in Day Terrace, I have no alternative but to exit via Queen Street onto Port Road heading either east towards the CBD or west towards the port. This entry onto Port Road is always difficult but it has become impossible over the last ten years with the increase in traffic heading along Port Road, particularly if I want to head west. In the mornings from about 0700–0900 hrs, the only way to get across the three streams of traffic onto the centre strip is when the cars bank up to Queen Street and the traffic stops and leaves a gap. If they don't do that, and that happens often, we are stuck there for another cycle of the Port/ South Road traffic lights. I have been informed that another alternative to the proposed Port Road U turn just west of Port/South Road intersection is to locate it opposite Queen Street under the control of traffic lights. In the interests of the safety of local residents, I ask that this alternative be implemented.	See Supplement Section 2.2 Port Road/Queen Street traffic signals.
PS035.5	While I understand the savings which will arise from bringing the train overpass over South Road to ground level just short of Queen Street, I want to point out that it will do nothing to ameliorate the very difficult traffic conditions which currently exist in Queen Street caused in part by the rail crossing. Queen Street, with its virtually single lane (caused by the parking associated with the Queen Street Pilates Studio and exacerbated by the new dental surgery and	Parking along Queen Street and in the vicinity of the rail crossing is a long standing issue for Council to achieve a balance between the parking needs of the local businesses and access for the wider Croydon residents.  Increased traffic flow along Queen Street–Elizabeth Street will occur with changes to local access.  Council and DPTI will work together to minimise



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Lollipops entertainment facility) is, as I have mentioned above, the only way out for many residents of Croydon.	impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate traffic management treatments.
PS035.6	If the train overpass over South Road does go ahead in its proposed state, then I take you at your word that there will be a real chance for residents of Day and Euston Terrace affected by this overpass to minimise the loss of visual amenity caused by this facility. Having said that, and based on DPTI's track record, I am confident that DPTI will be able to identify and provide a solution to this issue which is satisfactory to the residents.	See Supplement Section 3.2.6 Rail overpass workshop, and Section 3.3.1 Urban design of Outer Harbor rail overpass.
<b>PS036</b>		
PS036.1	<p>On behalf of the residents of Day Terrace, Croydon bounded by South Road and Elizabeth Street I wish to confirm that we as a resident group supported the original proposal for the elevated rail corridor and the benefits that the undercroft active spaces created for the greater Croydon community. We as a resident group did not make written submissions previously as we accepted that the commitment shown by the DPTI to urban and concept design for open space would be a positive outcome for ourselves and the community.</p> <p>The revised proposal of the short rail overpass will have an immediate impact on the residents in the section of Day Terrace Croydon bounded by South Road and Elizabeth Street.</p>	Noted.
PS036.2	<p>The visual impact of a solid barrier embankment will transition the existing street scape which has been for many years a green environment with hedging softening and screening the rail corridor.</p> <p>The objective of consultation with Day Terrace residents adjacent to the overpass must be biased to achieving an agreement on urban and structural design guidelines that contractors must deliver to ensure the visual impact does not affect the quality of life and property values. I look forward to the DPTI delivering on a design that integrates with the surrounding environment and urban fabric, and other relevant design principles developed in conjunction with Croydon Station CLG and consultation in the subsequent street workshops.</p>	See Supplement Section 3.2.6 Rail overpass workshop and Section 3.3.1 Urban design of Outer Harbor rail overpass.
PS036.3	The removal of the street trees and screening during the construction and location of temporary bypass single rail track closer to the homes in Day Terrace will also have an	Since release of the PAR, DPTI project team members have held several meetings with residents of Day Terrace and Euston Terrace to discuss the design of the rail overpass, future

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>immediate visual impact.</p> <p>DPTI needs to communicate and inform the street residents how they will address and manage the disruption and noise generated by the construction and relocated train line, e.g. Will DPTI offer home owners sound proofing; will screening fences be erected during the 9 month construction period; will relocation expenses be paid when night work is carried out?</p>	<p>landscaping and the vegetation removals that may be required to facilitate construction. Street corner meetings have also been held to give local residents an opportunity to provide feedback on the project and seek further information.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management.</p>
PS036.4	<p>The issue of access to Day Terrace (east) from Elizabeth Street, due to traffic restriction at Croydon rail crossing, has been an ongoing subject between the residents and council for many years. Exit and access via this intersection is essential for Day Terrace residents as we avoid the high risk South Road intersection. Closure of Day Terrace at Elizabeth Street is not an option that residents would accept as previously reported to Council by petition. It is suggested that a 'local traffic only' notice be posted at Day Terrace at Elizabeth to deter the rat run of motorists using Queen Street and Day Terrace to short cut and avoid Port Road South Road. This restriction will dramatically reduce the volume of north bound turning right into Day Terrace off Elizabeth Street at the Croydon rail crossing to the occupants of only 10 homes.</p>	<p>With improved traffic flow on the surrounding arterial roads following the upgrade, non-local traffic using the Croydon road network, including Day Terrace, is expected to reduce.</p> <p>DPTI is working with Council to address traffic issues around the Queen Street–Elizabeth Street level crossing and balance the parking needs of the local businesses and access for residents of the wider Croydon area.</p>
PS036.5	<p>I support the proposal to provide left in/left out of Day Terrace onto the surface level South Road. I also support the installation of a U turn facility just north of Port Road to enable Croydon residents travelling South on South Road to gain access into Day Tce, Robert St, etc.</p>	Noted.
PS036.6	<p>Reference 6.4.2 Last line page 71 states 'Investigations into the need to upgrade the level crossing will be undertaken'</p> <p>You, the DPTI and Council, are hereby put on notice to act responsibly and with a duty of care for public safety to eliminate the problem of queuing, remove the constriction and provide priority of movement at the Croydon rail crossing.</p>	Noted.
PS036.7	<p>The scope of work to bring the short rail overpass back to grade at the Croydon rail crossing must include an upgrade of the crossing to eliminate the inherent safety risk by realigning the road and restoring the crossing road width back to at least the original 11 metre to facilitate the turn and egress lanes (north and south). The upgrade must eliminate the risk of queuing by meeting uniform and best engineering practices defined in AS1742.7 to</p>	<p>Road safety improvements at the Queen Street–Elizabeth Street level crossing are under investigation, and are included in the scope of the project.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	improve traffic flow in Queen and Elizabeth Street. Parking restriction, traffic control and management in Queen Street and Elizabeth Street is essential. Access to Queen Street from Port Road should be address as part of this traffic management review with reference made to the Council's third part consultation for Rail Crossing and Road Safety audits.	
PS036.8	Concern is also raised on how the DPTI will manage the 2800 vehicles per day traffic movements to and from Port Road via Queen Street and Croydon Rail Crossing and how this traffic movement at Port Road will be separated from the proposed Port Road hook turn lane designed to transfer northbound motorists east onto Port Road. It is envisaged that any proposal to combine the hook turn at the Port Road Queen Street intersection will further compound the traffic hazard at the Croydon rail crossing.	See Supplement Section 2.2 Port Road/Queen Street traffic signals.
PS036.9	DPTI must work with Council to ensure a responsible approached for a total solution that addresses both project requirements, local traffic issues and ongoing impact on the community.  I remain committed to assisting the DPTI successfully deliver this project in line with the resident wishes I represent.	Noted.
