



PRESENT	PRESENT				
COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEMBERS					
Catherine	Ng	Councillor, City of Melbourne			
Bart	Sbeghen	Bicycle Victoria			
Rodger	Eade	Chair, Community Reference Group			
Fiona	de Preu	University of Melbourne			
Vincent	Hartigan	Bus Association Victoria			
Lloyd	Rowe	Department of Infrastructure			
Robyn	Williams	Councillor, City of Yarra			
Richard	Smithers	City of Yarra			
Colin	Smith	Royal Park Protection Group			
Heather	Sharp	Pigdon, Scotchmer & Michael Streets Assoc.			
Robert	Abboud	VicRoads			
lan	Bird	Carlton Residents Association			
Brian	Evans	Parkville Association			
John	Beckwith	Villages of Yarra Business Group & Road Safe Inner Melbourne			
Christopher	Pound	Clifton Hill Traffic Management			
Paul	Mees	Royal Park Protection Group			
Geoff	Barbour	Fitzroy Residents Association			
Sue	Chambers	Carlton Residents Association			
William	Taylor	Department of Infrastructure			
STUDY TEA	M				
Bob	Evans	Study Director			
William	McDougall	Study Manager			
Stephen	Smith	Study Planner			
<b>OBSERVING</b>	3				
N	Bassett	Princes Park Protection Association			
Warwick	Pattinson	City of Melbourne			
Bruce	Turner	Fulcrum International			
APOLOGIES					
Peter	Malatt	North West Melbourne Association			
Steve	Watson	Councillor, City of Yarra			
Peter	Mildenhall	Department Education, Employment & Training			
Laurie	Cuttiford	RMIT			
Peter	Daly	RACV			
Chris	Goodman	3068 Group			
Stephen	•	Bus Association Victoria			
John		Environment Victoria			
Geoff	Barbour	Fitzroy Residents Association			





No	Item	Discussion
1	Welcome and Apologies	Rodger Eade welcomed CRG members, observers and guests, including Anne Plympton, Robert Dunlop and Ray Jeffrey from the Infrastructure Planning Council.
2	Previous	2.1 Previous Meeting
	meeting & matters arising	After reviewing the previous CRG meeting notes the CRG noted that its contents were an adequate representation of proceedings.
		2.2 Matters Arising
		Rodger reported his visit with the study team to the Infrastructure Planning Council's Transport Task Group meeting on 22 January 2002. The purpose of this visit was to discuss recent events and issues concerning the NCCCS and the IPC's interim report progress. IPC members present included Rob Spence (MAV), Robert Dunlop (Macquarie Bank), Louise Johnstone (Deakin University), and IPC officers Anne Plympton and Ray Jeffrey (key officer contact).
		At this meeting, Rodger expressed some of the CRG's concerns about the IPC's interim report appearing to pre-empt the NCCCS outcomes by flagging the need for a link between the Eastern and Tullamarine Freeways. The IPC appeared to have a broad understanding of the issues facing the NCCCS and Metropolitan Strategy, as well as current and proposed transport plans. Whilst the IPC generally felt the need to improve links between major infrastructure routes, a general understanding of the need for more integrated transport strategies was also common ground. The study team will keep in regular contact with the IPC.
3	IPC presentation	Robert Dunlop, Executive Director Macquarie Bank, and Chair of the IPC's Transport Task Group, then made a presentation to the CRG.
		Rodger asked Robert whether he felt the IPC study needed to dovetail its report into the Metropolitan Strategy currently being worked on by the Government. Robert said that the IPC has a deadline to release the IPC report in May this year, and whilst the report will cover transport issues in Melbourne it has a broader mandate of addressing issues in the State, including transport, energy, water and communications. Robert said the NCCCS will capture the best view of the study area.
		Richard Smithers mentioned that the Yarra City Council has formally opposed a link between the Eastern and Tullamarine Freeways, and the council needs to feel confident about the current NCCCS process. The IPC's report, and the comments of its chairman in the press supporting a new freeway, have created a perception in the community that the results of the NCCCS will be undermined by the IPC, which is seen as having more direct access to the Premier.
		Sue Chambers asked whether the IPC has received a formal submission from the NCCCS? William McDougall responded no, but the IPC has been given the study's Issues and Trends report and will also receive the





