

Appendix A

Summary of Submissions and Responses

Tables A1 to A5 summarise and respond to the submissions received during the public exhibition of the *Project Impact Report*.

Table A1
Local Government Submissions (LGS)

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report</i> (PIR) or <i>Supplement</i> (S) | Response |
|---|---|--|--|
| LGS001 City of Port Adelaide Enfield | | | |
| LGS001.1 | Council submit that matters raised by staff during meetings and workshops and presentations attended by South Road Superway Project staff all contribute toward Council's response to the consultation. | PIR - 3 | Noted. |
| LGS001.2 | Council raised the impacts on Regency Reserve (of the Superway or a future South Road corridor project), and early identification of opportunities to address, noting that the nearby Ferryden Park Primary School, to be closed in 2011, may present opportunities for the State and Council to preserve recreational activities in the neighbourhood which may otherwise be at risk | PIR - 9.3.2 | Land acquisition in the vicinity of Regency Reserve has been minimised and the Reserve will be able to continue to function following completion of the Superway. Future South Road corridor projects will continue to consider impacts on Regency Reserve and recreational activities generally. |
| LGS001.3 | Council considers noise effects of the Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove connection on Sunnybrae Farm also need to be addressed. | PIR – 18 S – 4.2.5 and 4.2.9 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.5 and 4.2.9 |
| LGS001.4 | Council request to be continually engaged in a consultation process throughout the life of the project. | PIR - 3 | Noted. DTEI will continue to engage the City of Port Adelaide Enfield regarding the South Road Superway Project. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report (PIR)</i> or <i>Supplement (S)</i> | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| LGS001.5 | <p>Provision for mains sewer connection to industrial land situated north of South Terrace, Wingfield is of concern to Council.</p> <p>The most critical urban factor in the locality of the new Superway is the lack of mains sewerage. This impacts upon Planning Strategies for the future, particularly with the availability of key utilities being considered a basic tenet of orderly development. State Government need to urgently budget for an extension of the sewerage system into the Wingfield area to support their own vision for the locality.</p> <p>The lack of service infrastructure in the Wingfield area impacts upon new business creation and employment growth and compromises sustainable growth and economic development.</p> <p>This lack of sewerage in the Wingfield area has been identified by Council as one of the most significant and high risk issues in the Council. The further development of this area without the appropriate services being in place to manage high risk wastes is unsustainable. Environmental impacts potentially include soil contamination, spills risk and stormwater contamination. Discharge into part of the catchment of the Barker inlet wetlands makes risk management more critical.</p> <p>The development of the Superway provides an ideal opportunity to seriously advocate for the programming and provision of key infrastructure to be included in the civil works design and construction program. The sewer main along Grand Junction Road can be extended up to South Road to the PREXY, with lateral extension to the key roads in the area. This will allow for existing businesses in Wingfield to connect to the mains over a period of time, and ensure availability for new development.</p> | PIR - 7 | <p>Provision of a mains sewer to service the Wingfield industrial area is currently beyond the scope of work for the South Road Superway Project however, DTEI will work closely with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and SA Water to investigate potential opportunities to facilitate provision of sewerage infrastructure whilst construction works are occurring in the region.</p> |

Table A2
State Government Submissions (SGS)

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report</i> (PIR) or <i>Supplement</i> (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| SGS001 | Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA) | | |
| SGS001.1 | PIRSA stated that the Project has little direct impact on PIRSA and subsequently no issues were raised in their submission. | - | Noted. |
| SGS002 | Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST) | | |
| SGS002.1 | Stakeholder engagement; TAFE SA and DFEEST not included in consultation process (Regency TAFE is located within the study area). | PIR – 3 | <p>The project team met with the Regency Park TAFE General Manger, Education Programs and Services, in the first stage of the community engagement program in April 2009. A survey tool was completed on access and operational requirements and this information was inputted to the concept design. All following communications were provided to the General Manager, including information packs, <i>Project Impact Report</i> Executive Summary and invitations to the Information Days.</p> <p>DFEEST was also invited to comment on the draft <i>Project Impact Report</i> during the formal consultation phase from 23 October to 19 November 2009.</p> |
| SGS002.2 | Land acquisition – potential for TAFE land to be utilised needs discussion, no detail currently available. | PIR - 10 | Based on investigations to date there is no need to acquire any of the TAFE land at Regency Park as part of the South Road Superway Project. |
| SGS002.3 | There is the potential for relationships to be developed between the Superway and TAFE SA. Section 8.7 of the report recognises employment and industry skills formation programmes, TAFE and DFEEST advises a number of linkages already established with key organisations in the construction field which could be beneficial to the South Road Superway Project. | PIR - 8 | DTEI to liaise with DFEEST to discuss and establish links. |
| SGS003 | Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED) | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| SGS003.1 | <p>The Department supports the long term vision for a free flowing north-south corridor that will enhance the movement of people and goods throughout the metropolitan area.</p> <p>The project should contribute to averting economic risks associated with the growing volume of freight and passenger transport and associated costs to the community. The project will more efficiently connect businesses within and beyond the region, improve links between existing industrial hubs, key export infrastructure and community benefits.</p> <p>There are expected to be economic benefits associated with the project and the creation of substantial employment opportunities during the construction phase.</p> | PIR - 6 | Noted. |
| SGS003.2 | The project is expected to increase demand for industrial land across different markets. This may require some reprioritising by Government with respect to land development programming. | PIR – 6 and 10 | Noted. |
| SGS003.3 | Questions whether potential acceleration of demand for industrial land in the Gillman area may soften demand in other areas defined in Figures 6.1 and 6.2, and whether this is taken into account in the industrial land model. | PIR - .6.1 and 6.2 | <p>The projections used in the Project Impact are based on an industrial land sub-model that was based on Planning SA (now Department for Planning and Local Government) analysis on land demand scenarios by region for both the Rebased Medium and High scenarios for Adelaide. The employment model has been calibrated to economic parameters supplied by DTED.</p> <p>The industrial land projections provided in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 have not taken into account potential acceleration of demand, notwithstanding that anecdotal evidence from the eastern states (this has been witnessed most evidently in Melbourne with the opening of the Western Ring Road in conjunction with Citylink, the more recent delivery of Eastlink, and in Sydney with the opening of the Western Sydney Orbital.) suggests that there will be both acceleration in the uptake of land as well as an increase in property values.</p> <p>However, in a constrained industrial land market as is the case in Adelaide and given that all land in the north and north west quadrants have their own unique competitive advantages then the impact of potential acceleration of demand should not be at the expense of other land, at least in the Northern Region where recent metropolitan consumption of vacant land has primarily occurred.</p> |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| SGS003.4 | The project will alter access patterns to South Road and local roads, modify visual proximity for businesses, and impact on future growth opportunities for local businesses. Potential for reduction in capture of passing trade is a concern. It would be useful to know the extent to which affected businesses rely on passing traffic as opposed to trade from local traffic. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| SGS003.5 | Business impact assessment should take into account relocation, the availability of alternative sites, preferred trading region and degree of financial trauma. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| SGS004 | Department for Environment and Heritage (DEH) | | |
| SGS004.1 | DEH has not identified any significant issues with this proposal. | - | Noted. |
| SGS004.2 | It will be important for the Contractor's Environmental Management Plan to ensure that risks of contamination to aquatic habitat during the construction stage are well managed. The avoidance of any major disruption to the extent, frequency and duration of wetland inundation during or post-construction will mean that the impact of the construction footprint on native plants or fauna will be minor | PIR – 14 and 15 S – 4.2.7 | Noted. The preparation of a Contractor's Environmental Management Plan will ensure appropriate management measures are implemented and monitored. |
| SGS004.3 | DTEI officers are requested to liaise with officers of the DEH Heritage Branch in relation to the preparation of a site-specific Heritage Management Plan for the Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove Link as described under sub-section 11.4.1 of Chapter 11 as it relates to the Sunnybrae Farm Complex. | PIR - 11.6 S – 4.2.5 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.5 |
| SGS004.4 | The project is not expected to have any significant direct or indirect impact on Matters of Environmental Significance and is unlikely to warrant a referral under the <i>Environment Protection, Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> . | PIR - 15.5 | Noted. |
| SGS005 | Department of Health (SA Health) | | |
| SGS005.1 | This response is provided following a rapid health impact analysis of selected portions of the report and should not be considered a detailed analysis. | - | Noted. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report</i> (PIR) or <i>Supplement</i> (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| SGS005.2 | The proximity of residential areas (Westwood Estate) warrant more targeted analysis on potential impacts during construction of the project and its future operation. It is acknowledged that some impacts will be inevitable; however a considered and consultative approach will assist in limiting the extent of these impacts. | PIR – 18 and 19 S – 4.2.11 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.10 and <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 19.7, 19.8, 18.7 and 18.8 |
| SGS005.3 | The report identifies potential for Regency Park Golf Course to be modified. Whilst the extent is unknown the golf course currently acts as a buffer between sensitive residential uses and the visual, noise and air quality impacts of South Road. Once the extent of any modification is known impact modelling should be revised and mitigation measures applied where appropriate. | PIR - 18 and 19 | Construction of the South Road Superway Project will require acquisition of a narrow strip of land along the north eastern boundary of the Regency Park Golf Course. Modification of up to four fairways will be required, however the golf course will continue to act as a landscape buffer between South Road and the residential area to the west. Noise and air quality modelling, assessment, and mitigation measures reported in the <i>Project Impact Report</i> (refer Sections 18 and 19) has taken the modified golf course into account. |
| SGS005.4 | The project has the potential to improve local air quality through reduction of congestion and greater dispersion of emissions through the elevation of the <i>roadway</i> . | PIR - 19 | Noted. |
| SGS005.5 | Dust during construction has potential to cause short term impacts during construction. Dust mitigation measures should be prioritised and every effort made to control it. | PIR – 19 S – 4.2.10 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.10 and <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 19.8 |
| SGS005.6 | The Department of Health offer further assistance in examining health impacts when more detailed planning commences. | - | Noted. |
| - | Environment Protection Authority (EPA) | | |
| | The EPA's comments were not received before 8 December 2009 and therefore have not been included in the <i>Supplement</i> . DTEI will continue to work with the EPA to respond to issues raised by them. | | |