<b>PS037</b>		
PS037.1	<p>Intersection of Port Road and Bertie St</p> <p>The proposal illustrates a merge lane on Port Road which extends past the Bertie St intersection. I am concerned that this will pose safety risks regarding access and egress to Bertie St for a number of reasons.</p> <p>a) At the Port Road merge lane, traffic will be speeding up, while any traffic turning left into Bertie St is slowing down, possibly crossing the remaining merge lane to enter into Bertie St. I feel this is a significant safety issue. Will the bike lane be remaining here? If so this left turn will require negotiation of accelerating traffic, slowing or stopping to give way to bicycles and turning into Bertie St which has limited visibility from Port Road. This is an existing problem that I feel will be exacerbated by the proposal.</p> <p>b) Bertie St is currently congested at the Port Road intersection, primarily due to customer parking for City Mazda 6 days per week, and truck parking from Avis 7 days per week. Additionally, traffic is travelling relatively fast down Bertie St toward the intersection. There are many near misses in the current situation,</p>	The location of the merge lane in relation to Bertie Street will be reviewed as part of the detailed design process.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>and the proposed merge lane will be an additional risk.</p> <p>My preference would be that this merge lane does not continue past the Bertie St intersection. In the event this is not possible, I feel at a minimum, parking on the eastern side of Bertie St needs to be restricted.</p>	
PS037.2	<p>Restriction of right hand turn at intersection of South Road and Port Road</p> <p>The restriction on right turns at the Port Road and South Road intersection will be a significant inconvenience for the residents of Croydon and West Hindmarsh. Access to our local streets is already difficult enough due to the limited right turns from Port Road due to the median, and from the rest of South Road once the trench is created.</p> <p>Another problem is the concept of the U-turn lanes in the median of Port Road. These lanes will reduce the amenity of the area for local residents and pedestrians. For example, it will make it difficult for pedestrians to cross Port Road from near Mazda in order to reach the city bound bus stop. There is also the issue of the extra traffic and associated noise and pollution.</p> <p>My preference is that a design solution be found that allows regulation right hand turns at the intersection of South Road and Port Road (as per the ANZAC highway intersection for example, or as per the original South Road proposal).</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements and Section 2.2 Port Road/Queen Street traffic signals.</p> <p>The traffic signals at Queen Street will provide for safer pedestrian access across Port Road.</p>
PS037.3	<p>Removal of Bike Lane</p> <p>It is disappointing to see that the bike/pedestrian path from the original proposal has been removed. Given that \$70 million has apparently been saved by avoiding removal of the substation, it was peculiar to hear at the open day that the bikeway was removed due to a 'value analysis'. As a daily cyclist in the area, I (and many other residents) value this sort of thing very much!</p> <p>The plan to mark a bike lane through the back streets of West Hindmarsh instead does not offer anything that is not currently available – in fact it will be worse if the extra bridge is built across the Torrens River, due to extra traffic on the back streets south of Grange Road.</p> <p>I believe that without the bike lanes, the current proposal is not consistent with the aims of <i>The 30-year plan for Greater Adelaide</i>. The South</p>	<p>On-road bicycle lanes will be included along the length of the project.</p> <p>An off-road shared use path will be constructed on South Road, north of Port Road. South of Port Road, there is insufficient road reserve for an off-road path.</p> <p>A new bridge across the River Torrens will link West Hindmarsh with Torrensville for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.</p> <p>Council and DPTI will work together to determine the best local road route to link the River Torrens Linear Park and the Outer Harbor Greenway for recreational cyclists.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Road corridor is a publicly owned resource that should facilitate the efficient movement of people (not exclusively just motor vehicles).	
<b>PS038</b>		
PS038.1	<p>Myself and my wife have recently started attending church at St Barnabas in Croydon. The church has been renovated to become a more modern and usable space, not only for the growing church community, but for the wider Croydon community as well. Having spent a good amount of time in the surrounding streets and nearby cafes, we've loved the community atmosphere of the Croydon area. We think that there would be good ways to nurture and enhance this fantastic community atmosphere in considering how some of the land around St Barnabas is developed.</p> <p>In particular, it could be great to develop some of the land nearby the church (opposite) into a community space, potentially with a playground. Not only would it be great for the church community, but it would serve the local Croydon community in providing another convenient space for families to gather and for children to play.</p>	See Supplement Section 3.3.3 Community park on the corner of William Street and Elizabeth Street.
PS038.2	To make a community common area/playground be even more effective, it would be worth considering blocking off the South Road access to William Street. This could allow for more car parking space (good for common area and church) and easier access for pedestrians.	See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local road access at Cedar Avenue and William Street, Croydon.
<b>PS039</b>		
PS039.1	<p>I would like to contribute a few recommendations with regard to what is otherwise an excellent infrastructure proposal for the Torrens to Torrens South Road Upgrade and the Croydon neighbourhood.</p> <p>The consultation has been considerable and myself and other Croydon residents appreciate having our views heard, so that we now will retain the character nature of our precinct, without a massive concrete structure through the middle of it. The coming to grade option for the Queen St railway station was the result of considerable effort and negotiation by the design team. The traffic and transport issues I feel still require addressing are:</p> <p>Residents and visitors to the area require a right hand turn on and off South Road from Port Road in both directions. The shopping precinct, the R-12 Islamic school in Croydon and residential</p>	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	traffic flowing in and out of the suburb can not be accommodated without right hand these turns.	
PS039.2	It is essential that the bike path/greenway continue past South Road, Ridleyton, to the city. The off ramp is essential for local commuting but cyclists and walkers need the option of a path going straight ahead to the city. An efficient route will encourage cyclists (so less traffic) and inefficient route (down ramps and local streets) will discourage cyclists. The greenway will work best if it's an efficient commuting route.	See Supplement Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway.  DPTI intends to continue the greenway path within the rail corridor on the eastern side of South Road through to Coglin Street.  An access ramp will also be provided to South Road to cater for users wanting to access the local area.
<b>PS040</b>		
PS040.1	My husband and I own and live in a property on McInnes Street, Ridleyton. We are primarily concerned with the following:  The additional noise that will be created by raising the train line at the back of our property. Will this also cause additional vibration/ground movement?	See Supplement Section 3.4.2. Operational noise assessment.  A comprehensive noise and vibration assessment will be carried out over the detailed design phase of the project, where the effects on all sensitive dwellings within the project assessment area will be assessed.  See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management.  Noise and vibration mitigation measures will then be identified and designed as required. Note that raising the train line is not likely to cause additional vibration due to train movements. However, some vibration/ground movement might be felt during construction of the rail overpass. A construction noise and vibration management plan will be developed with the intent to minimise excessive noise and vibration nuisance where practicable.
PS040.2	Are there plans to electrify the Outer Harbor/Grange train lines?	The draft <i>Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i> proposes a future conversion from diesel heavy rail (passenger trains) to electrified light rail (trams) along the Outer Harbor rail line.  The timing and funding of this electrification work has not been determined.
PS040.3	The aesthetics of the raised train line section – what will this look like from our backyard? Is it just a plain, concrete monstrosity or are there plans to at least paint sections of it/include artwork etc?	DPTI has been working with residents of Day Terrace and Euston Terrace to develop an appropriate urban design concept for the Outer Harbor rail overpass embankment and associated pedestrian bridge structure.  The embankment on the eastern side of South Road is likely to be a complementary but simplified version of what would be constructed on the Day Terrace and Euston Terrace side. This is due to the predominantly commercial and industrial land use in that section of Hindmarsh, Ridleyton and Brompton. Urban design elements of the rail overpass will be further developed by

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
		the construction contractor during the detailed design phase.
PS040.4	The height of the raised section of train line – how much sunlight will we lose as a result? We are neighboured by two tilt up warehouses on McInnes Street and struggle to get much light into our backyard as it is.	<p>The rail overpass embankment is expected to be approximately 5 metres high adjacent to your property and some overshadowing is likely to occur, particularly during winter.</p> <p>The design of the rail overpass will be developed further during the detailed design phase of the project.</p>
PS040.5	The safety/lighting etc. of the pedestrian crossing across South Road to the Croydon train station – as a female that uses the train at least 5 days a week x 2 times a day, I am obviously concerned about safety – not only along the raised walkway but along McInnes and surrounding streets after you exit the walkway on the South Road/McInnes Street corner. Both McInnes Street and Wood Avenue are very badly lit at present (an ongoing problem) with people also dumping wood, rubbish etc. along the side of the roads – this is extremely dangerous at times due to the lack of adequate street lighting in the area.	<p>Any new pedestrian facilities constructed as part of the project (including bridges, shared paths and footpaths) will be lit in accordance with <i>AS 1158: Lighting for Roads and Public Spaces</i>.</p> <p>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles will be incorporated into all elements of the design to ensure a safe environment is created for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Street lighting on McInnes Street and Wood Avenue is the responsibility of the City of Charles Sturt and is not proposed to be upgraded as part of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project.</p>
PS040.6	When looking at the fly over video, it seems strange to have a zigzagged, long walkway up to the train line – as a regular commuter, this style of walkway is a time-waster when trying to get to the train station or home quickly. Provide easy, quick, safe access. I cannot see how there will be enough commuter-traffic to justify such a long walkway up to the raised train line. Croydon station is not that busy a station, even at peak times. The majority of people using the station live in the Croydon area and will not be using this walkway.	<p>The design of the ramp on the eastern side of the rail overpass will depend on achieving the necessary gradients for Disability Discrimination Act requirements within the space available.</p> <p>The overpass pedestrian bridge and ramp design will be refined further during the detailed design phase and will reflect the urban design theme developed for all infrastructure elements in the corridor.</p>
PS040.7	Additional train commuter/pedestrian traffic and the potential for this to add to the issues we already have in the area with graffiti/rubbish/property damage/crime etc.	<p>The Torrens Road to River Torrens Project (including the rail overpass and adjacent paths) will be designed in accordance with CPTED principles.</p> <p>CPTED involves the application of a range of design initiatives and principles to an area or site to minimise the potential for that site to facilitate or support criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Careful consideration will be given to the following elements to ensure opportunities for criminal behaviour are minimised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• overall layout and visual appearance of the area</li> <li>• design, positioning and materials used for</li> </ul>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
		<p>physical structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lighting and landscaping</li> <li>• interaction and encouragement of legitimate activities of the space</li> <li>• ongoing maintenance of all project aspects.</li> </ul> <p>The passive surveillance that additional commuter, pedestrian and cyclist activity in this area will provide may also serve to discourage criminal activity.</p>
PS040.8	Pollution levels – how will the pollution levels created by additional vehicles using South Road be dealt with?	The air quality assessment process is outlined in PAR Chapter 16. Additional air quality assessments will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.