No	Item	Discussion
		study's Initial Appraisal report, and continued liaison will take place. Regarding the Melbourne City Council submission to the IPC, Sue also asked whether the IPC's brief allowed for addressing parking eg. early bird parking in the central city? Robert said yes, and carparking was an issue the report was looking at.
		Cr Williams mentioned that the inner north was traditionally a neglected area, always chasing funding for rejuvenation. A blueprint was needed to guide successful housing and business development and social facilities, infrastructure and reducing reliance on the motor vehicle. Robert agreed and asked generally whether inner city residential developments should be forced to provide carparking? This issue, Robert said, brings more vehicles into the inner areas and causes problems.
		Chris Pound asked whether the IPC report would address disincentives for driving cars into the city? Robert confirmed that the report would address this issue.
		Brian Evans asked what attempts has the IPC undertaken to garner community aspirations? Robert said that the IPC had consulted with at least ten Victorian areas in the community. Vincent Hartigan mentioned that no consultation, for example, had been undertaken with National Bus Company which would have been desirable from the company's point of view. Vincent said recommendations are needed from the IPC to help service providers get more people using public transport.
		Paul Mees noted that there was nobody representing either council on the IPC sub-committee. Paul asked Robert for the reference material which was used to conclude that a freeway link was required between the Eastern and Tullamarine Freeways. Robert said that the information would be made available.
		Fiona de Preu mentioned that the IPC report has an opportunity to establish some strong principles in transport planning, but at the moment it appears through the interim report that the report is pro-vehicle at the expense of improving public transport infrastructure. Maybe the NCCCS study team could make a comments about this?
		Bob Evans responded by thanking Robert at the conclusion of the IPC discussion with CRG members, and mentioned that the IPC members have heard a broad spectrum of issues the NCCCS is addressing. To enable us to reach a considered opinion on whether or not a road tunnel is needed, we are considering, but not limited to, these three key issues:
		1 dispersion of traffic from/to Eastern Freeway;
		2 the Government objective of 20% of motorised trips by public transport by 2020; and
		3 community aspirations.
		Rodger concluded that the IPC and NCCCS team will continue to liaise, and information will be forwarded to the CRG as the study proceeds.





No	Item	Discussion
4	Study progress	4.1 2021 Base Case
		William explained the level of complexity of the study, and the difficulty in catering for emerging, metro-wide policies. The base case reflects committed projects, but not emerging policies. Rather than calling it a base case, it could be referred to as a 'business as usual' scenario. William mentioned that the increases in public transport frequencies are in the strategies and not the base case, because they affect the study area. The study's specialists were waiting for the outcome of the transport modelling before finishing their respective studies.
		4.2 Community consultation
		Rodger informed the CRG that he had not as yet received any correspondence from the Premier in relation to the CRG's concern about the IPC's interim report. (Please note: a few days after the CRG meeting Rodger received correspondence - the Premier's letter reassures the CRG and study team of their crucial role in assisting the Government to determine the transport priorities for the inner north. See attached scanned letter)
		William mentioned that the Minister for Transport, in conjunction with the Cities of Hobsons Bay, Maribyrnong and Moonee Valley and VicRoads launched the Inner West Integrated Transport Strategy on 12 February. The strategy will aim to develop and manage transport networks in the inner western suburbs.
		William also mentioned that consultation with the NCCC adjoining councils is continuing at officer/councillor level with consultation progressing in the lead up to the release of the Initial Appraisal report and draft strategy.
		4.3 Strategy elements
		William tabled a number of diagrams illustrating the strategy elements that will be assessed as part of the process of developing an integrated transport strategy for the inner north.
		The strategy elements are indicative only, and are prepared as examples of possible initiatives for evaluation purposes. There is no guarantee that they will form part of the final overall strategy in the form presented – the outcomes of the evaluation and consultations will lead to further refinement and combination of elements to provide the optimum overall strategy, from a 'triple bottom line' point of view.
		The strategy elements will be evaluated, by grouping them into a series of scenarios for testing. The sequence of these scenarios is intended firstly to put up 'carrots' (initiatives to improve the attractiveness of alternatives to car), then 'sticks' (initiatives to "force" less car use), and finally the major infrastructure initiatives that need assessment (the Doncaster area rapid transit system, and the road link between the Eastern and Tullamarine Freeways. Another road tunnel option, linking the Eastern Freeway to the north-east corner of the CBD, will also be explored but is not shown on the





No	Item	Discussion
		diagram at this stage).
		The sequence of the strategy elements should not be interpreted as representing priorities, nor an indication of the relative timing of implementation. These aspects (priorities and timing) will be derived from the results of the evaluation process, which will give a better understanding of the relative effectiveness of each strategy element.
		An extra meeting has been organised with the study team and specialists for 27 February to discuss these strategy elements. The CRG's input to this part of the process is crucial, and the study team looks forward to hearing members' views and receiving feedback and/or advice on the strategy elements. Written comments are welcomed if members cannot attend this meeting (details at end of these notes).
5	Reports back from CRG members	Sue Chambers reported that the Carlton residents Association is working closely with the City of Melbourne to come up with a submission to the IPC in relation to the IPC's interim report.
		Bart Sbeghen from Bicycle Victoria reported that he has been liasing with transport specialist Malcolm Daff on pedestrian and cycling modelling.
6	Media Release	It was agreed that a media release was not required at this stage.
7	Close	Rodger thanked participants for attending the CRG meeting and closed the proceedings at approximately 8.30pm.
8	Next Meeting	27 February 2002, 5pm – 8pm, light supper served at 6.30     Strategy Elements Meeting, Council Meeting Room, Melbourne     Town Hall.
		Please note that the purpose of the Strategy Elements meeting is to discuss and hear your views on the indicative strategy elements currently under assessment. Some study specialists will be present at this meeting.
		<ol> <li>13 March 2002, 6pm light supper, 6.30pm meeting start – 8.30pm Council Meeting Room, Melbourne Town Hall. Please RSVP to Stephen Smith 9655 8770 or <a href="mailto:stephen.smith@doi.vic.gov.au">stephen.smith@doi.vic.gov.au</a> by 11 March 2002.</li> </ol>