Table A3
Representative Bodies' Submissions (RBS)

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report</i> (PIR) or <i>Supplement</i> (S) | Response |
|--|---|--|--|
| RBS001 Royal Automobile Association of SA Inc (RAA) | | | |
| RBS001.1 | The RAA welcomes the Federal and State Governments' commitment for a safe and efficient north south corridor. The RAA believes the completion of a non-stop, north-south corridor is a number one transport priority for South Australia. | PIR-4 | Noted. |
| RBS001.2 | Whilst supportive of the overall intent of the project we feel further investigation should be undertaken into the proposed shoulder widths for the Superway. The RAA believes the shoulder on the western side should be increased to accommodate vehicle breakdown, sufficient space should be provided for motorists and roadside assistance. This will further enhance safety and efficiency. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

Table A4
Public Submissions (PS)

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| PS001 | Submission Topics: Late notification of community engagement process, increase in traffic congestion, rail crossings, safety, property access, noise, loss of open space, property values, Naweena Road | | |
| PS001.1 | This project will be a fantastic improvement for South Road, however the improvements for South Road will have a completely opposite negative effect on my personal situation. | - | Noted |
| PS001.2 | I had no knowledge of this project until I received the report on 9 November 2009. I have not been involved in any workshops or meetings, and my opinions have not been considered before even the preliminary concept plan has been finalised. The period of four weeks available is insufficient. | PIR – 3 S – 4.2.11 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.11 |
| PS001.3 | A key objective for this project is to reduce traffic congestion and travel time and delays. This will have the totally opposite effect in my case. Most of this traffic will be “heavy commercial traffic, semi trailers, B doubles and A doubles diverted to Rafferty Street”. “Rafferty Street is to be upgraded to A double requirements”. This is not reducing traffic congestion. | PIR - 4 and 7 S – 4.2.8 | <p>The South Road Superway Project aims to decrease traffic congestion along South Road given its significant role as the only continuous transport link between the Port River Expressway and the Southern Expressway.</p> <p>To help achieve this, a critical part of the new local road network is to service the local commercial and industrial properties in Wingfield and Regency Park. Rafferty Street was previously identified as a local road upgrade with traffic expected to increase on during construction of the Superway, This option has been further refined with stakeholder engagement and an assessment of the optimal traffic improvements for the Wingfield north-east precinct is currently being undertaken.</p> <p>Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8</p> |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS001.4 | Another key objective is to eliminate at grade rail crossings. This affect is opposite as a new rail crossing is planned at the Rafferty Street, South Road intersection. This will cause queuing for rail crossing directly in front of the property and reducing safe access. This is increasing the rail crossings. | PIR – 7 and 17 S – 4.2.8 | An assessment of the optimal traffic improvements for the Wingfield north-east precinct is currently being undertaken. This includes assessing the need for a rail crossing at Rafferty Street or maintaining the existing ground level rail crossing on South Road. If the rail crossing at Rafferty Street was to be constructed, it would have vastly reduced traffic volumes compared to South Road, as a result of the project. Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| PS001.5 | Another key objective is to improve safety: “the project will reduce crashes”. The opposite effect is likely as increase in traffic can only lead to increased crashes. | PIR – 7.2.1 and 17 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 and Project Impact Report Sections 7.2.1 and 17 |
| PS001.6 | Another key objective is to “minimise effects on individual landholders and business disruption”. This increase in traffic is a devastating blow in regards to effects on my individual land holding. | PIR - 8 | See Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS001.7 | Another key objective is to minimise noise and vibration effects. With the increase in traffic the noise and vibration affects are increased. Vehicle pollution will be increased in the Rafferty Street area as well. This project will be great for South Road but I thought the whole concept of this project was to reduce traffic congestion out of the suburbs and on to the main roads and Superway. | PIR 18 S 4.2.8 and 4.2.9 | Rafferty Street is predicted to carry about 5,500 vehicles per day if this aspect of the project was to be built. This is similar to sections of South Terrace. Rafferty Street will be designed to accommodate the predicted traffic volumes. Alternative options for access into the Wingfield north-east precinct are being investigated. Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 and 4.2.9 and Project Impact Report Section 18 |
| PS001.8 | Other key objectives of “minimising loss of open space” and “creating improved landscape and urban design outcomes” this seems impossible when considering you are to widen Rafferty Street and remove vegetation. | PIR - 14 and 15 S - 4.2.7 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.7 |
| PS001.9 | Although mentioned elsewhere in the report it is not a key objective to maintain property values. I personally can only see the value of my property going down. | PIR – 10.4 S – 4.2.4 | Refer Project Impact Report Sections 10.4 and Supplement Section 4.2.4 |
| PS001.10 | If extra access is required in this area, Naweena Road could be extended directly north to the Salisbury Highway. | PIR - 5 | Refer Project Impact Report Section 5 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS002 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road upgrade, safety, site access, Alternative solutions | | |
| PS002.1 | Do not support the proposed upgrading of Naweena Road. Concerned that should this proceed, the safety and welfare of not only our staff but customers and suppliers will be compromised. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS002.2 | <p>Concerned with the access to our site with vehicles heading in a southerly direction from Grand Junction Road who would need to immediately indicate right which poses the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ with Naweena Road proposed to be a single lane, this has the potential to hold up the traffic flow which is heading south which potentially could result in an accident and or injuries ▪ depending on the synchronisation of the proposed traffic lights at the Naweena Road and Grand Junction Road intersection a vehicle could also be held up with the backlog of traffic travelling north on Naweena Road but unable to proceed due to traffic lights. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.5 4.2.8 | <p>The new Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove Link has been designed to accommodate predicted traffic volumes.</p> <p>Following the release of the <i>Project Impact Report</i>, DTEI has investigated two options (an offline option running parallel to Naweena Road and an online option, along the existing Naweena Road). The offline option is the preferred option.</p> <p>The design of the traffic signals at Grand Junction Road and Regency Road will cater for the predicted traffic volumes, and DTEI will review the potential for synchronisation of the two intersections.</p> <p>Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.5 and 4.2.8</p> |
| PS002.3 | <p>The Regency Park business area is predominately transport related and it is with interest that most do not have an issue with traffic along South Road between Regency Road and Grand Junction Road. I have noted that the intersection of South and Grand Junction Road has been identified as a traffic snarl. In my opinion, this is a result of traffic been held up by the railway line which runs parallel with Cormack Road. My recommendation would be to consider the following alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have the railway line which runs parallel with Cormack Road as an underpass thus allowing for traffic along South Road to flow without having to stop for trains. ▪ Have the proposed overpass commence north of Grand Junction Road to the Port River Expressway which would allow for traffic along South Road to flow without having to stop for the traffic lights at the Cormack Road intersection as well as the train line | PIR - 5 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS003 | Submission Topics: Noise, Pedestrian crossing Kateena Street. | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS003.1 | Overall the concept proposal as presented does not prompt any significant concerns for the business. | - | Noted |
| PS003.2 | <p>We have however identified a potential problem, specifically: We have 2nd floor offices and meeting rooms close to the western boundary of our site. Today these are largely above the traffic noise, but with the elevation of the roadway and with the sound containment sheeting on it's western side at this point we are concerned that the noise impact on these meeting rooms and offices will be substantially increased and may be such that additional sound proofing measures (potentially double glazing of windows etc) would need to be implemented in order for these rooms to be able to continue to be used for their current purpose. In the event this was to occur would we be compensated for this expense and what would this process be?</p> | PIR – 18 S – 4.2.9 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.9 |
| PS003.3 | <p>There is presently quite a lot of pedestrian traffic crossing from the eastern side of South Road to the “BP On-the-Run” complex opposite Kateena Street. It is a central point for the provision of lunches and the like. Today this is a very dangerous road to cross as there is high speed, high traffic volume, and no designated pedestrian crossing point. Given the lights at Kateena Street are to be upgraded as part of the project, and allowing for reduced traffic flow impact of the Superway it would seem a good opportunity to build into the Kateena Street Light upgrade a designated South Road pedestrian crossing.</p> | S – 4.2.8 | <p>Provision for a pedestrian and bicycle crossing has been provided for in the current design of the intersection of South Road and Kateena Street.</p> <p>Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8</p> |
| PS004 | Submission Topics: Project Scope, Congestion | | |
| PS004.1 | <p>This part of South Road is probably the best in relation to road surface and traffic flow north of Darlington. Whilst it may eliminate some congestion, money is better spent in upgrading south of Regency Road for the entire length. The road surface and flow is very poor. Fix the section from Regency to Grange Road, overpasses save money against overpasses, thus more sections of road can be upgraded.</p> | PIR - 4 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 and 6. Refer <i>Supplement</i> 4.2.1. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS004.2 | Believes the project will only provide minimal benefits to the community with additional congestion closer to CBD. | PIR – 4 and 6 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 6 |