PS040.9	Are you adding garden beds/trees etc. in the area? Earlier releases made the area look much more attractive/green and also much more pedestrian/cyclist-friendly than the current version.	<p>Landscaping (with trees, shrubs and understorey plants) will be incorporated wherever space permits within the South Road corridor, and along Euston Terrace and Day Terrace. Several small parklet areas will also be created as part of the project to provide additional green open space for the community.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design, Figures 3.4–3.6.</p> <p>Road safety and future extension of the project will also determine the type of landscaping that can be installed.</p> <p>Low maintenance treatments will be used to minimise ongoing maintenance costs for DPTI and local councils.</p>
PS040.10	The cyclist route that opened up recently will need to be changed and appropriate signs/road painting removed.	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.5 Outer Harbor Greenway.</p> <p>Changes to the Outer Harbor Greenway and the necessary signage changes will be included in the project.</p>
PS040.11	McInnes Street, Wood Avenue, First Avenue, Coglin Street – there will be a lot more traffic using these roads to get into the Ridleyton/Brompton/Bowden areas. Are surrounding streets being upgraded (a number of streets are badly damaged/full of potholes etc. with extremely limited spending by the council on the roads, gutters, pathways for many years now).	<p>With the changes to the local access, redirected local traffic is expected to use Wood Avenue, First Avenue and Coglin Street.</p> <p>With improved traffic flow on the surrounding arterial roads following the upgrade, non-local traffic currently using these roads is expected to reduce.</p> <p>Council and DPTI will work together to determine the existing condition of Council assets and the impact caused by the project.</p>
PS040.12	We currently live on McInnes Street, Ridleyton and I cannot now see how we can walk over South Road to get to Croydon station. Also, how will I get to my street if I'm travelling north on	Pedestrians and cyclists will be able to cross South Road using a dedicated overpass structure attached to the Outer Harbor Rail Bridge.



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	South Road?	<p>To access McInnes Street when travelling north on South Road, you have two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• turn left onto Port Road and use the U-turn facility to head east on Port Road, turn left into Coglein Street then left into First Street and McInnes Street</li> <li>• turn right at Hawker Street, turn right at Wood Avenue and turn right into McInnes Street.</li> </ul>
<b>PS041</b>		
PS041.1	<p>I am very concerned that, in order to create a non-stop North-South Freight Corridor, that the Ridleyton and Croydon community is being divided through insufficient pedestrian, cycling and vehicle linkages.</p> <p>Many Croydon residents shop at the Foodland Supermarket on the corner of Hawker and South Roads and access to these shops must be maintained.</p> <p>To remedy this situation I would like to see more pedestrian/bike crossovers than are currently planned to facilitate un-impeded crossing of South Road.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p> <p>Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.</p> <p>The project team is aware of the local community concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist access across the North–South Corridor. Pedestrian and cyclist links will be provided at the signalised intersections and at the Outer Harbor rail overpass as part of the greenway.</p>
PS041.2	<p>Currently, the Bowden/Brompton/Ridleyton and Croydon/Croydon West community have very close friendships and often work together on Community projects like National Tree Day, public art projects and visiting friends.</p> <p>Quite a number of Croydon residents have garden plots in the Brompton Community Garden and hence many strong friendships exist between the ‘two sides’ of South Road.</p>	<p>DPTI is keen to work with the local community to develop appropriate public art and design projects which could be incorporated as part of the project.</p>
PS041.3	<p>Furthermore, it is imperative that public art projects, reflecting the strong community ties, are initiated to embellish the sound walls.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.1 Design and location of noise barriers.</p>
PS041.4	<p>More open space must be created in Croydon by utilising vacant land left between the sound wall and existing residents.</p> <p>Create strong access from Ridleyton/Brompton to Queen Street and the Croydon Railway station.</p> <p>The sense of community is very strong in this area and every effort needs to be made to maintain this.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design, Figures 3.4–3.6.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
<b>PS042</b>		
PS042.1	<p>My submission regarding the Torrens Rd to River Torrens Project is in specific relation to the design of the South Rd/Port Rd intersection; specifically that southbound traffic on South Rd will not be able to turn right into Port Rd without first turning left onto Port Rd, heading towards the city for a short distance then making a U-turn on Port Rd in order to continue the intended journey in a 'westerly' direction along Port Rd.</p> <p>The lack of the turn right lane onto Port Rd appears to stem from the impact of the footprint of the existing SAPN Croydon substation on the NW corner of the existing intersection.</p> <p>This design appears shortsighted and unable to be reworked once the substation is eventually rebuilt, which will occur at some stage in the coming decades when the existing SAPN infrastructure reaches the end of its useful life.</p> <p>The current design incorporating the U-turn system adds additional congestion, reduces the clear and timely flow of vehicles through the intersection, creates multiple events whereby the same vehicle adds to the congestion of the intersection, and removes green space in the centre of Port Rd.</p>	<p>The proposal to bypass the electrical substation is not related to removing the right turns from South Road into Port Road. Refinement of the concept design has shown that shifting the alignment to the east has reduced the level of risk to project delivery. It is estimated that the construction time will be reduced by one year, resulting in less impact on the local community.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>
PS042.2	<p>The existing substation is decades old. It would not need to be completely rebuilt in order to make way for the perfect road design (which would have the ability to turn right onto Port Rd). Some parts of the substation could be shifted and rebuilt (replaced where this is more economic) on land to become vacant immediately to the north of the existing substation site. Whether the T–T Project pays for this work or whether SAPN can recoup the cost from its network charges incorporated into the retail prices for electricity consumers is a matter that could be considered.</p> <p>If the proposed design proceeds and, one day, the substation is rebuilt (which is inevitable or should be made to become inevitable) on a more N–S footprint further to the west and using the vacant land to the north, the location of the South Rd underpass under Port Rd will already be fixed (as will the width of the eastern ground level lanes on South Rd heading south), which will mean that the turn right lanes will not be able to be retrofitted.</p> <p>The government should take the opportunity to create this intersection properly for future</p>	<p>SA Power Network is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the substation and any future replacement or rebuild that may be required.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	generations and not leave a legacy that is flawed.	
