

Addendum

To: Ben Eveleigh (DoPI)
CC: Heather Warton (DoPI)
From: Matthew De Marco & Tony Fransos (SMEC)
Date: 31 August 2012
Project: **Graythwaite Concept and Stage 1 Project Application**
Re: Comments on GTA Consultants Response to DoPI Request for Further Information

1.0 Background

SMEC Australia has completed an independent review of the traffic and transport issues relating to the submission for the Graythwaite Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application.

As part of the review process, a telephone conference was held with the proponent, representatives of the Shore School and the DoPI on 27 July 2012. As a result of this telephone conference, a formal response was provided by the proponent, detailing their response to all resolved and unresolved traffic and transport matters. This response, "Response to DoPI Request for Further Information" by GTA, dated 21 August, 2012, has now been examined.

This document forms an addendum to our review of the Stage 1 Project Application.

2.0 Purpose of this document

The purpose of this addendum is to formally address GTA's response to SMEC's Review of the Transport Impact Assessment. The issues raised by SMEC in the review were generally resolved in the telephone conference. GTA's response and this document provide a final resolution to the Project Application.

3.0 Issues Addressed

We accept that GTA have now addressed all issues raised in our review of the Stage 1 Project Application, except for the argument on on-site parking provision in section 2.4.3 of the response.

Key issues raised are addressed below.

3.1 Worst Case Traffic Generation

In our original assessment, we identified the worst case traffic generation to be full development of the school with Union Street available for the use of more than half of school students.

The additional information provided in the response indicates that our definition of the worst case has been addressed in two separate steps. Firstly, the traffic generation for the full development of the school has been correctly analysed. Secondly, use of the pick-up and drop-off areas will be restricted in the school's management plan. This was confirmed by Shore School management

during the telephone conference. In this case, we accept that the 'worst case' traffic generation at the school has been properly analysed.

In addition, the relevant SIDRA files have been provided as requested. We have reviewed the SIDRA intersection analyses and we confirm that the results are consistent with the results tabled in the Halcrow Traffic Report (October 2011). We have now verified the accuracy of the SIDRA results. As a result, we agree that the traffic impact has been satisfactorily assessed and the intersection analyses in SIDRA are accurate.

3.2 Proposed Union Street Pick Up Facility

During the telephone conference, Shore School management detailed the current mitigation measures used to manage the existing Edward Street facility. Similar mitigation measures would be taken for the proposed Union Street facility.

We are now aware that an active management strategy will be put into place and hence SMEC has no objections to the 50/50 traffic distribution used hereafter in the traffic and transport assessment, providing that this arrangement is also satisfactory to the Department.

3.3 Why not a Drop-off Facility?

The additional information provided by the Shore School detailing use of the pick-up facility on Union Street for pick-up only has been provided. We have already agreed that traffic volumes in the afternoon peak period are more concentrated than those in the morning peak period. This supports the School's decision to only use the proposed Union Street facility for pick-up only.

It may be useful in the future for a new assessment be made as part of Stage 2 and/or Stage 3 of the Project Application to allow for the facility to operate as a drop-off facility if conditions require.

3.4 On-site car parking provision

We have re-considered the proponent's argument for additional on-site parking. However, it is clear that the number of parking spaces currently available exceeds, by a considerable margin, the allocation of spaces under North Sydney's DCP 2002 for the school at full development. We have no criteria for assessing and resolving the arguments put forward in Section 2.4.3 of the Response for provision of the additional 41 spaces.

3.4 Bus Facility

The additional information provided by the Shore School detailing the use of the proposed bus facilities has been addressed. We support the proponent's intention to service the bus requirements on Williams Street. We agree, as stated in section 2.5.1 of the response, that this element and use of the existing public bus stop in Blue Street for the afternoon bus pick-up should be re-assessed as part of a detailed development application for Stage 2.

4.0 Conclusion

In light of the additional information provided by the proponent and the resolution of matters in the phone meeting, we believe that the traffic and transport issues have been addressed, with the exception of the issue of provision of additional parking spaces. However, resolution of the parking issue will require a determination according to policy or policies of State and Local governments.

There are no further obstacles to the Graythwaite Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application on grounds of traffic and transport impact.