| PS005 | Submission Topics: Project scope | | |
| PS005.1 | This is a long overdue project that has been required for a long time! | - | Noted |
| PS005.2 | This current plan will be seen as a joke because this short stretch won't do much at all for the community or business! The only thing wrong is that you are only half doing the job! Why stop at Regency Road? Go all the way down south to the southern expressway and make it a gold coin toll road. We need a freeway that bypasses Adelaide! | PIR – 4 and 6 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 6. Refer <i>Supplement</i> 4.2.1. |
| PS006 | Submission Topics: Local business access/ parking, construction, passing trade, South Road access, safety, Environmental concerns, railway crossings, cyclist and pedestrian access, drainage and water, land use, congestion, project scope | | |
| PS006.1 | Concerned regarding impact on local industry/ business particularly, the businesses between Port Road intersection and Regency Road which have been in limbo for too long. Many of them are run down and have inadequate parking. I don't support this project at all. It should be happening between Port Road and Regency Road. | PIR - 4 S - 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 |
| PS006.2 | Construction impacts are a concern as South Road will become unusable if any construction begins. | S - 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS006.3 | Concerned regarding ease of access between locations on either side of South Road. Suggested this is almost impossible. | S - 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS006.4 | Feels the current situation is unsafe and congestion leads to increased driver frustration and consequent loss of care. | - | Noted |
| PS006.5 | Feels there will be serious impacts on sensitive environmental, cultural or heritage areas | PIR - 11, 12, 14, and 15 | Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 11, 12, 14 and 15. |
| PS006.6 | Concerned regarding railway crossings. Railway bridges or underpasses should be prioritised. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS006.7 | Concerned regarding cyclist and pedestrian access arrangements on South Road. The footpaths are narrow. Pedestrians are often at risk when using the lights at the Foodland crossing. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| PS006.8 | Concerned regarding local drainage, water capture and reuse | PIR – 16 S – 4.2.12 | Refer Project Impact Report Section 16 and Supplement Section 4.2.12 |
| PS007 | Submission Topics: General favour, project scope | | |
| PS007.1 | While I'm generally in favour of any project which will contribute to the overall objective of making South Road a non-stop road, I think the benefit to the local business and community is marginal in comparison to other sections of South Road which should have been addressed first. | PIR – 4 and 6 | Refer to Project Impact Report Sections 4 and 6 |
| PS007.2 | It is strange that this project has been given priority over 1. Port Road to Torrens Road, 2. Edwardstown (multiple intersections and pedestrian crossings) and 3. Sturt Road – well known bottlenecks. | PIR – 4 and 6 | Refer to Project Impact Report Sections 4 and 6 |
| PS008 | Submission Topics: Local business, noise, access to and across South Road, Safety, cyclist and pedestrian access | | |
| PS008.1 | Concerned about impacts on local industry/business in particular potential noise impact on second floor offices | PIR – 18 S - 4.2.2 and 4.2.9 | Refer to Supplement Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.9 |
| PS008.2 | Interested in local business access to South Road especially Kateena Street access for B Doubles critical . | S - 4.2.2 | B-Double access will be maintained. Refer to Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS008.3 | Interested in ease of access between locations on either side of South Road. There is a (current) need for pedestrian access across South Road and Kateena Street. Can pedestrian crossing be provided to give access across South Road and Kateena Street? This will also provide improved safety for road users. | S - 4.2.8 | Provision for a pedestrian and bicycle crossing has been provided for in the current design of the intersection of South Road and Kateena Street. Refer to Supplement Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS009 | Submission Topics: Access across South Road, Railway Crossings, traffic, property, access | | |
| PS009.1 | Concerned re ease of access between locations on either side of South Road in particular access to Days Road | S - 4.2.8 | East-west movement across South Road is proposed at Days Road Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS009.2 | Not concerned about railway crossings feels getting rid of rail crossing is good | PIR – 7 | Noted |
| PS009.3 | Believes project will benefit the local community and businesses by less local traffic eventually and no train crossings | PIR - 4 | Noted |
| PS009.4 | Believes the planning study should consider the amount of extra South Road traffic south of Regency Road. | PIR - 4 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 |
| PS010 | Submission Topics: Property value, access | | |
| PS010.1 | I am the landlord of a property on South Road Regency Park. I will find it harder to lease this property because of lack of access due to no right hand turn from South Road. | S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.6 | The development of the new Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove Link will provide enhanced accessibility for the Regency Park precinct including for businesses on South Road. The provision of u-turn facilities at Days Road will also provide for direct access to South Road properties. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.6 |
| PS011 | Submission Topics: Access, passing trade, safety, property, project scope | | |
| PS011.1 | Concerned Wing Street area will have no access to Port River Expressway/Salisbury Highway. Put an access lane from South Terrace believes this will impact upon local business. Buy some land and put in north bound access from South Terrace | S – 4.2.8 | DTEI is currently investigating options for the provision of heavy vehicle access to the South Road Superway Project via Hanson Road from Wingfield north-west precinct (described as Precinct 1 in the <i>Project Impact Report</i>). The precinct is bounded by Port River Expressway to the north, Cormack Road to the south, South Road to the east and Hanson Road to the west. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS011.2 | Concerned regarding local business access to South Road. Believes no access to the north and back street maze to the south is ridiculous. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS011.3 | Regency Park and Wingfield will be cut off from passing trade and is concerned regarding the impact | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS011.4 | Concerns regarding safety for road users especially entry and exit for Wing Street area and Rafferty Street being widened. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS011.5 | Believe the project will bring no benefit to local businesses and the community. Why not spend half and put in two overpasses at Cormack/Rail and Junction Road. The other \$400 million could go towards the real problem between Regency Road and Grange Road. | PIR – 4 and 6 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 6. Refer <i>Supplement</i> 4.2.1 |
| PS012 | Submission Topics: Access, Naweena Road, | | |
| PS012.1 | Interested in the ease of access between locations on either side of South Road, especially Naweena Road. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS012.2 | Concerned with Naweena Road becoming a two way link road as it would be much too narrow for land and long vehicles now servicing the area to stop and turn wide as required without causing major traffic disruptions and safety issues. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS013 | Submission Topics: Local industry, safety, Naweena Road, | | |
| PS013.1 | Concerned about the capacity of Naweena Road to handle mixed traffic, light and heavy, local and thoroughfare. This will become a road safety issue, as well as a logistical problem for local businesses. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS014 | Submission Topics: Local industry, access, safety, cyclists and pedestrian access, alternative solutions, project scope | | |
| PS014.1 | Concerned re impacts on local industry/business. Notes that it is not clear how we are going to access our plant in Tikalara St, by bicycle, from the south. | PIR - 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | The new Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove Link will provide safe and efficient vehicle and cycle access to the Regency Park precinct, including to Tikalara Street. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS014.2 | Concerned re safety for road users. This looks likely to make the rest of South Road even more dangerous. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS014.3 | Concerned re cyclist and pedestrian access arrangements. There are no safe cycling facilities on the rest of South Road. Traffic is too fast and too heavy. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS014.4 | Believes the project will provide little benefit to the local community and businesses because it does not address safety issues with South Road, but looks likely to add more traffic to it. It looks likely to make South Road into a greater barrier. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS014.5 | An alternative access route to Regency Park is essential. Can speeds be reduced and bike lanes added to the other sections of South Road first. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS015 | Submission Topics: Access, construction, passing trade, safety, railway crossing, drainage and water, property | | |
| PS015.1 | Concerned with local business access to South Road in particular indirect access off South Terrace and Staite Street (both ways). Concerned re railway crossings believes closure on South Road major issue and requests access via Wing St. Suggests the study consider extending ramp north therefore access on South Road to Wing Street. Suggest looking at acquisition on West side to facilitate ramp extension. | S – 2.2.3, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.3, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS015.2 | Concerned regarding construction impacts and reduced access. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS015.3 | Interested in the impact on frontage/passing trade access will be restrained. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS015.4 | Interested in safety for road users. Believe the current access is acceptable – new arrangement confusing. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| PS015.5 | Believes the free flow of traffic will benefit the local business and the community. | - | Noted |
| PS016 | Submission Topics: Property value, noise | | |
| PS016.1 | Queried what the effect will be on property value and rental value. | S – 4.2.4 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.4 |
| PS016.2 | Concerned regarding noise and vibration travel on two storey building at Wingfield | PIR – 18 S – 4.2.9 | Refer to Supplement Section 4.2.9 and Project Impact Report Section 18 |
| PS017 | Submission Topics: Local industry/ business, access, construction impact, visual impacts, congestion, project scope | | |