<b>PS043</b>		
PS043.1	<p>This submission addresses the proposed Torrens Road to River Torrens Upgrade as part of the North–South Corridor project. The Community Alliance SA would like to make the following points on the lack of publicly available information and inadequate community engagement in the planning process for the project:</p> <p>There is no public evidence of a rigorous investigation of alternatives for dealing with congestion and increasing traffic levels on South Road e.g. improving and making use of other roads as a network for greater dispersal of traffic, developing an alternative route for freight, improving public transport, introducing schemes to encourage people to live closer to their employment, or a combination of approaches.</p> <p>The Community Alliance wants to see publicly available reports on alternative proposals to the North–South Corridor proposal with the research and analysis open to public and expert scrutiny.</p>	<p>Planning studies have investigated the benefits of a North–South Corridor and a number of options for how such a corridor might be achieved.</p> <p>The findings of these planning studies will continue to be confidential to ensure that no unnecessary impact occurs on properties located along any of the many alignment options investigated.</p>
PS043.2	<p>No alternative ways of upgrading the road have been presented to the public such as placing the corridor, or sections thereof, in a tunnel, elevating the road, building a lowered road that is capped, or designing the expressway for a lower traffic speed. Tunnels and capping could allow parks or other high amenity areas to be developed over the road at ground level. Unlike the current plans, these would maintain or increase the neighbourhood connectivity and property values, and attract investment. They would also mitigate the negative aspects of a surface freeway corridor such as levels of higher crime, increased traffic fatalities and increased vacant properties.</p> <p>The public needs to be given the opportunity to review the pros and cons of alternative ways of upgrading the road.</p>	See response to PS043.1
PS043.3	<p>The need for the upgraded road as proposed is unclear. As far as we are aware, the figures for future traffic levels have been released without the public seeing what assumptions these are based on (e.g. population increases, induced demands and modeling for commuter, freight traffic and other traffic). It is also not clear how the high number of short trips currently made on South Road will be accommodated.</p>	<p>Traffic modelling and volumes are based on the population projections outlined in <i>The 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide</i>.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Furthermore, there is no available information on what future levels of congestion are expected i.e. at what point congestion on the upgraded road will reach today's levels, and what plans there are for when that occurs.</p> <p>The traffic modeling reports and assumptions made need to be made available and open to public scrutiny.</p>	
PS043.4	<p>Most worryingly, the North–South Corridor is being planned section by section and the merits of and financial costs for the project as a whole are unclear. As we understand it, no business case or benefit cost analysis for the project has been presented for evaluation by Infrastructure Australia, nor are they publicly available.</p> <p>A business case and benefit cost analysis for the North–South Corridor need to be provided publicly and to Infrastructure Australia for evaluation as soon as possible.</p>	<p>The business cases for North–South Corridor projects are not for public release. The business case for the Torrens Road to River Torrens project was completed and submitted to Infrastructure Australia in August 2012 and supplementary papers submitted in December 2012. This showed the proposed project from Torrens Road to the River Torrens to have a benefit cost ratio of 2.4. The submissions to Infrastructure Australia are confidential documents and will not be publically released. The content of these documents would release sensitive information that could be misleading to future construction bids as part of the procurement process for the project.</p>
PS043.5	<p>It appears that community connectivity is being considered at the end of the planning process, rather than at the beginning. This is particularly a problem as the upgrade of the corridor is being considered section by section and not in a comprehensive way. As a consequence, the South Road upgrade proposal doesn't adequately address the critical issue of allowing people to get around in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>The best way to address community connectivity is to give communities the opportunity to review the pros and cons of alternative ways of upgrading the road (as in the second dot point).</p>	<p>Community and stakeholder engagement began in February 2011 when the South Road Planning Study was undertaken. During that study, a number of open days were held and a survey was undertaken to determine community needs and preferences. All the businesses fronting South Road within the study area were also interviewed in order to get a better understanding of their needs and views. Since the study, community and stakeholder engagement has continued and has fed into the decision making. The chosen solution was the result of many years of community and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Community engagement activities will continue through all phases of the project.</p>
PS043.6	<p>The overall view of the Community Alliance is that public consultation is occurring too late in the planning process with the public excluded from considering vital information and not being consulted on other options. This leaves community members with little faith that their views will change anything but minor details. This is a major flaw throughout Adelaide's planning system, which is currently dominated by politics and engineering needs with little consideration given to the social, environmental and economic implications. This is not planning for the people of Adelaide.</p>	<p>See to response for PS043.5.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
<b>PS044</b>		
PS044.1	<p>While I understand the importance of South Road to the function of our city and economy, I can not help but feel that the designers have had insufficient regard for the integration of the road upgrade with the local community and the way in which people of the inner west move around our neighbourhood. The concept as it stands appears to only have a focus on north–south vehicular traffic movements and very little consideration and inclusion for convenient movements from east–west be it by vehicle, foot or bicycle. There are some token gestures made to providing pedestrian links at intersections (which should be a bare minimum) and some cycle provision for north south trip.</p>	<p>Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.</p> <p>The project team is aware of the local community concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist access across the North–South Corridor. Pedestrian and cyclist links will be provided at the signalised intersections and at the Outer Harbor rail overpass as part of the greenway.</p>
PS044.2	<p>As a resident of Bowden I frequently travel (mainly by car but sometimes by bicycle) to local facilities on the western side of South Road. These include my doctor's rooms in Croydon, the local shops in Queen St–Elizabeth Street Croydon, Welland Shopping Centre, Officeworks, Dan Murphy's etc. Also, I regularly travel further west to Port Adelaide, Semaphore and West Lakes to visit family members, friends and for coastal activities. Given other recent changes to the local transport network that have removed the ability for to turn right from my street to Port Road or right onto Park Terrace from Sixth Street Bowden and the near constant level crossing road blocks at Hawker Street, I tend use either Chief Street/Port Road or South Road/Port Road intersection in order to commence a journey to the western suburbs. The current concept plan preventing right turns onto Port Road and requiring motorists to do a U-turn seems somewhat of a backward and ill thought idea. If I am reading the limited information correctly, I will also not be able to take a direct route from across South Road to Croydon (for example to go from my doctor's to the chemist, which are less than 100 metres apart but separated by South Road just south of Hawker Street. Will I be able to conveniently ride my bike across South Road near the Hawker Street intersection and onto the award wining Queen Street precinct?</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>The design of the South Road/Hawker Street–Hurtle Street intersection will be amended during the detailed design phase to cater for cyclist and pedestrian movements between Hurtle Street and Hawker Street. All existing traffic movements to and from Hawker Street to the surface road will still be able to occur.</p>
PS044.3	<p>I ask that the needs of local residents be considered more carefully and clear information provided. I currently feel connected with the Croydon community on the west of South Road but fear that the current concept plan will permanently and negatively bring about a great</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.2 Community engagement following release of the Project Assessment Report.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>divide.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving further information and hopefully feeling reassured that another piece of State Infrastructure is not going to further sever and frustrate the residents of the inner west.</p>	
<b>PS045</b>		
PS045.1	<p>One of the things that attracted me to purchase a property in Hurtle Street is that it is a very quiet street where traffic is generally confined to residents of the street. People from outside of the street rarely drive through Hurtle Street because access to South Road is very limited (i.e. cars cannot exit right onto South Road or enter from South Road) and for the limited access to South Road that is available from Hurtle Street, there are many other streets within Croydon that offer that type of access and more (e.g. Dartmouth St, Bedord St, William St, Henry St, Robert St).</p> <p>Hurtle Street is therefore a very quiet street that is used by very few people other than those who live in the street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Access to Hurtle Street is currently left turn in only.</p>
PS045.2	<p>I understand that the Torrens-to-Torrens upgrade involves a proposal to redesign access to Croydon, from South Road. In particular, Hurtle Street would be designed to allow for a right turn onto South Road.</p> <p>I am concerned that this proposal (which will make Hurtle Street the only South Road exit from Croydon) will concentrate and channel traffic into Hurtle Street.</p> <p>My concern is that Hurtle Street will be transformed from one of the quietest streets in Croydon, to one of the busiest. This is a concern because of the impact of increased noise and traffic on my quiet and peaceful enjoyment of my house and the safety of my young child, but also because of the potential negative impact on the value of my house.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the efforts the government is making to upgrade critical state infrastructure (namely to the North–South Road Corridor), I am worried that I, as a resident of Hurtle Street, will bear significant negative consequences.</p>	<p>All turning movements were initially proposed at the Hurtle Street intersection. Following concerns from individual community members and the Community Liaison Group regarding increased traffic movements on Hurtle Street, access was modified to right turn out only. Right turn out at Hurtle Street, together with left in/left out at other local roads and right turn in access via Torrens Road and Ellen Street, provides sufficient access to the local area.</p>
PS045.3	<p>My experience living in Croydon is that, during peak times, most residents currently exit the suburb onto Port Road (via Queen Street) or onto Torrens Road (via Ellen Street).</p> <p>I wonder whether it would be possible to</p>	<p>Under a situation where there would be no right turn access from Croydon directly onto South Road, all right turn movements from the local area would be redirected via Queen Street onto Port Road or via Ellen Street onto Torrens Road,</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>proceed without any access from Croydon onto South Road? Entry and exit from the suburb could continue to be via the existing Port Road and Torrens Road access routes.</p> <p>After all, Hurtle Street is only 500 metres or thereabouts from the Torrens Rd/South Rd intersection. It would add very little time to people's travel.</p>	further increasing traffic volumes on these roads.
PS045.4	If plans for the redesign of the South Road/Hurtle Street intersection proceed in their current form, is there any channel through which I can seek compensation from the State Government if it can be established that there has been a negative impact on the value of my house?	<p>Compensation is not available for properties indirectly affected by a project.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.5.1 Property values.</p>
PS045.5	Has there been any consideration of the potential for idle traffic to build-up along Hurtle Street (to the point where the traffic congests the street and makes it difficult for residents to exit their driveways) whilst cars are waiting for traffic lights to change? I have previously lived near Galway Avenue in Collinswood (which is the primary access route to North East Road) and I have witnessed how traffic can build up along a street whilst waiting for traffic lights.	The signalised right turn out at Hurtle Street is intended to provide safe egress for local traffic movements. The expected demand is not expected to generate long queues and DPTI will work with Council to minimise non-local traffic travelling through the local area. The signal operation can also be modified to minimise any queuing on Hurtle Street.
PS045.6	I would greatly appreciate any efforts you can make to avoid Hurtle Street being the only South Road exit from Croydon, and thereby avoid the consequences of Hurtle Street being transformed from one of the quietest streets to one of the busiest. I would also appreciate your advice on the questions I have raised.	Following consultation with the community, the project team worked collaboratively with both the Community Liaison Group and Council to develop a local access arrangement where the redirected traffic is distributed as evenly as possible throughout the local network, while also maintaining an adequate level of access.
<b>PS046</b>		
PS046.1	I am not a regular user of the Torrens Road to River Torrens section of South Road, but I am a resident of the area. I am therefore concerned about the disruption that may be caused when the works commence. I understand there is a proposed option to construct an auxiliary train line to facilitate continued rail operations.	The T2T Alliance are working on a construction methodology to ensure minimal disruption to residents and commuters.
PS046.2	<p>Chiefly, my submission is that DPTI should, throughout the course of the upgrade:</p> <p>Monitor and report changes in traffic volumes on (local) neighbourhood streets, particularly Elizabeth Street, Croydon, and Rosetta Street, West Croydon.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.</p>
PS046.3	Publish forecast allowable changes in traffic volume in neighbourhood streets, so that a comparison may be made.	See Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
PS046.4	Do everything possible to continue rail services operating on the Outer Harbor/Grange Line to the city.	The T2T Alliance are working on a construction methodology to ensure minimal disruption to residents and commuters.
