



Our ref: 09150

23rd August 2013

Director Urban Assessments
NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention Ms. Natasha Harras

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Major Project Application MP10_0068 Proposed Retail and Commercial Development of Westfield Shopping Centre Parramatta

We write in response to your e mail dated 23rd July 2013 seeking the proponent's response to issues raised by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's traffic and transport consultant ARUP, and from Transport for NSW (TfNSW) and the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS).

The issues raised relate to traffic and transport matters and have been reviewed and considered by the proponent's traffic and transport consultant, Colston Budd Hunt & Kafes Pty Ltd (CBHK). Please find attached the response of CBHK to the traffic and transport issues raised by TfNSW, ARUP and RMS.

Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has provided comments relating to the impact on bus operations through the intersection of Pitt Street/Park Street/Argyle Street and requested relocation of bicycle parking on Campbell Street. CBHK advise that while there will be some increase in delays to the southern approach to the subject intersection for buses, overall there would be a reduction in delays for buses within the road network. With respect to bicycle parking in Campbell Street, CBHK advise that this bicycle parking is to be relocated to the western side of Marsden Street. This can be addressed by a suitably worded consent condition. The impact on bus operations and relocation of Campbell Street bicycle parking are therefore resolved.

TfNSW note that the proposed Parramatta/Epping Rail Link was identified in CBHK's transport and traffic report as planned future public transport infrastructure and advise the State Government is not currently committed to this project. While this increases the level of uncertainty regarding when and if this planned public transport infrastructure will be built, the traffic and transport impacts of the proposed development are not impacted by any decision not to build this rail line.



TfNSW has requested that a consent condition be included requiring preparation of a construction management plan which addresses any impact on bus operations and pedestrian access. The proponent is agreeable to such a consent condition being imposed and undertakes to prepare this management plan, prior to issue of the Construction Certificate for the project.

ARUP was appointed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure DoPI to review the proponent's traffic assessment prepared by CBHK and the PARAMICS traffic modeling undertaken for the project. ARUP has raised concerns with the adequacy of the traffic modeling and consequent use of the results of the traffic modeling in assessing traffic impacts. ARUP's concerns have been addressed in detail on pages 3-5 of the attached response to traffic and transport issues prepared by CBHK.

The traffic modeling was undertaken in close consultation with the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and has been completed to the satisfaction of RMS. RMS were consulted and agreed to the traffic counts and timing of traffic surveys. The project includes a lower rate of parking provision and the traffic assessment appropriately includes a higher proportion of public transport trips, based on surveys of travel modes to the existing Westfield Parramatta Shopping Centre. Such an approach is more accurate than using traffic generation data derived from surveys of more car dependent shopping centre, where there is less public transport accessibility and a much higher rate of parking provision.

The RMS in its correspondence dated 1st August 2013 and raises no objection to an approval of the project, subject to road improvements being undertaken to mitigate traffic impacts of the proposal. Had there been concerns about the traffic modeling or the manner in which the results of such modeling were applied, the RMS would have made such concerns known to the proponent and the DoPI.

ARUP has identified a shortfall in the provision of bicycle parking. The Level 2 floor plan has been amended to provide additional bicycle parking, providing for a total of 124 retail bicycle parking spaces (36 visitor and 88 staff), which complies with the requirements of the DCP. A copy of the revised Level 2 floor plan is included in the attached response to traffic and transport issues, prepared by CBHK.

The proponent acknowledges that the proposed development will result in some increase in traffic in nearby streets, including the Great Western Highway. The traffic assessment prepared by CBHK indicates the proposed development will result in a relatively minor increase in traffic of less than 10% on this road network.

The RMS in its correspondence dated 1st August 2013 has identified a number of road and intersection improvements, which RMS considers will satisfactorily mitigate the traffic impacts of the proposal. These requirements have been considered in the attached response from CBHK. The proponent is agreeable to making a reasonable contribution towards the cost of identified road improvement works, commensurate with the proportional traffic impact of the proposed development.



Improvement works at 2 intersections require the acquisition of private land and would rely on the cooperation of Council or the RMS to effect such acquisition. The RMS response also states that *"all works associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RMS."* If this is intended to apply to the identified off-site road improvements, then it is considered unreasonable to burden the entire cost of such road improvements and land acquisitions on one development, where the traffic generation of that development is less than 10% of the total traffic generation.

It is noted that RMS does not specifically seek a condition that the proponent fund the cost of the improvement works/land acquisitions, perhaps in recognition that such a condition would be unreasonable. However, the RMS requirement that *"the abovementioned works need to be implemented prior to the issue of occupation for the proposed development"* has similar effect. The proponent could not risk several hundred million dollars of investment, on the assumption that the proponent or another party is able to complete the land acquisitions and road improvements before the proponent is ready to open the shopping centre additions.

The road widening works are dependent on acquisition of privately owned land. Westfield does not have compulsory acquisition powers and would be obliged to negotiate with individual landowners in the open market, to purchase a portion of each landholding. Those landowners would be in a position to hold up the occupation of the proposed development, unless they are compensated at a value well in excess of market value, or decline to accept any purchase offer. The only feasible way for the road widening land acquisitions to proceed is for such acquisitions to be undertaken by a public authority, such as the RMS or Council.

The road widening works and land acquisitions identified by the RMS were formulated long before the proponent's planned additions to the Westfield shopping centre and are required, whether or not the Westfield project proceeds. A number of large developments have been approved in the Parramatta CBD since the need for the road improvements were identified, yet these projects were not required to contribute towards those road improvements, or prevented from occupation until the nominated road works were in place.

We wish to enter into discussions with the DoPI and RMS with a view to reaching agreement on the wording of a suitable consent condition that provides for a reasonable contribution from the proponent towards the cost of identified road improvement works. Such contribution could be imposed by a suitably worded consent condition or alternatively by way of a voluntary planning agreement. Such an outcome enables the development to proceed, whereas the requirement to delay the project until the road improvements are in place is tantamount to a refusal of the application.



Please contact the undersigned should you require any further information. We would be pleased to meet at your earliest convenience with representatives of the DoPI and RMS with a view to negotiating suitable arrangements for facilitating a reasonable contribution from the proponent towards the cost of the road improvements identified by the RMS.

Yours faithfully

Nick Juradowitch
Director
Ingham Planning P/L