| PS017.1 | Concerned about impacts on local industry business. See impacts as extreme, for very little immediate or long term gain. Concerned regarding local business access to South Road. | PIR – 4 and 6 S – 4.2.2 | Refer to Project Impact Report Sections 4 and 6 and Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS017.2 | Concerned re ease of access between locations on either side of South Road. Believes traffic to and from Angle Park/ Regency Park will add to the congestion at Grand Junction and Naweena Road. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS017.3 | Concerned about visual impacts from proposed viaduct structure. Is interested to know why the viaduct is so long, why can't it come to ground between Wirriga Street and Kateena Street and move upgraded traffic signals from Kateena Street to Taminga Street. | PIR – 5 and 13 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 5 and 13 The alternative suggested was considered in the early identification and assessment of options. The option was discounted for a range of reasons including the need to acquire more properties (south of Grand Junction Road) to accommodate predicted traffic volumes and the resultant greater affect on landowners, tenants and businesses. Also this option would require the closure of the intersection of Days Road with South Road which would significantly limit the connectivity of the study area for residents, businesses and other road users. |
| PS017.4 | Believes anything to alter level train crossings is beneficial | - | Noted |
| PS017.5 | The funnel effect from both the north and the south of the city just adds to the already congested strip between Richmond Road and Regency Road. Believes the project will bring limited if any at all benefit to local business and the community. The north/south corridor needs fixing between Regency Road and Darlington first. An overpass of South Tce- Wingfield Rail and Cormack Road makes sense to me but any further works including the Grand Junction Road intersection only moves delays and bottlenecks further south. Suggests – fix the South Road crossings at Torrens Road, Regency Road, Port Road, Grange Road, Henley Beach Road and Richmond road first. Widen the South Road between Regency Road and Richmond Road first. | PIR - 4 | Noted Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 |
| PS018 | Submission Topics: Access Gallipoli Grove, noise, benefits for some businesses | | |
| PS018.1 | Concerned regarding impacts on local industry/business. Believe a service road from Gallipoli Grove still needs access for ceremony cars including stretch limousine access to Sunnybrae Farm. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Access will continue to be provided to properties along Gallipoli Grove and discussions will continue through the detailed design stage of the project with individual landowners and tenants to ensure vehicle access needs are met. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS018.2 | Interested in construction impacts, in particular noise impacts. | PIR – 18 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.9 | Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 18 and <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.9 |
| PS018.3 | Believes some businesses will be better seen via height of viaduct and see this as a benefit. | - | Noted. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS019 | Submission Topics: Construction impacts especially dust | | |
| PS019.1 | <p>Concerns regarding the impact construction will have on our manufacturing site. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. pollution via dust entering our facility 2. We manufacture fresh product on a daily basis and dust or other contaminants are a major concern. <p>We would appreciate some expert thought being given to how our facility will be protected from any form of contamination from the roadworks. In saying this we believe a thorough understanding of our process is needed and therefore request a meeting on site be arranged so a suitable solution is tabled before any construction is commenced.</p> | PIR – 19 S – 4.2.10 | A site visit has been undertaken and DTEI will continue to liaise with potentially affected businesses on this matter. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.10 and <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 19 |
| PS020 | Submission Topics: Project scope, traffic, access, linkages, Naweena Road, congestion, passing trade | | |
| PS020.1 | Commend Government – Singular and Plural- Local, State and Federal for grasping the challenge to produce an efficient north-south transport route. | PIR - 4 | Noted |
| PS020.2 | I think you're just starting in the wrong place - this part of the north-south route is undoubtedly the fastest flowing. | PIR - 4 | Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 |
| PS020.3 | <p>For such traffic the solution proposed looks great but for businesses in Wingfield, east or west of South Road, for those in Angle Park and Regency Park I do not think the solutions are well thought through. I would like to know from the traffic counts just how many vehicles (and particularly truck) movements which start at say Regency Road, are through passages to the Port River Expressway and vice versa by comparison with those same starting points which go to destinations in Wingfield, Angle Park and Regency Park.</p> <p>You claim that the Superway will 'enable local east west links across South Road to be maintained and enhanced'.</p> <p>Page 4 "The Superway's non stop corridor will enable significant improvement to property access etc."</p> | S - 3.3.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 3.3.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| PS020.4 | <p>The only realistic reason for selecting this part of South Road for the first stage is the volume of vehicle movement at Grand Junction Road – I also agree that Cormack Road and the rail crossing are problems, but I do not think your proposed solutions are going to significantly reduce movements at that intersection.</p> <p>Presently there are 3 lanes of right turn from South Road into Grand Junction Road to travel east. Under the new proposal that is reduced to two and any northbound South Road traffic wanting access to Wingfield, east of west will still have to use this intersection. There are then two lanes up onto the Superway but apparently no ground level</p> | S - 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS020.5 | <p>Similarly with the Naweena Street proposal - with traffic lights at Grand Junction Road; surely there is enough space to bridge over Grand Junction Road and eliminate these lights which will cause significant delays and potential blockages particularly to east bound traffic on Grand Junction Road?</p> | S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| PS020.6 | <p>I do not believe Naweena is wide enough as it is to carry the volume of traffic it will get, particularly in the construction stage of the Superway.</p> | S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| PS020.7 | <p>The Superway only goes south as far as Taminga Street, then, essentially reverts to the current 3 lanes each way. How will this section possibly cope with the planned 4 fold increases in traffic?</p> | PIR – 4, 7 and 17 S – 3.3.1 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 17 |
| PS020.8 | <p>What will happen, particularly if immediate attention is not given to widening South Road from Regency Road, Torrens Road, Port Road etc. south, is that traffic will bank up from the South Regency lights - right back- perhaps as far as Camira Street, thus compromising access/exits to South Road frontages.</p> | PIR – 4, 7 and 17 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 17. Refer <i>Supplement</i> 4.2.1 |
| PS021 | Submission Topics: Meeting Request, loss of visibility, local roads, service road, large vehicle access, freeway status, project program, construction impacts, access, project scope, signage, business impacts | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | |
| PS021.1 | <p>Complete loss of visibility and exposure of both dealerships by passing trade and traffic from the Superway.</p> | S – 4.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.3 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS021.2 | Where does the service road under the Superway lead? | PIR - 7 | The service roads under the Superway become part of the local and regional road network providing a distribution and local access function to properties within the area. See Plan in Appendix B . |
| PS021.3 | Confirmation that the upgraded local road network will be suitable for B-Double traffic and that there will be no restrictions (current or future) on the use of the road network by B-Double vehicles is required | PIR - 7 | Current B-Double access arrangements will be maintained. |
| PS021.4 | Confirmation that the Superway will remain a freeway (not a tollway) for the life of the asset is required. | - | Funding for the South Road Superway Project has been committed. The Superway will not be a toll road given this funding allocation. |
| PS021.5 | Details of project program and construction sequence are required. | PIR – 1 SR – 1 | Section 1 of the <i>Supplement</i> provides information on the broad project timeframes. Further detail on construction programming and sequencing will be developed by the Contractor's appointed to carry out the local road upgrades and the design and construction of the South Road elevated roadway and service roads. |
| PS021.6 | There will be significant adverse disruption to business during the proposed 3 year construction period as many of our customers will seek alternate dealerships for sales and service. Compensation for this disruption will need to be discussed. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS021.7 | B Double access in dealerships during construction must not be hampered. Single land access to sites along the construction corridor is not sufficient | S – 4.2.2 | Current B-Double access arrangements will be maintained. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Report Section 4.2.2 |
| PS021.8 | The proposed landscape and sculptures underneath the Superway will obstruct visibility of dealerships from passing local traffic. | PIR – 13 S – 4.2.3 | The proposed landscaping and any public art will be designed to enhance visual amenity beneath the elevated roadway. DTEI also has a requirement to provide replacement planting for trees and areas of vegetation removed to enable construction. Appropriate species selection (including use of low grasses, ground covers and street trees) will achieve a balance between maintaining visibility to adjacent business and improving visual amenity. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.3 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS021.9 | An off ramp at Grand Junction Road (for north bound traffic) would be beneficial. | - | Vehicles travelling north along South Road will be able to use a new service road starting south of Days Road to access Grand Junction Road, accordingly there is no need for a further off ramp at Grand Junction Road. In addition, DTEI has investigated and plan to build a new access road on South Road between Grand Junction and Rosberg Roads. This new link would provide at grade access from Grand Junction Road north to Cormack Road, under the Superway. |
| PS021.10 | Loss of right turn access into Regency Park dealership from South Road (heading north) is a concern. | PIR – 7 S – 3.3.2, 2.2.6 and 4.2.8 | Noted. Safety is a concern and the preference is to use the Naweena Road/Gallipoli Grove Link. In addition, DTEI is investigating the potential for U-Turns at Days Road intersection. |