PS046.5	Report through a subscription service (SMS, email, website, etc.) the levels of congestion (forecast and actual) caused by works, so that busy intersections may be avoided.	Noted. Possibilities are being investigated.
PS046.6	<p>The key is communication, regular communication. I expect to know, in almost real time, when the works are having an effect on traffic flow beyond that forecast or allowed by the project. A weekly or monthly report of traffic volumes on local streets and a statement regarding whether the incursion level was expected, along with the cause, should be made available so that any criticism of project performance is well informed.</p> <p>If I knew where and when traffic was becoming congested due to works, I would do my best to avoid that area. Working together in this respect will allow fewer incidents that may cause disruption, resentment or criticism. Today, it is not unreasonable to experience communication on a personal level for this purpose, instead of roadside signs informing you that you are in a traffic jam due to works.</p>	Noted. Possibilities are being investigated.
PS046.7	As a regular user of the train line, I am very interested that the rail service continue throughout the upgrade. If that means that DPTI must fund construction of an auxiliary line, then that should be done and placed as a high priority.	See response to PS046.4.
<b>PS047</b>		
PS047.1	<p>My property is the only one I have seen in the plan that is so close to the barrier fencing that it would intersect our home if it didn't change path.</p> <p>We abut South Road and face it. The barrier will capture north–south traffic and ram it down our property because the barrier has to turn back toward South Road. The sound travelling through our property will be atrocious.</p> <p>We will have no parking out the front. We have 2 cars and 1 boat. Our two other neighbours have multiple cars. This will turn Henry Street into a mess because it is a narrow street and there will be times of traffic build-up. Our driveway will be unsafe as it appears cars will be able to turn into Henry Street at speed.</p>	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration. DPTI staff will be in contact with you to discuss the proposed design and location of the noise barrier.
PS047.2	There is no evidence of front fencing to affected properties.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	I already suffer significant privacy issues now that neighbouring houses have been demolished. So, I now have the added expense of needing curtains to reduce noise and give privacy to my bedroom during the commencement of works.	Front fencing will be provided to properties where noise modelling shows it to be required.  New noise barriers to be installed on the western side of South Road will restore privacy to properties that have been exposed to South Road following demolition of acquired properties.
<b>PS048</b>		
PS048.1	Noise – noise wall to be joined end of Cedar Avenue/Elizabeth Street (former church site).  Definitely close Cedar Avenue end at South Road.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.  See Supplement Section 2.1.3 Local access at Cedar Avenue and William Street Croydon.
PS048.2	Intersection of Queen Street and Port Road to be considered either install traffic signals.	See Supplement Section 2.2 Port Road/Queen Street traffic signals.
PS048.3	Croyden train station to be upgraded especially the access on the south platform.	An upgrade of the Croydon Station is not currently being considered as part of the Torrens Road to River Torrens Project.  <i>The draft Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i> proposes a future conversion from diesel heavy rail (passenger trains) to electrified light rail (trams) along the Outer Harbor rail line. Croydon Station would need to be upgraded in future in order to accommodate electrified light rail.
<b>PS049</b>		
PS049.1	Prefer Hurtle Street–Hawker Street intersection to be as one intersection as per original concept. No stop lights at all just before underpass. No turning at all at Hindmarsh Avenue.	All turning movements were initially proposed at the Hurtle Street intersection. Following concerns from individual community members and the Community Liaison Group regarding increased traffic movements on Hurtle Street, access was modified to right turn out only. Right turn out at Hurtle Street, together with left in/left out at other local roads and right turn in access via Torrens Road and Ellen Street, provides sufficient access to the local area.  See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.
PS049.2	From Ashwin Parade to Hindmarsh Avenue – is that TBC?	This section of road will be addressed in future stages of the North–South Corridor. The upgrades on this section as part of the Torrens Road to River Torrens scope have been undertaken to facilitate efficient access to and from the remainder of the project area.
PS049.3	Future plans for going from Torrens Road to Regency Road?	This section of road will be addressed in future stages of the North–South Corridor.
PS049.4	In most cases the revised plan makes more sense than the original, having said that,	This section of road will be addressed in future stages of the North–South Corridor.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	properties right up to the River Torrens should have been acquired.	
PS049.5	The pedestrian crossing before the underpass should not be there.	See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street and Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing South of Hawker Street.
<b>PS051</b>		
PS051.1	<p>We have a child who is currently in year 5 at school, the project is expected to be completed in 2018, during the construction phase of this project our child will be in years 6, 7, 8 and 9. Chapter 3 of the report states that <i>The Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan</i>, Planning strategy for South Australia and Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia support the seven strategic priorities identified by the South Australian Government to guide all other government initiatives. One of these seven priorities is stated as 'every chance for every child'.</p> <p>We believe the construction plan will need to include measures to ensure that our child's chance at the very least is not compromised by the construction phase of this project. Note, our bedrooms and study areas will now be less than 10 metres away from significant works at the intersection of Grange and South Road.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Community Engagement team is available to address concerns and can be contacted by:</p> <p>calling: 1300 794 899</p> <p>emailing: DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au</p>
PS051.2	<p>What is the most likely time frame for these services to be disrupted, i.e. not available?</p> <p>Sewer relocation was not mentioned in this list. What alternative arrangements will be put in place during these periods?</p> <p>Phone service disruption will need to be minimised due to health issues.</p> <p>Ongoing disruption of internet services will be an issue as this service is a necessary component of high school studies.</p>	<p>Utility services will be affected at different times throughout the project, depending on the staging of the works. Cutover from old to new utility services is typically when outages occur. Timing and duration of outages vary but considerations include seasonal, time of day, duration needed to complete work and customers impacted. Notifications from the service authority will typically be provided before an outage.</p> <p>Sewer relocations will occur. However, when relocation of the sewer main is being undertaken, the sewer is typically still able to be used as it is maintained by temporary pumping. Where works are required to happen on the sewer connection (reconnection from a property to new or existing main), then people may be asked to refrain from flushing the toilet for short periods (e.g. a few hours). Property owners/occupants will be contacted before outages.</p> <p>Telephone outages will be needed; however, all outages are minimised as much as possible.</p> <p>Ongoing disruption to internet services is not expected; however, there may be some outages</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
		as above.
PS051.3	We have been directly affected by the property acquisition of our neighbours. The boundary of our property, which is currently more than 60 metres from South Road, will be at the intersection of two major roads.	Noted.
PS051.4	While our property is not Heritage Listed, it is listed in the Charles Sturt Council development plan (p. 396, Heritage NR 11200) as being a contributing item.	Noted.
PS051.5	We understand from information provided at the open day that we should expect the department to contact us and install noise mitigation measures to our property as an attempt to mitigate some of the construction noise.	See Supplement Section 3.4.2 Operational noise assessment.
PS051.6	As we will be within 10 metres of the South Road/Grange Road works, we request a building condition inspection prior to any further works being undertaken.  We also believe that it would be appropriate for DPTI to consider funding an inspection by an 'independent' inspector.	See Supplement Section 3.4.4 Property Condition Assessments.  Property condition assessments will be undertaken by an appropriately qualified engineer/builder. As part of the process, DPTI will engage a company specialised in undertaking these type of assessments. The property condition assessment report can be provided to the property owner upon request.
PS051.7	Noise monitoring for Grange Road–Manton Street crossing of South Road was conducted on Manton Street; however, B-double movement is from South Road, then along Grange Road, not Manton Street. It is anticipated that, if the noise monitoring had been conducted on Grange Road as opposed to Manton Street, that the results may have been higher, especially at night from B-doubles accelerating from the intersection. Given the changed nature of the plan, consideration should be given for additional testing at more relevant locations.	See Supplement Section 3.4.2 Operational noise assessment.  Comprehensive noise modelling will be carried out during the detailed design phase of the project. The noise modelling will take into account the changed traffic conditions at all noise sensitive locations affected by the project. Further noise level measurements will be carried out, as required, to validate the noise modelling outputs.
PS051.8	Given the change to the plan now has our property closest to the source, what was the expected vibration level for our property and how close was this to the nuisance guideline levels? We request additional modelling with the new plan parameters.	See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management.  A vibration assessment will be carried out over the detailed design phase of the project, where the effects on all sensitive dwellings within the project assessment area will be assessed.
PS051.9	How many vehicle movements per day was this based on? (i.e. the 31,700 to 51,000 or the designed flow of 113,000?)  Has there been a study done to predict the air quality around Grange Road and South Road, with the 'aerodynamic' influences of the at grade fly-over etc.	The air quality assessment process is outlined in PAR Chapter 16. The assessment was based on the future projected traffic volumes.  Additional air quality assessments will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Note: residents at our property have significant health issues, pertaining to asthma and allergies.	
PS051.10	There is no mention of the expected change to soil moisture content near the road corridor and the effect this will have on soil suction characteristic and its resulting impact on the foundations of properties close to the corridor.	The lowered road is being constructed above the permanent watertable, so impacts are considered to be unlikely. Geotechnical testing has identified the soils in this area as not as reactive as those in other parts of metropolitan Adelaide.
PS051.11	<p>We have a child who is currently in year 5 at school, the project is expected to be completed in 2018, during the construction phase of this project, our child will be in years 6, 7, 8 and 9. These are critical years of schooling, what measures will be put into place to ensure our child is not disadvantaged from the construction works, given his bedroom / study will be less than 10 metres from the South Road and Grange Road intersection works?</p> <p>Will electricity/phone/internet services be guaranteed?</p> <p>What noise mitigation measures will be in place during construction?</p> <p>What access will tutors have to our property?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Community Engagement team is available to address concerns and can be contacted by calling: 1300 794 899</p> <p>emailing: DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au</p>
PS051.12	The contractors will need to be made aware of our situation so they can make provisions in-line with the items raised above	Noted.
PS051.13	<p>Our property is shown to be within the largest noise level contour, does this mean we should expect additional noise mitigation measures to be implemented?</p> <p>What are these measures?</p> <p>When will residents be consulted?</p> <p>Will the community consultation group have input into what is 'reasonable and practical'?</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.2 Operational noise assessment.</p> <p>The noise levels contours shown in the PAR were the predicted noise levels without noise mitigation being applied. With noise mitigation installed as part of the project, noise levels will be reduced.</p> <p>Property owners eligible to receive noise treatment will be consulted to discuss specific property treatments where affected. Consultation will occur at key stages over the course of the detailed design phase.</p>
PS051.14	<p>The project assessment report indicates that the expectation, based on measurements at Kurralta Park, that the traffic vibration levels will be in levels of human annoyance (which is reported as a peak particle velocity of 0.2 mm/s).</p> <p>However the data provided for Kurralta Park was 0.14, with no traffic in the merging lane, at a distance of 10 metres.</p> <p>The concern as the vibration relates to our</p>	Vibration will be assessed further during the detailed design phase of the project. However, generated vibration due to trucks travelling over irregularities in the road surface will be minimised where possible.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>property from traffic is; B-doubles will use this roadway. The vibration effect of B-doubles travelling south along South Road and turning right onto Grange Road on the 'bridge at grade over South Road' is likely to be amplified by the bridge section.</p> <p>Additionally, the sleeping areas of the house are going to be less than 10 metres to the source. As vibration travels as a wave, the peak to peak magnitude will increase by a factor of one over the distance squared, significantly increasing the peak to peak magnitude, as shown by the difference in the readings 2a and 2b.</p> <p>Concern is the potential impact of the vibrations felt at our property will be greater than the adopted criteria.</p>	
PS051.15	<p>Our property is well inside the 20 metres distance of the construction activity (i.e. within 10 metres) which will occur at the South and Grange Road intersection.</p> <p>Our property is also within the 15 metre zone.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management.</p> <p>A construction noise and vibration management plan will be developed for the project. Note that some vibration could be felt during construction activities.</p>
PS051.16	<p>Based on the data presented in the assessment report, it is understood that our house will meet the criteria for the treatment of residual noise from the project.</p> <p>When is the projects detailed design phase?</p> <p>Will noise mitigation measures be completed before construction begins?</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4.2 Operational noise assessment.</p> <p>A comprehensive noise assessment will be carried out over the detailed design phase of the project, which will begin once a contractor is selected to undertake the detailed design and construction of the project. This is planned to occur in the first half of 2015. The effects on all sensitive dwellings in the project assessment area will be individually assessed. Noise mitigation measures will then be designed and installed as required.</p>
PS051.17	<p>Safe access across construction site at Grange Road for pedestrians and bike riders.</p> <p>I cross the intersection as a pedestrian to commute to work every day, Section 14.3.1 is stating that a safe pedestrian access will be maintained across South Road during the construction project.</p>	<p>Temporary closures of footpaths and cycle networks may be required during the construction period. Temporary diversions will be put in place to ensure connections are maintained.</p>
PS051.18	<p>Have locations of dedicated pedestrian/cyclist crossings been defined and located with regards to public transport in the area?</p>	<p>DPTI is aware the need for pedestrian and cyclist access across the North–South Corridor and the need to provide safe access to bus stops. DPTI will work with Council officers to ensure bus stops are appropriately located and can be easily accessed by the community.</p>
PS051.19	<p>Will this hotline be open 24 hours a day 7 days a week and able to deal with issues raised outside</p>	<p>The telephone information line will be staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	of core 9 to 5 hours?	
<b>PS053</b>		
PS053.1	The U-turn facilities were mentioned on Port Road but there is no mention of the U-turns on South Road. This was an important aspect as there are no right turns onto South Road – these were discussed to alleviate access problems.	A signalised U-turn provision will be included at the signals of South Road/Manton Street–Grange Road for northbound traffic on the surface road. This will facilitate right turn access to the south from West Hindmarsh.  The U-turn provision just north of Port Road is under investigation by the T2T Alliance.
PS053.2	I would also like to see progress made with a positive outcome to the West Hindmarsh access. A on p. 16 of the Executive Summary, construction of the footbridge/one way road bridge is still being discussed.	See Supplement Section 3.6.3 West Hindmarsh access.
<b>PS054</b>		
PS054.1	The Project Assessment Report amendments relating to the section of South Road between Torrens and Port Road, as made to the original proposal, are welcomed. Thanks go to the project team for genuinely consulting with the community and responding positively to its concerns.	Noted.
PS054.2	<p>Hurtle Street/South Road intersection</p> <p>The amended proposal to restrict traffic movement to a right turn out only at Hurtle Street is strongly supported. It is argued that this solution will minimise the funnelling of traffic along Hurtle Street arising from the South Road upgrade and prevent queuing and congestion at the eastern end of the street.</p> <p>As a narrow residential street, with several cross-streets (also narrow, residential), Hurtle Street is unsuited to increased traffic flows. Increased traffic would decrease community amenity and safety. The suburb not only houses aging residents with long-standing connections to the area, but also increasing numbers of children as younger families move in.</p> <p>An intersection connecting Hurtle Street with Hawker Street would have facilitated a highly inappropriate through-route in to and out of the city via both Torrens and Port Roads, Rosetta Street, Hurtle Street, Hawker Street and Memorial Drive. This arrangement had the potential to greatly increase traffic within the suburb, which it is not designed to handle. Existing accident 'hot-spots' at the intersections with Ellen and Brown streets would have been exacerbated.</p>	<p>Through consultation with the community, limiting access to right out only at Hurtle Street is deliberate to reduce the potential of non-local using travelling through the Croydon local road network.</p> <p>The signalised right turn out from Hurtle Street provides a controlled location to head south from the local area, which is important in distributing redirected movements from the local area.</p> <p>In addition, see Supplement Section 3.6.2 Local road modifications.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Any moves to widen Hurtle Street to accommodate more traffic is absolutely opposed as destructive of amenity, sense of community, tree avenues and house values.	
PS054.3	<p>Left in/left out points along South Road</p> <p>The number and placement of left in/left out access points as set out in the Project Assessment Report are also strongly supported. (i.e. west: Day, Robert, Henry, William and Bedford Streets; east: McInnes, Forster, Monmouth, Hythe and Paget Streets). There are advantages not only for residents of Hurtle Street, but also for those of other streets in these arrangements. They equitably share the internal traffic load within the suburb, with no one street carrying the burden of significantly increased traffic.</p> <p>It is understood that the right turn out only solution for Hurtle Street may still generate some increase of traffic on current use, especially at the residential eastern end. It is essential that this be minimised by the maintenance of the proposed left-in/left-out access points along South Road.</p>	<p>Through consultation with the community, increasing the number of left in/left out access points to the Croydon local area has created a more balanced redirection of traffic through the local area.</p> <p>DPTI will work with Council to minimise impacts on the local road network and determine the most appropriate traffic management treatments.</p> <p>See Supplement 3.4.2 Local road modifications.</p>
PS054.4	<p>U-turn capacity on South Road</p> <p>The provision of U-turns both north and south of Hawker Street is supported. These will enable access to the suburb by north and south bound traffic, and enable Croydon residents to safely connect with Hawker Street and the nearby shopping centre without the need for a common intersection (which is not supported).</p>	Noted.