| PS021.11 | Dealership signage strategy will be adversely affected and no longer effective. Changes and compensation will need to be discussed. The business strategy of having both sites acting as a gateway capturing passing traffic will be totally destroyed by the proposed Superway. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 |
| PS021.12 | The interconnectivity of our two dealerships will be adversely affected. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS022 | Submission Topics: Relocation concerns, management during construction phase, financial assistance | | |
| PS022.1 | Sunnybrae Pony Club has been in existence, on the same site for 26 years and are very much part of the local community and local environment. | - | Noted. |
| PS022.2 | The proposed Superway will necessitate the relocation of a number of existing facilities within the existing pony club, these include: the day paddock, the entry gate, the all weather riding arena, grassed riding area, the canteen, stables, clubrooms, wash bay, round yard, manure pit, club shed, associated infrastructure and fencing. Temporary fencing will be required during the construction phase, some fencing will also require an upgrade | PIR - 10 | Noted. DTEI will continue to work with the Pony Club during the detailed design phase to ensure minimal disruption to the horses, staff and club members during construction. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS022.3 | Financial assistance required with relocation cost. | PIR - 10 | The <i>Land Acquisition Act 1969</i> provides for compensation to property owners, tenants, businesses and other parties directly affected by land acquisition associated with a proposal. DTEI will continue to discuss compensation with affected parties. |
| PS022.4 | Concerns regarding retention of trees. | PIR - 14 | Remnant native vegetation in the project areas has been extensively cleared, however it is acknowledged that planted trees and shrubs make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area. Where possible, trees will be retained or pruned, however some vegetation clearance will be unavoidable in order to upgrade the local road network and construct the elevated roadway. Under DTEI's Vegetation Removal Policy, replacement planting will be carried out to compensate for any vegetation that is removed. DTEI will work with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield to develop a landscape revegetation plan and appropriate street tree planting Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 14 |
| PS022.5 | Access/ egress and car parking concerns pre and post construction phase | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
| PS023 | Submission Topics: Traffic volumes, noise, design, access, passing trade, safety, visual impact, drainage and water impacts | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS023.1 | <p>The proposed Superway will have a major impact on existing businesses within the locality in that:-</p> <p>It will significantly reduce the volume of traffic directly passing the subject site and other sites along South Road. It is understood that two way flow of traffic will decrease and the volume of traffic passing the site will reduce to less than 30% of the existing flow with direct access to the site. It is considered that there will be major impacts to both the level of access to passing traffic with significant volume of the existing traffic flow being relocated onto a road with no direct access to the site. Significantly it is considered likely that commercial vehicle traffic using the full extent of the Superway will simply bypass the site, therefore using alternative facilities with substantial reduction in trade on the site. This aspect is compounded by the currently proposed level of access to be provided off the service roadway.</p> | PIR - 7 S – 4.2.2 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.2 |
| PS023.2 | <p>There will be potential noise issues relating to traffic travelling on the elevated roadway of the proposed Superway. While it is understood that there is no acquisition of any land within the subject property, it would appear that the design of the Superway will result in the viaduct being located close to the boundary of the site resulting in potential noise issues.</p> | PIR – 18 S – 4.2.9 | Refer to Project Impact Report Section 18 and Supplement Section 4.2.9 |
| PS023.3 | <p>The design of the service road does not extend to the south of our site. Hence access for existing customers travelling to and from the south would be difficult. While it is understood that this issue will be re-examined with a view to continuing the service road to the south of the site, this will potentially impact on the ability to provide access to both Rosberg Road and the roadway to the south of the service station site. It would presumably require some significant modifications to the design in order to link a service road to the intersection of South Road and Grand Junction Road.</p> <p>In the event that that the service road is not continued to the south to connect with the intersection of South Road and Grand Junction Road, then there will be a very substandard level of local access.</p> | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | <p>This issue is currently being investigated by DTEI to ensure local road access is maintained.</p> <p>Refer to Supplement Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8</p> |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| PS023.4 | The existing design does not appear to provide for a direct access into the site off the (future) service road of South Road. Such an access is considered to be critical, given that the subject site provides access for both private cars and commercial traffic including B-doubles and semi-trailers. The design of the future access arrangement will require detailed review by my client. | PIR-7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | This issue is currently being investigated by DTEI. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS023.5 | My client is most concerned that unimpeded access can be maintained to the subject site during the construction period. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS023.6 | In principle the safety to road users should increase given the reduced levels of side friction along the main (elevated) roadway and the presumably lower speed limit to be provided along the service road. | PIR - 17 | Noted. |
| PS023.7 | The design of the elevated roadway will result in a reduced level of conflict at the major intersections and will overcome potential conflicts with railway crossings. | PIR - 7 | Noted. |
| PS023.8 | The provision of a viaduct adjacent to the subject site will have a significant visual impact on the service station, particularly given the close proximity of the convenience store to this structure and potential overshadowing. | PIR - 13 | The north-south alignment of the Superway means that some properties within close proximity of the structure maybe partially affected either early morning or late afternoon by overshadowing |
| PS023.9 | Traffic accessing the site and travelling to and from the north will be required to cross the existing railway crossings. On this basis, delays and potential conflicts associated with the rail crossing for customers of this site would not significantly change. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> 4.2.8. |
| PS023.10 | Local drainage, water capture and reuse. This aspect is also seen as fundamental. | PIR – 16 S – 4.2.12 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 16 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.12 |
| PS023.11 | Potential relocation of the up ramp for northbound traffic with this ramp shifted to the north of the intersection of Mansell Court with South Road. This would not only permit traffic entering South Road at Grand Junction Road to access the Superway but would also allow a greater level of access to the Superway from the local road network. | PIR - 7 | Relocation of the up ramp to the north of the intersection of Mansell Court and South Road will shorten the weaving length of the main Superway and will have negative traffic impacts, therefore it has been discounted on safety grounds. |
| PS023.12 | Provision of direct access into the site from the proposed at grade (service) roadway of South Road is considered critical. | PIR - 7 | Direct access from the north is considered acceptable with direct access from the south currently being investigated by DTEI. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS024 | Submission Topics: General support, Naweena Road/ Gallipoli Grove connection, access, Regency Road intersection | | |
| PS024.1 | We are most supportive of the core of the project being the South Road elevated Superway as an important addition to Adelaide's major roads network. | - | Noted. |
| PS024.2 | It is the ancillary work of connecting Naweena Road to Gallipoli Grove and exiting traffic through a lighted intersection at Regency Road that we take issue with. The southern connection to Regency Road creates the opportunity for through type commuter traffic to use a new access which currently does not exist. One must wonder what the purpose of building a Superway is if it is necessary to create a new rat run thoroughfare parallel and 300m distant from South Road, especially when Churchill Road exists as the next alternative arterial. Naweena/Gallipoli connection is not necessary. Its abolition will save the need for land acquisition and save substantial cost. The lighted intersection at Regency Road will severely impact on our access, is bad traffic planning and will create dangerous traffic conflicts. | S – 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS024.3 | Proposed access will render right turn out from property impossible | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Access will continue to be provided to properties along Gallipoli Grove and Naweena Road and discussions will continue through the detailed design stage of the project with individual landowners and tenants to ensure needs are met wherever possible. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS025 | Submission Topics: Loss of street frontage, congestion on Dunstan Road corner, impact on business, B-Double and road train access, access, parking and congestion on Rosberg Road, land acquisition | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| PS025.1 | <p>One proposed option for Rosberg Road upgrade includes cutting off Grand Junction Road service road, this will restrict access from the service road to the south east corner of our property. We are concerned closing off the Grand Junction service road will force all traffic (including heavy vehicles) to exit the service road via Dunstan Road. This corner will then become very congested, impacting upon businesses operating in this section, visibility will be limited. We fully support the recent suggestion to build an exit road from the Grand Junction Road service road out to Grand Junction Road to enable east bound traffic to exit directly onto Grand Junction Road.</p> <p>We are concerned that any restriction of traffic from Rosberg Road onto Grand Junction Road Service Road will impact upon transit oriented businesses along this road. How will B-Double and Road Train access be maintained?</p> | S – 4.2.8 | <p>Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8.</p> <p>Current B-Double access arrangements will be maintained and enhanced.</p> |