PS054.5	<p>Access to Ridleyton shopping centre</p> <p>Safe access to the Ridleyton shopping centre from Croydon via pedestrian crossings with lights at both the Hawker Street intersection and closer to the shops is required. The walking distance to the shops via a crossing at Hawker Street only is too great for residents, including the aged and very young, in the south of Croydon. Unsafe attempts to cross South Road may be encouraged without both pedestrian crossings. If pedestrian access is eventually to be via an overpass, this must be accessible to people with a disability, in wheelchairs and with prams and shopping carts.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p>
PS054.6	<p>Sound wall timing and placement, and green space.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that the sound walls between the suburb and the greatly expanded</p>	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration and Section 3.3 Landscape, visual amenity and urban design.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>South Road be completed as soon as possible in order to protect residents from break-ins, vandalism and construction noise and dust.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the sound walls be placed on the South Road side of land made vacant by the demolition of houses in Croydon and that the remaining vacant land be used to create much needed green space within the suburb. Croydon residents currently have little green space in which children can play, dogs can be walked, and for relaxation.</p> <p>Revegetation of these spaces will also increase residential protection from the increased noise and pollution from South Road. The placement of the walls behind vegetation will also mitigate their solid, looming presence.</p>	
PS054.7	<p>Services relocation and effects</p> <p>Further information on the relocation of services and their effects would be appreciated. It is currently understood that any relocation will be confined to streets close to the main roads. However, discussion with staff at the last open day indicated that plans had not been finalised.</p> <p>It was also unclear as to whether or how any tree avenues would be affected. Maintenance of trees is required for street amenity, temperature and noise mitigation. Some service suppliers are not known for their sensitivity to and respect for local vegetation (to put it mildly). Service organisations should be bound by clear guidelines and procedures, including regarding the protection of vegetation, set by the department in any relocation of services arising from the upgrade.</p>	<p>Service relocations will occur both on arterial roads such as South Road, Port Road, Grange Road and Torrens Road and on local roads. Most of the works on local roads will happen on the western side in the first two streets parallel to South Road (and roads that intersect the arterial roads); however, there may be some localised areas further afield. Some designs are still being finalised due to the extensive nature of the redesigns.</p> <p>Please contact the project team on 1300 794 899 if you have an interest in a certain area and further detail can be provided.</p> <p>DPTI is working with service providers to minimise impacts to vegetation as a result of service relocations.</p>
<b>PS055</b>		
PS055.1	<p>I think that you have not included enough options for Hawker St and Port Road intersections. I live in Second St Brompton and it would be most difficult for me to access my home from these points.</p>	<p>Driving south on the surface road, you will be able to turn left into Monmouth Street and continue to Second Street.</p> <p>Northbound traffic on the surface road will need to turn left on Port Road, U-turn at the new signalised facility and then continue through the signals at South Road to access the Ridleyton local area at Coglein Street. See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.</p> <p>To access the local area via Hawker Street, northbound traffic can turn right directly into Hawker Street at the signals.</p>
PS055.2	<p>You should be able to turn right into Hawker from South Road – I always try to shop at</p>	<p>The current design includes the right turn movement from South Road surface road onto</p>



Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	Foodland as it is South Australian owned, and it is run by locals. It is going to be almost as difficult to do this as it would be to drive a few extra blocks to the large precinct at Welland, which I do not want to do.	Hawker Street.
PS055.3	You should be able to turn right into Port Rd from South Road – I often travel along South Road to get to clients and friends.	See Supplement Section 3.6.1 South Road/Port Road – right turn movements.
PS055.4	If the underpass was further extended to beyond Hawker St in a northerly direction, you could then change this intersection and still keep the non-stop thoroughfare along South Road.	See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.
PS055.5	You should be able to access the western side of South Rd more easily – it is going to create an even larger rift between the two sections.	Effects of local community severance, social cohesion and access have been considered through the planning and design of the project. The Community Liaison Group has worked with the project team on resolving local access issues and connectivity. Access to the surface road will continue, although in some situations via alternative routes, and east–west travel occurring at major road intersections.
PS055.6	Please do not forget that we are locals living in this area and we have a strong community bond between the east and west of South Road. It is not all factories and industry, despite what you seem to be planning for.	Noted.
PS055.7	I do look forward to the upgrade, so long as these points are at least taken into consideration. South Road along this path has long been a hazardous area to travel. Let's not forget who is living here and make it a good upgrade for all.	Noted.
<b>PS056</b>		
PS056.1	<p>Pedestrian crossing to Foodland and other stores at Ridleyton</p> <p>The current plan to have a ground level pedestrian crossing as per currently is inconsistent with the objective of creating a free flowing North–South Corridor for Adelaide traffic. Such a crossing, which I understand will be synced to the traffic lights at Hawker Street, will create considerable traffic hold ups on both the north flowing traffic which at that point will include traffic on the 'up ramp' to the ground level, and the south flowing traffic.</p> <p>It is my understanding that one of the objectives of the nearly \$1 billion project is to create a better flowing traffic system along South Road, and this will be thwarted by the installation of these two ground level pedestrian crossings. An</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 2.1 Extension beyond Hawker Street.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 2.1.2 Pedestrian crossing south of Hawker Street.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>above ground crossing associated with the necessary lifts should be able to cater for the needs of Croydon residents trying to safely cross South Road to undertake their shopping, and not impede the traffic flow objective of the project.</p> <p>Once the planned extension of the trenched (or lowered) road continues north to Torrens Road, then it maybe possible to revert to a ground level crossing, as this would only disturb local traffic, but I am concerned that any cost saving from not initially establishing an above-ground crossing will be lost by increased traffic congestion in that stretch of the road leading to the pedestrian crossing.</p>	
PS056.2	<p>Installation of noise barriers should occur prior to road construction</p> <p>As one of the residents who has been affected by the change of plans from last year to this year, in that the houses to my east on Elizabeth Street are now being demolished, I am quite concerned about the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• level of noise that will be occurring during the construction phase</li> <li>• reduced level of security at the back of my property, which will now be exposed to the construction of South Road and thus the public when construction is not active.</li> </ul> <p>To this end, I believe that the construction of the noise barriers (indicative on the plans provided) at the rear boundary of my property, prior to road construction would markedly reduce these twin concerns.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.</p> <p>A construction noise and vibration management plan will be developed with the intent to minimise excessive noise and vibration nuisance where practicable during construction.</p> <p>Security patrols have been engaged nightly and will continue to maintain a presence in the project area, with increased patrols operating on weekends and public holidays.</p> <p>Police patrols will also continue to monitor the project area and can be contacted on 131 444 or 000 in an emergency situation.</p> <p>Members of the community can help by reporting any suspicious activity.</p>
<b>PS057</b>		
PS057.1	Bring forward discussion on fencing and ultimately the erection of appropriate fencing.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.2	Options to compensate households for double glazing.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.3	Going back to the plan from earlier this year to have a green zone with bike and foot paths through that green zone that separate residents from South Road.	On-road cycle lanes will be provided for the entire length of the project area. Where practical, off-road shared use paths will be incorporated into the design.
PS057.4	Appropriate monitoring of adjacent properties with reports and input actively sought from impacted residents – possibly via a dedicated contact for the duration of the project to ensure consistency and to develop an appropriate relationship that can be built on mutual trust and respect.	The Community Engagement team is available to address concerns and can be contacted by calling: 1300 794 899 emailing: DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
PS057.5	Engagement with impacted neighbours should be undertaken immediately to minimise the time taken to enable erection of fences.	Engagement has begun in advance of the start of construction.
PS057.6	Installation of fencing at the earliest possible time. Gaps in the finalised fencing solution can be left for service relocation but that should not impact existing fence lines – so we should be looking to implement this ASAP.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.7	The ability to move from the western side of South Road to the eastern side of South Road for the purpose of attending work in the city – how will this be managed through the construction phase?	<p>See PAR, Table 14.3.</p> <p>Construction of the non-stop road will disrupt north–south travel and modify east–west arterial and local road access.</p> <p>Temporary closures of roads, pedestrian and cycle networks will be necessary during construction. Temporary road diversions and/or speed restrictions will be put in place to ensure connections are maintained throughout the construction process.</p> <p>A series of alternative access route maps will be produced to notify the community of these changes. The maps will be available on the project website <a href="http://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t">www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/t2t</a></p>
PS057.8	Impact on property prices? One house in the street has been on the market for months as still remains unsold.	See Supplement Section 3.5.1 Property values.
PS057.9	Potential for damage to our property during construction.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.10	Potential for damage to our property when a major road is mere metres away.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.11	Further delays – based on how long it has taken to move to this point, we are keen to see how long this project will actually take and the prolonged impact this will have on the family living through a long construction period.	The project is due for completion in late 2018.
PS057.12	<p>Safety</p> <p>Vandals have already taken a liking to the fences that now back onto South Road and we have disturbed at least one graffiti artist.</p> <p>We have noticed a number of people wandering around properties that were vacant before they were torn down looting the empty properties of fittings and fixtures</p> <p>There is now easier access to our backyard with no house behind us.</p>	<p>Security patrols have been engaged nightly and will continue to maintain a presence in the project area, with increased patrols operating on weekends and public holidays.</p> <p>Police patrols will also continue to monitor the project area and can be contacted on 131 444 or 000 in an emergency situation.</p> <p>Members of the community can help by reporting any suspicious activity.</p>
PS057.13	Reduced privacy following the removal of rear	New noise barriers to be installed on the western

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	property.	side of South Road will restore privacy to properties that have been exposed following demolition of acquired properties.
PS057.14	Traffic noise has increased dramatically and is far more noticeable, especially during peak periods.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.15	Access to property during construction of the fencing solution – this needs to be managed well to ensure a negligible impact from the perspective of the impacted residents.	See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.
PS057.16	Overall, it has been disappointing that the responsible departments did not continue to engage with us, the residents, who are the impacted parties. The project team needs to be more proactive especially with the residents this impacts the most (residents on St Lawrence Ave and other streets affected). No advice was sent to residents to advise that the destruction of houses were commencing behind us and as a result we found out by being woken to the sound of demolition noise at the beginning of this year and before 7am? As a courtesy a letter placed in our letter boxes would have been appropriate so at least we had some warning that demolition was about to commence.	Thank you for your feedback. We are continuing to learn during this process and are now providing advance notice of demolition works to immediate neighbours.
<b>PS059</b>		
PS059.1	<p>We are located on the section of road between Torrens Road and Hawker Street and our house now backs onto vacant blocks that will become part of South Road.</p> <p>By way of background... We have been in this house for almost 19 years and the South Road widening has been on the agenda for the past 6 to 8 years. I believe this is the 3rd or 4th set of plans that have been proposed and we are hoping that this time we will actually see an outcome. When this plan was first tabled we were actively engaged with the project team and had one meeting with the project manager at our residence.</p> <p>Liaison with residents</p> <p>It is disappointing that, since this time and through further iterations of the proposal, that the responsible departments did not continue to engage with us as directly impacted parties. To this end, I believe the current project team needs to be more proactive with directly impacted residents. As a prime example, we were not advised of the destruction of the house immediately behind us and as a result we were woken by demolition noise on the first Monday of</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Thank you for your feedback. We are continuing to learn during this process and are providing advance notice of demolition works to immediate neighbours.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.2 Community engagement since Project Assessment Report release.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>the 2014 calendar year, before 7am in the morning (why start so early and during what is traditionally a holiday period for many people?). As a courtesy I would have expected a face to face visit with a letter box drop (if no one answered) a couple of days prior to demolition, incorporating at a minimum the 3–5 neighbours immediately adjacent to the demolished property.</p> <p>The remaining 5 houses on our block have gradually been removed over the past couple of months so a follow up visit would have been nice so that we knew what was about to occur. A visit in this case based on the fact that nothing had occurred for some 5–6 months.</p> <p>Outcome sought – Increased liaison with directly impacted residences through the remainder of the project.</p>	
PS059.2	<p>Proposal to move the northbound lane further west</p> <p>We note the intention of the project team to move the northbound lane further west therefore allowing easier access to the middle section of the road for potential future lowering under Torrens Road. While I understand this and it makes sense, we are concerned that there is currently no funding or guarantee that this will occur in a reasonable timeframe, if at all. As a result, the current proposal will result in three lanes of high volume traffic being located within approximately 3 metres of our back fence – a recent amendment that will result in the road being somewhere between 10 and 20 metres closer to the fence than we were advised earlier this year.</p> <p>Should the current thinking in respect of creating an underpass below Torrens Road and lowering South Road further to support this eventuate, I would expect this lowered road to incorporate the bulk of traffic flow, in particular heavy vehicles, which will further improve the experience of directly impact parties such as ourselves. Our concern here is that such an outcome will be years away and, until such further work occurs, we will be stuck with excessive levels of noise. We also experience the odd instance of window vibration from trucks using air brakes, which has increased notably since the house behind us was removed. I expect that this will only get worse, regardless of what sort of fencing is placed against the back fence.</p>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.</p> <p>Also see response to PS049.2.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>Outcome sought – option 1 – additional funding is sought to undertake this work once so that it is done right the first time – a much better outcome for taxpayer dollars. Multiple projects will result double spending on some sections of the road. Given the potential duration of the project I believe it is reasonable to expect the project team to continue to push for such an outcome.</p> <p>Option 2 –substantial noise walls will need to installed against the property with the ability to further compensate directly impacted residents with double glazing to any windows that face or are 90% to the roadway.</p>	
PS059.3	<p>As a family we are concerned with noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the construction period</li> <li>• For extended periods of time through construction</li> <li>• Night construction</li> <li>• Post completion of the project</li> <li>• Impact on children who are undertaking year 11 and 12 during the proposed project timeframe</li> <li>• Impacts on domestic pets</li> </ul> <p>Pollution concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levels of dust during construction and the impact on the usability of our backyard for extended periods</li> <li>• Dust through house and into rainwater and gutters</li> <li>• General health – we have children suffering asthma</li> <li>• Longer term traffic pollution – there is noticeable darkening associated with properties located directly against main roads</li> </ul> <p>Outcomes sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring forward discussion on fencing and ultimately the erection of appropriate fencing</li> <li>• Options to compensate households for double glazing</li> <li>• Going back to the plan from earlier this year to have a green zone with bike and foot paths through that green zone that separate residents from South Road</li> <li>• Appropriate monitoring of adjacent</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.</p> <p>See Supplement Section 3.7 Air quality.</p> <p>The air quality assessment process is outlined in PAR Chapter 16. Additional air quality assessments will be undertaken in the detailed design phase of the project.</p>

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	<p>properties with reports and input actively sought from impacted residents – possibly via a dedicated contact for the duration of the project to ensure consistency and to develop an appropriate relationship that can be built on mutual trust and respect.</p>	
PS059.4	<p>At the recent Open Day I was advised that fencing required general agreement from a group of adjacent neighbours and that various service relocations will need to be undertaken prior to erecting fences. In term of service relocations I do not expect that there are relocations required along the existing fence line and that this is more likely to impact the areas away from existing fence lines. I also expect that there will be service and access implications that prevent a continuous fence being erected.</p> <p>Outcomes sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with impacted neighbours should be undertaken immediately to minimise the time taken to enable erection of the agreed fencing solution.</li> <li>• Installation of fencing at the earliest possible time. Gaps in the finalised fencing solution can be left for service relocation but that should not impact existing fence lines – so we should be looking to implement this ASAP, especially since the blocks such as the one we are on are essentially free of any impediment. (I expect the final house on our block will be removed shortly given its current state of disrepair.)</li> </ul>	<p>See Supplement Section 3.4 Noise and vibration.</p> <p>Noise walls can be installed before utility services and vice versa; however, the design of utility services relocation and noise wall are related due to the space constraints in the verge i.e. the design of noise walls must take into account the utility services in the vicinity of the walls.</p>
PS059.5	<p>Other concerns:</p> <p>the ability to move from the western side of South Road to the eastern side of South Road for the purpose of attending work and schools in the city – how will this be managed through the construction phase.</p>	See response to PS057.7.
PS059.6	Impact on property prices – I previously did not live adjacent to a major road and in the future I will.	See Supplement Section 3.5.1 Property values.
PS059.7	Potential for damage to our property during construction.	See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management, and Section 3.4.4 Property condition assessments.
PS059.8	Potential for damage to our property when a major road is mere metres away.	See Supplement Section 3.4.3 Construction vibration management and Section 3.4.4 Property condition assessments.
PS059.9	Further delays – based on how long it has taken	The project is due for completion in late 2018.

Submission/ comment number	Issue summary	Response
	to move to this point, I am keen to see how long this project will actually take and the prolonged impact this will have on the family living through a long construction period.	
PS059.10	<p>Safety</p> <p>Vandals have already taken a liking to the fences that now back onto South Road and we have disturbed at least one graffiti artist.</p> <p>We have noticed a number of people wandering around properties that were vacant before they were torn down.</p> <p>There is now easier access to our backyard with no house behind us.</p>	<p>Security patrols have been engaged nightly and will continue to maintain a presence in the project area, with increased patrols operating on weekends and public holidays.</p> <p>Police patrols will also continue to monitor the project area and can be contacted on 131 444 or 000 in an emergency situation.</p> <p>Members of the community can help by reporting any suspicious activity.</p>
PS059.11	Reduced privacy following the removal of rear property.	New noise barriers to be installed on the western side of South Road will restore privacy to properties that have been exposed following demolition of acquired properties.
PS059.12	Access to property during construction of the fencing solution – this needs to be managed well to ensure a negligible impact from the perspective of the impacted residents and their pets.	Engagement activities regarding property condition surveys and temporary fencing have begun.
PS059.13	<p>Outcomes sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued liaison.</li> <li>• The appointment of a relationship manager will provide an avenue to raise concerns.</li> <li>• There must be a continuing focus on the experience of the impacted resident throughout the life of the project. While a concern may seem trivial to you or member of your team we will be living through the experience on a daily basis.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Community Engagement team can be contacted by</p> <p>calling: 1300 794 899</p> <p>emailing: DPTI.T2T@sa.gov.au</p>