| PS025.2 | <p>The north/south section of Rosberg Road is used for overnight truck parking, once the road is carrying more traffic this will create a general traffic hazard</p> | PIR - 7 | <p>The South Road Superway Project does not propose any change to parking along Rosberg Road.</p> |
| PS025.3 | <p>Would like to comment further once details in relation to Rosberg Road extension have been finalised.</p> | PIR - 3 | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The project team is currently working on revised concept designs for the Rosberg Road to Grand Junction Road link and will seek feedback from local businesses and landholders on the preferred scheme.</p> |
| PS025.4 | <p>Concerned about access between locations on either side of South Road, particularly during construction phase – how will congestion be managed?</p> | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | <p>Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.8</p> |
| PS025.5 | <p>The proposal should improve the profile of the area for business. The proposal should have a long term benefit to the area, but access must be maintained to local businesses.</p> | PIR – 4 S – 4.2.2 | <p>Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2</p> |
| PS025.6 | <p>Concerned regarding railway crossings, note South Road will be fixed but question traffic routed to other local rail crossing.</p> | PIR - 7 | <p>By constructing an elevated roadway over the existing South Road rail crossing, safety for large volumes of through traffic will be significantly improved. The proposed Rafferty Street Link (including the new rail crossing) will be designed to cater for the predicted traffic volumes and a signalised rail crossing may be provided. This solution is currently under review.</p> |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| PS026 | Submission Topics: Local industry, access South Road, passing trade, safety, no community benefit, alternative route suggestion | | |
| PS026.1 | Concerned regarding the excess traffic and noise which will be disruptive for local industry/ business. Concerned the proposal will create difficulty and time issues for local business access to South Road. There is no benefit that we can see. It will be disruptive with excess traffic and noise. Regency Park / Wingfield is a transport hub and these plans will make access to local business by the transport companies much difficult | PIR – 4, 6 and 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.9 | The South Road Superway Project aims to decrease traffic congestion along South Road given its significant role as the only continuous transport link between the Port River Expressway and the Southern Expressway. See Appendix B for general access maps |
| PS026.2 | Concerned regarding impact to passing trade, believes that if Rosberg Road becomes a main access road it will lead to access problems for customers. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS026.3 | Concerned that direct access to the business will be denied and this will add time to delivery points. The proposal requires that B-Doubles access the property on the bend of Rosberg Road creating a safety issue. | S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS026.4 | We suggest the best solutions would be to have a new road pass through the wetlands and continue on the eastern side of the drain through to Regency Road. This would have a much lesser impact on business in the immediate area. | PIR - 7 | The Barker Inlet Wetland is a valuable environmental resource. One of the objectives of this project is to minimise effects on the wetland and the current solution aims to meet this objective. |
| PS027 | Submission Topics: Access, right hand turns, passing trade | | |
| PS027.1 | Concerned regarding the impact of turning right out of 605 South Road, in relation to business access and passing trade. We require a break in the island under the Superway allowing a right hand turn into 605-607 South Road, and shared road, from northern travelling traffic | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | No right turn access will be available at this location due to safety reasons. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS028 | Submission Topics: Access, passing trade, extend to South Terrace | | |
| PS028.1 | Concerned the proposal will lead to reduced accessibility, it will be harder to get to businesses which are in the direct vicinity of 122 South Terrace Wingfield (corner of South Road and South Terrace). Passing trade will be reduced because business is harder to get to. Less traffic to area of Wingfield as it will be travelling overhead, leading to shorter travelling times | S – 3.3.2 and 2.2.6, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Sections 3.3.2, 2.2.6, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| PS028.2 | Please extend South Road up to South Terrace as part of the local network. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.6 | Extension of South Road service lane up to South Terrace is not preferred due to the rail crossing and subsequent safety issues. However, given input from local businesses and ARTC the traffic options for this area are currently under review. |
| PS029 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns, safety, environmental, cultural concerns, safety, drainage | | |
| PS029.1 | Require more information regarding right hand turns into Grand Junction Road from Naweena Road, has safety concerns | PIR.7 | Traffic signals are proposed at the intersection of Grand Junction Road and Naweena Road and this will facilitate safe right turn movements. |
| PS029.2 | Concerned regarding access to Sunnybrae Farm from Naweena Road or Gallipoli Grove and impacts on environment, cultural or heritage areas. | PIR – 11, 12, 14 and 15 | Refer to Project Impact Report Sections 11, 12, 14 and 15 |
| PS029.3 | Believe open drain at west side of Gallipoli Grove is a safety hazard. | PIR - 7 | During the design process issues relating to safety will be addressed and treatments recommended where required (e.g.: guard fencing). |
| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
| PS030 | Submission Topics: Congestion, Grand Junction Road service road, traffic flow, proposed cul-de-sac creating bottle neck, suggested solution | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| PS030.1 | <p>Concerned about likely heavy vehicle congestion resulting from the closure of the Grand Junction Road service road, understand same concern held by other businesses. Businesses at Wingfield recognised nationally as interstate truck stops for Adelaide. The traffic flow will force all exiting trucks onto the Grand Junction service road, many head in an easterly direction, exiting east along the Grand Junction Road service road and out onto Grand Junction Road</p> <p>The cul-de-sac proposed at 559 Grand Junction Road would force all trucks to head west back to Grand Junction Road creating more of a bottle neck and making some businesses inaccessible.</p> <p>Solution is to install an exit road from Grand Junction Road service road out through the grass onto Grand Junction Road to allow traffic to proceed east onto Grand Junction Road (diagram included)</p> | PIR – 7 and 17 S – 2.2.4 | <p>DTEI is currently investigating a link between Grand Junction and Rosberg Roads to address community concerns about loss of continuity on the South Road alignment related to the properties on the western side of Grand Junction Road. While such a link has not been finalised in the current concept design, it remains under consideration by DTEI.</p> <p>Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.4</p> |
| PS030.2 | Sees a benefit associated with increased spending in the local area during the construction phase. | PIR - 6 | Noted. |
| PS031 | Submission Topics: Site Acquisition | | |
| PS031.1 | Suggest enter discussion regarding purchasing site. Current site usage will not be supported after construction, and site location makes for a good site office. Purchase will be mutually beneficial. | PIR - 10 | Noted. |
| PS032 | Submission Topics: Local business, passing trade, project should be revised | | |
| PS032.1 | Concerned regarding impacts on local industry business, sees the proposal as a long term disaster. Believes access to South Road will be impacted as there will be practically no way to go northwards. Concerned impact on passing trade will break a number of businesses. Believes the benefits of the proposal will go to those who use the road, but not come from the area. | PIR – 4 and 6 S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 6 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS033 | Submission Topics: Some positives but needs greater clarification, Impacts on small business, land acquisition, cost justification, Naweena Road, master plan required, project scope, B double access, property value, construction impact, Visual impact, railway crossing, social impacts | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS033.1 | I am in favour of fixing South Road. It is long overdue. | PIR - 4 | Noted. |
| PS033.2 | Pleas regarding the inclusion of a service road that allows traffic to move along the ground level on the current South Road alignment to provide access for vehicles travelling north from Regency Park on South Road and for vehicles travelling from both sides of Grand Junction Road. | PIR - 7 | Noted. |
| PS033.3 | Some small businesses will be significantly disadvantaged to the point they may be forced out. | S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS033.4 | The Government should seriously look at acquiring the land at pre-Superway valuations and then can deal with the property in due course as the project is completed. | PIR - 10.4.2 | Noted. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 10.4.2. The design of the South Road Superway Project has sought to minimise land acquisition. |
| PS033.5 | Concerns over the figures presented regarding increased traffic, would like the detail of these calculations present to explain how they justify the need for the \$850 million expenditure. | PIR – 4 and 6 S – 3.3.1 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 4 and 6 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 3.3.1 Future traffic volumes (year 2031) used in planning the Superway have been obtained using DTEI's Metropolitan Adelaide Strategic Transport Evaluation Model (MASTEM). The model includes programmed road and public transport improvements on Adelaide's transport network. The model demographic scenario is based on the Department of Planning and Local Government's 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide planning case, interpolated to 2016 and 2031 for this assessment. The traffic volumes are also based on the inclusion of the link with the possible future project, Northern Connector, which is subject to another planning study. The proposed budget of the project is \$812 million. |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| PS033.6 | <p>No detail provided on the Naweena Road alignment alternative. This alternative is believed to offer benefits, including cost savings, minimal traffic disruption, no significant reduction of property or business values, quicker build time and ability for more industrial land release.</p> <p>What is the cost of the overpasses? The Cormack Road and Grand Junction Road intersections are main issue. Have been advised that three lanes are necessary requiring considerable property and business acquisition costs, seeks detail of these costs and cost differences between design, and of the benefit?</p> <p>Seeking a cost benefit summary between the proposed Superway, overpasses x 2 and Naweena Road intersection</p> | PIR - 5 | <p>The alternative options considered and the assessment criteria used to identify the preferred option are described in Section 5 of the <i>Project Impact Report</i>. The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) for the proposed South Road Superway Project was 1.9. The BCR for option N4 was also 1.9. The BCR for the two overpass option (N1) was 1.2.</p> <p>DTEI previously considered the option of an alternative alignment off South Road (“offline option”). There are numerous advantages in constructing a new corridor away from the existing South Road, however this option was not pursued further by the DTEI for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is not a strategic fit with the South Australian Government’s long term commitment to build a non-stop, free flowing north-south corridor by 2031 between the Port River Expressway and the Southern Expressway. Australian Government funding for the project also requires the works to be located on the existing South Road alignment ▪ An alternative off-line option does not maximise utilisation of the existing road infrastructure, e.g. interchange of South Road/Port River Expressway (PRExy)/Salisbury Highway. An off-line option would require construction of two new interchanges; one to connect to Salisbury Highway and another at Grand Junction Road, which is considered too close to the existing South Road/PRExy/Salisbury Highway interchange and would not comply with Austroads Road Design Guidelines |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An off-line option offers very limited improvements to traffic accessibility and safety along the section of South Road, between Regency Road and PRExy, in particular at the intersection of Grand Junction Road/South Road and an at-grade rail crossing. Traffic conditions would continue to deteriorate as traffic demand and residential, commercial, and industrial developments grow rapidly in Westwood, Regency Park, and Wingfield areas ▪ An off-line option would have a significant environmental impact on the Barker Inlet Wetland. <p>Due to the issues listed above, DTEI determined that the current South Road Superway alignment will deliver the best outcome for the majority of the local community and road users.</p> |
| PS033.7 | <p>The process of fixing the road, section at a time is ineffective; an overall master plan is required. Given the funding provided wouldn't it be more prudent to prepare a whole of South Road master plan first. Why is DTEI not fixing the really bad sections of South Road e.g. Torrens Road to Port Road. Why work on the best section of the road when there are other constraining sections. Is there a risk that funding to do the bad sections of South Road will take many years to be made available? Is there a risk that a complete design of the road might be compromised by this Superway design?</p> | PIR - 4 | <p>Planning for the length of the north-south corridor is currently under development. The Australian Government has provided \$70 million for DTEI to undertake this planning work. The Port Road Tunnel and widening to Torrens Road have been put on hold to ensure that the preferred solution for those locations is compatible with the overall plan for the corridor.</p> <p>Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 4 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.1.</p> |
| PS033.8 | <p>Concerned regarding impact on local business. A service road along the whole length of South Road is required including crossing over the railway line and all the way to Wing Street/South Terrace. This will create significant lack of access to businesses on the northern side of the railway crossing.</p> | S – 4.2.2, 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.6 | <p>Provision of a continuous at-grade service road between Aruma Street and the Port River Expressway is not possible without significant property acquisition and business effects at the intersection of South Road and Grand Junction Road (due to the need to provide ramps up to the elevated roadway in this location). A connection between Grand Junction Road and Rosberg Road is proposed.</p> <p>Alternative access to the Wingfield north-east precinct is currently being reviewed. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2, 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.6</p> |
| PS033.9 | <p>Good access required for B doubles and other transport vehicles. Site viability has been reduced and property value reduced, service road extension may go some way to mitigate this.</p> | PIR - 7 | <p>B-double access will be maintained</p> |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS033.10 | Concerned the underside of the Superway will become a ghetto, especially in areas where traffic volumes are low. Concerned regarding visual impact from the proposed viaduct structure; that it will be a significant negative for this property. Property will be in shadow and appear dwarfed by proposal | PIR – 13 S – 4.2.3 | <p>Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 13 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.3.</p> <p>Some properties within close proximity of the structure maybe partially affected either early morning or late afternoon by overshadowing, however the height of the structure allows sunlight to penetrate below minimising the impact of overshadowing.</p> <p>The interpretation of whether there will be social ramifications of an elevated roadway are open to individual interpretation. On the one hand there is a view that the visual character of South Road may be affected leading to a lower quality of amenity. On the other hand elevated roadways or Viaducts have not only been successful in separating traffic conflicts and improving amenity and social connectivity across busy roads but have also led to other opportunities. For example, in San Lorenzo, a district of Rome, the Viaduct has spurred on street art and lighting has kept the neighbourhood lively at the ground level; in Chelsea, North York, the High Line structure has allowed for mixed use development; the Holborn Viaduct in London, UK has seen buildings fronting the viaduct as well as on the Street below; in Wu Jiao Plaza, Shanghai, urban designed installations have created a unique focal point for two neighbourhoods and in locations such as the Minami Senju Underpass in Tokyo, Japan or the I-5 viaduct in Seattle, USA spaces under viaducts offer an opportunity to establish public places and walkways through design, lighting and landscaping. DTEI, with its consultants, have undertaken a 'Visual Analysis' of the corridor and offered a strong landscape plan that proposes to build on, and improve landscape character where possible.</p> |
| PS033.11 | Concerned regarding construction impact, cannot clearly define what the impact will be. Imperative that access to the site be maintained during this time | PIR - 7 S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS033.12 | Considers that safety for road users will likely increase as a result of this design. | PIR - 4 | Noted. |
| PS033.13 | The Superway needs to respect potential impacts upon sensitive environmental, cultural or heritage areas including wetlands and aboriginal sites. | PIR – 11, 12, 14, 15, 16 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> , Sections 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| PS033.14 | Believes local drainage and water capture and re-use are very important issues not only for the property but also for the whole community. | PIR - 16 S – 4.2.12 | Refer to <i>Project Impact Report</i> Section 16 and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.12. |
| PS034 | Submission Topics: Economic impacts, access, route alternative, timing, council restrictions, construction damage | | |
| PS034.1 | Proposed roadwork restrictions may jeopardise specific requirements of tenants in relation to road frontage and access | PIR - 7 S – 4.2.2 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS034.2 | Concerns relating to legal battles over access to customers during or after construction. Who is liable for costs associated if tenant breaks lease and what compensation would be available? | PIR - 10 | The Land Acquisition Act 1969 provides for compensation to property owners, tenants, businesses and other parties directly affected by a proposal. DTEI will continue to discuss compensation with affected parties. |
| PS034.3 | Will there be uninterrupted access below the new overpass for traffic between Grand Junction Road and Cormack Road? | PIR - 7 | DTEI is currently investigating a concept design for local road access between Grand Junction Road and Cormack Road. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.4. |
| PS034.4 | Will there be easier access from Cormack Road northbound traffic? Rather than use Grand Junction Road would an up ramp alternative route at Cormack Road be considered? | PIR - 7 | An extension of the South Road service lane between Cormack Road and South Terrace is not preferred due to the safety and traffic efficiency issues arising from the rail crossing. An up ramp at Cormack Road to the Superway was considered not feasible due to land acquisition, cost, traffic engineering and safety reasons. |
| PS034.5 | Are there any assurances that the Davis Road upgrade to Francis Road will be open to traffic prior to any closures on the South Road between Grand Junction Road and Cormack Road | PIR – 1 S – 1.1 | The Davis Street Link is proposed as part of the early works package to ensure the link is open prior to construction commencing on the South Road Superway Project. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 1.1 |
| PS034.6 | Will local council signage restrictions be amended to allow extra visibility from overhead passing traffic i.e. roof signage? | S – 4.2.3 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.3 |
| PS034.7 | Will damage to properties during construction, i.e. building degradation, dust impacts be made good? | S – 4.2.2 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| PS035 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, access, area identity, new link, parking | | |
| PS035.1 | Would like to ensure comments are included in <i>Supplement</i> | PIR - 3 | Noted |
| PS035.2 | Oppose the existing Naweena Road being used as a link. Strongly oppose any connection though to Grand Junction Road directly adjacent to premises (e.g. concept 1 which will disable access between their 5 existing gates and result in a cul-de-sac at the eastern end of Indama) | S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| PS035.3 | Would like to see the uniqueness of the area retained, for example no line marking | - | Noted. The first priority is to ensure safety. |
| PS035.4 | Consider having a new link set east of the drain. On-street truck parking needs to be retained. | S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS036 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns, construction impacts, emergency services | | |
| PS036.1 | Concerned regarding no right hand turns for north bound traffic on South Road. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.6 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| PS036.2 | Concerned regarding B-double access during construction and traded sales. | PIR - 7 | B-double access will be maintained. |
| PS036.3 | Concerned regarding emergency vehicle access. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Emergency vehicle access will be maintained. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

Table A5

Submissions recorded on feedback forms (FS) – provided to South Road Superway Consultation Team Members

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report</i> (PIR) or <i>Supplement</i> (S) | Response |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| FS001 | Submission Topics: Access | | |
| FS001.1 | Early concept plans indicated that they would lose an access point to the property | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 | Continuing work and ongoing consultation with businesses and land owners resulted in the revision of the design at this location. |
| FS002 | Submission Topic: At grade connection | | |
| FS002.1 | Need an at-grade connection along South Road between Grand Junction and Cormack Roads | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3. |
| FS003 | Submission Topic: Access | | |
| FS003.1 | Early concept plans indicated that they would lose an access point to their property. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 | Continuing work and ongoing consultation with businesses and land owners resulted in the revision of the design at this location. |
| FS004 | Submission Topics: Access, Property Values | | |
| FS004.1 | Early concept plans indicated that they would lose an access point to the property. Property owner concerned about losing tenants as a result. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 | Continuing work and ongoing consultation with businesses and land owners resulted in the revision of the design at this location. |
| FS005 | Submission Topic: At grade connection | | |
| FS005.1 | Need at-grade connection along South Road between Grand Junction and Cormack Roads | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3. |
| FS006 | Submission Topic: At grade connection | | |
| FS006.1 | Need at-grade connection along South Road between Grand Junction and Cormack Roads | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3 |
| FS007 | Submission Topics: Access, at grade connection | | |
| FS007.1 | Property owner along South Road, concerned about access to his retail business, from Grand Junction Road. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS007.2 | Need at-grade connection along South Road between Grand Junction and Cormack Roads | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8, 3.3.2 and 2.2.3. |
| FS008 | Submission Topic: Access | | |
| FS008.1 | Early concept plans indicated that they would lose an access point to the property | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|---|
| FS009 | Submission Topic: Access | | |
| FS009.1 | Currently concept plans show they have lost an access point that is critical to the operation of their property | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 Concept plans for new access points to businesses located between Grand Junction and Rosberg Roads on South Road are being developed. |
| FS010 | Submission Topics: Access, Impact on local business | | |
| FS010.1 | Early concept plans indicated that they would lose an access point to their property. The business operates 24/7. They are only allowed to get in and out at certain times, so need to factor this into construction. If these movements are going to be difficult, we would rather move sooner rather than later. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Continuing work and ongoing consultation with businesses and landowner resulted in the revision of the design at this location. Concept plans for new access points to businesses located between Grand Junction and Rosberg Roads on South Road are being developed. |
| FS011 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, safety, traffic congestion | | |
| FS011.1 | Two-way access is required between property gates; concern about proposed increase in traffic volumes; Naweena Road not currently big enough; We are concerned about our own credibility and safety No parking on eastern side and subsequent increased parking on western side would inhibit sight lines for vehicles exiting properties along Naweena - further increasing safety issues; | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS011.2 | Time taken for large vehicles to exit Naweena properties is likely to cause huge delays to through traffic | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | The interface between vehicles accessing Naweena Road properties and any proposed increase in traffic along this road has been considered by the project team. Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section and 4.2.8 and 2.2.7 |
| FS012 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, right hand turn | | |
| FS012.1 | Concerned that vehicles travelling south along Naweena Road will have difficulty turning right into the Regency Park precinct, as there are no right hand turn lanes to assist | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS013 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, right hand turn, social impacts | | |
| FS013.1 | Concerned that vehicles travelling south along Naweena Road will have difficulty turning right into the Regency Park precinct, as there are no slip lanes to assist. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 and 2.2.7 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 and 2.27 |
| FS013.2 | If there is no lane heading north from Grand Junction Road that that precinct, between Grand Junction Road and Cormack Road, will become a high crime drag strip at night | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| FS014 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, turning traffic, traffic interface | | |
| FS014.1 | Currently have to stop traffic while move large vehicles out of site; Require significant space on Naweena for turning movements; absence of white lines is unique to this area. Line marking would impede current movements; Concerned about interface of road trains / heavy vehicles and proposed through traffic. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS015 | Submission Topic: Naweena Road, right hand turn | | |
| FS015.1 | Concerned that vehicles travelling south along Naweena Road will have difficulty turning right into the Regency Park precinct, as there are no right hand turn lanes to assist. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS016 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, road trains, turning, parking | | |
| FS016.1 | Significant road train movements; Require significant space on Naweena for turning movements; 200vpd to site; Absence of white lines is unique to this area. Line marking would impede current movements; Interface of road trains / heavy vehicles and proposed through traffic. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS016.2 | On-street parking important | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS017 | Submission Topics: Access, local business | | |
| FS017.1 | Access reduced by 70% if Indama Street becomes dead end, reduces their exposure by inaccessibility. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 4.2.8 and 4.2.2 | Refinement of local road upgrades is progressing, with the initial concept (which saw Opala as a dead end) now being redesigned to enable connectivity with the new signalised intersection at Grand Junction Road. Both revised concept plans for the Naweena Road / Gallipoli Grove link currently being investigated comprise a new link to Grand Junction road located east of the Naweena drain. Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8, 4.2.2. |
| FS017.2 | Would like to know whether Council will allow exploitation of air space to mitigate the impact. | S – 4.2.3 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.3 |
| FS018 | Submission Topics: Access, road trains turning | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| FS018.1 | Road trains use whole road (both middle lanes) to turn out & it is not practical to take out whole fence on-site; Getting road trains out of property in peak periods will be a major issue | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| FS019 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, road trains turning, parking | | |
| FS019.1 | Significant road train movements; Require significant space on Naweena for turning movements; Absence of white lines is unique to this area. Line marking would impede current movements; Interface of road trains / heavy vehicles and proposed through traffic. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 2.2.7 and 4.2.8 |
| FS019.2 | On-street parking important. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| FS020 | Submission Topics: road train movements, traffic interface | | |
| FS020.1 | Road train movements; concern in regard to the possible delay of deliveries to site due to queues turning into site; interface of road trains / heavy vehicles and proposed through traffic | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| FS021 | Submission Topics: Access Grand Junction Road | | |
| FS021.1 | Requires additional access to Grand Junction Road as road trains and B-Doubles cannot exit via service road | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| FS022 | Submission Topics: Access Grand Junction Road | | |
| FS022.1 | Requires additional access to Grand Junction Road as road trains and B-Doubles cannot exit via Dunstan Road (too sharp) | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.8 | Refer Supplement Section 4.2.8 |
| FS023 | Submission Topics: Superway impact on over dimensional vehicles, business impact | | |
| FS023.1 | Company utilises over dimensional vehicles which utilise the entire width of South Road. Superway will prevent this. Company only one of a few with specialised equipment for transporting extra wide loads, will not be able to manoeuvre vehicle and may lose competitive edge | PIR - 7 | DTEI has investigated the ability for over dimensional vehicles to undertake movements underneath the expressway and provided details to the tenderers. The design does accommodate movement of over dimensional sized vehicles along South Road and via the Regency Park Naweena Road link by escort. |
| FS024 | Submission Topics: No right turn | | |
| FS024.1 | No right turn from South Road impacts on customers and suppliers | PIR – 7 S - 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to Supplement Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS025 | Submission Topics: Access, congestion, parking, right hand turn into Kateena Street | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in <i>Project Impact Report (PIR)</i> or <i>Supplement (S)</i> | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| FS025.1 | Strong objection to the removal of right hand turn from South Road into Kateena St. Need traffic lights or a 'Keep Clear' road sign painted on Kateena St outside their business in light of further congestion on Kateena St and access to their property for customers. Would also like to know whether Council intends on putting parking restrictions in place in Kateena St (very concerned about the impact this will have on customers). | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | DTEI will be reviewing the on-street parking arrangements in Kateena Street. Any proposed changes to parking in Kateena Street will be developed in consultation with local businesses and Port Adelaide Enfield Council. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS026 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns, passing trade | | |
| FS026.1 | No right hand turns from South Road north of Regency Road and Grand Junction Road and concerns about how this will affect passing trade | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS027 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns, passing trade | | |
| FS027.1 | Would like a meeting regarding no right hand turns and their concerns about passing trade. | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS028 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns, passing trade | | |
| FS028.1 | No right turn from South Road and impacts on customers and suppliers | PIR – 7 S – 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 2.2.6, 3.3.2, 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS029 | Submission Topics: Impact on property value | | |
| FS029.1 | Believes similar projects in Melbourne (Viaducts) led to unrentable, unsellable properties. Other example business at Mile End where rent has increased four times since the Sir Edwin Smith Dr upgrade – insurmountable access | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.4 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.4 |
| FS030 | Submission Topics: Travel times, passing trade | | |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| FS030.1 | Heading northbound requires much more travel time in the current solution and this will negatively impact on business. Also very concerned about exposure to passing trade being removed. | PIR – 7 | <p>Under the current concept design, northbound access from the Wingfield north precinct will only be possible via right hand turn to Hanson Road or left turn from Cormack Road (east) to Churchill Road (over the rail crossing with significant delays).</p> <p>Exposure to passing trade for businesses located on South Road is not being removed, however, direct access from the Superway will be limited to the Grand Junction Road and Port River Expressway interchanges.</p> <p>Local network access plans will be developed by DTEI and distributed to study area businesses in order to inform suppliers and customers of the local access changes.</p> <p>Opportunities to provide an at grade connection to the north have been investigated. There is simply not enough distance between South Terrace and the Port River Expressway interchange to facilitate safe merging (weaving) of traffic in this vicinity.</p> |
| FS031 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns | | |
| FS031.1 | Turning right from South Terrace to Hanson Road, resulting in further congestion and lost productivity | PIR – 7 S –4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| FS032 | Submission Topics: Land acquisition | | |
| FS032.1 | Would like to sell their property, 500m2, zoned industrial. | - | Noted. |
| FS033 | Submission Topics: Access, land acquisition | | |
| FS033.1 | Concerned about customer and heavy vehicle access and impact on business operations. Would like a concept design prepared to see if it is practical for the business to remain given partial land acquisition. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.4 |
| FS034 | Submission Topics: land acquisition | | |
| FS034.1 | Moving business due to land acquisition | - | Noted. |
| FS035 | Submission Topics: business impact | | |
| FS035.1 | Losing tenants | S – 4.2.4, 4.2.2 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.4, 4.2.2 |
| FS036 | Submission Topics: Access | | |
| FS036.1 | Access to site for customers and heavy vehicles | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |

| Submission number | Issue summary | Section Reference in Project Impact Report (PIR) or Supplement (S) | Response |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| FS037 | Submission Topics: Business Impact | | |
| FS037.1 | Have just spent \$25 million on property, urgently needs to see someone to discuss and have a site visit | - | Noted |
| FS038 | Submission Topics: Access | | |
| FS038.1 | Reduced access for heavy vehicles to site due to increase in volumes, customer access to site from PREXY | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Heavy vehicle access to Rafferty Street will remain possible and will be available via the new Rafferty Street link from Salisbury Highway, the new Rafferty Street rail crossing from Cormack Road and from South Terrace. The majority of traffic on Rafferty Street will be south bound. Current heavy vehicle movements will remain possible. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS039 | Submission Topics: Naweena Road, Access B-doubles | | |
| FS039.1 | Concerned about Naweena Road link and how it will affect their access for B-doubles. May require redesign of property and alternate access point. Would like to see interim traffic volumes during construction, to more accurately determine how the project will affect them in the short term. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.2 |
| FS040 | Submission Topics: Right hand turns | | |
| FS040.1 | Would like Davis St, Grand Junction Road intersection to have a right hand slip lane so that trucks facing south waiting to turn onto Grand Junction Road won't hold up all the traffic that wants to turn left. | PIR – 7 S – 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 | Refinement of local road improvements will continue to evolve as detailed design develops. Currently, Davis Street is not wide enough to facilitate a right hand turn lane without land acquisition and road widening. Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.8 |
| FS041 | Submission Topics: Access- Emergency Services | | |
| FS041.1 | Concerned about emergency services access – no breakdown lanes | S – 4.2.8 | Refer to <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.8 |
| FS042 | Submission Topics: Visual impacts, noise impacts | | |
| FS042.1 | Concerned about visual, noise impacts. | PIR – 13 and 18 S – 4.2.9, 4.2.3 | Refer <i>Project Impact Report</i> Sections 13 and 18, and <i>Supplement</i> Section 4.2.9, 4.2.3 |