

Appendix A

Letter from DPI

Contact: Ray Lawlor
Phone: 02 9228 6468
Email: ray.lawlor@planning.nsw.gov.au

Ms Sarah Houston
Senior Consultant – Urban Planning
Urbis
GPO Box 5278
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Our ref: MP08_0192

Dear Ms Houston,

**Preferred Project Report - Concept plan for mixed use development including
Stage 1 Masters home improvement store – 164 Station Street, Penrith –
MP09_0192**

I refer to the exhibition of the preferred project report (PPR) for the above project. The department has reviewed the PPR documentation and, having regard to public and agency submissions, considers there are some outstanding issues relating to traffic and access that must be addressed before a determination can be made, refer to Attachment A.

A copy of further correspondence received from the RMS is enclosed for your consideration. I draw your attention to issues by the RMS regarding the SIDRA modelling, the poor level of service at the Ransley and Station Streets intersection, the lack of warrants for traffic signals at this intersection, and need for further analysis of alternative traffic options.

The department considers that it is critical to ensure that provision can be made for suitable access to the Masters store and measures can be provided to ensure that this access and the intersection operate adequately and effectively.

Further advice and consultation with RMS is required regarding the issues they have raised, and it is suggested that you meet and discuss these directly with RMS.

Should you wish to discuss any of these matters please contact Ray Lawlor on 02 9228 6468 or via email at ray.lawlor@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



26/8/13

Chris Ritchie
Manager – Industry, Social Projects and Key Sites

ATTACHMENT A

PPR - 164 Station St Penrith – MP09_0192

Issues identified by the Department of Planning & Infrastructure

The following is a list of issues identified by the department following its consideration of the PPR, which should be addressed, in conjunction with issues raised in agency and public submissions following the exhibition of the PPR.

1. Traffic and Accessibility Impact assessment

The department engaged an independent traffic engineering consultant to review the Traffic and Accessibility Impact report, May 2013, prepared by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes (Appendix O to the PPR). This was necessary having regard to the increased importance of traffic issues, particularly due to the relocation of the Masters store to the northern part of the site, the related deletion of access to Jamison Road and the resulting focus of site access to Station and Woodriff Streets. The following issues have been identified which should be addressed.

a) Intersection of Ransley Street and Mulgoa Road

Ransley Street will become a major access point into the development, with the most direct access to Mulgoa Road. Intersection analysis of current and future conditions at the Ransley Street and Mulgoa Road intersection needs to be undertaken. Details of any required mitigation measures should also be considered and identified.

b) Traffic/trip generation rates

The rates that have been used to estimate traffic generation for the residential component of the proposed development and for the tavern are considered to be too low. A generation rate of 0.4 to 0.5 trips per hour per dwelling (for medium density residential flats) would be more appropriate or at the very least a rate of 0.29 vehicle trips per hour per apartment (for high density residential development within a metropolitan sub-regional centre).

Traffic generation for the tavern have been based on the previous assessment of 60 vehicle trips per hour. This now equates to approximately 1 vehicle trip per hour per 30 square metres, which is considered to be too low. This trip generation rate should be substantiated with comparisons from similar nearby land uses.

The traffic generation for the Masters store is also considered to be too low due to the adoption of an inappropriate passing trade discount of 20% (an average for new shops within existing retail centres). The 20% discount is considered too high in this case as the street frontage of Station Street is to a lower order road, compared to higher order road such as Mulgoa Road (to which a 20% passing trade discount may apply). RMS guidelines suggest that the passing trade discount should not apply without adequate substantiation.

c) Parking for the proposed Tavern

Parking provision for the tavern development needs to be reconsidered, or adequately substantiated, in light of the low parking provision proposed, compared to council's DCP requirements. There are inconsistencies in the use of the DCP requirements in one instance (ie. basing parking requirements on surveys) and then the use of the DCP requirements in another instance by reducing the need for on-site parking (ie. DCP states that at least 60% of parking is to be provided on site or 40% can be provided off-site). If the 60% reduction is adopted, it should be used against the DCP parking provision requirements, which would be 60% of 200 spaces required, or 120 spaces. If surveys are to be relied upon, then the number of on-site spaces should be based upon surveys of similar clubs and taverns. An under-provision of parking for the

proposed tavern may result in nearby on-street parking impacts.

d) Trip distribution

While trips along the road network have been shown in Table 3.1 of the Colston Budd report, further details of trip distribution to and from each site access point are required; to clarify along which sections of the road network the traffic generated by the project is travelling.

Note: Table 3.1: Derby Street east of Woodriff Street is missing additional development traffic of +65 during the weekday afternoon and +100 during Saturday midday. This additional development traffic has been included in the traffic flow figures (Figure 2 and Figure 3) as well as the SIDRA analysis.

e) Traffic volumes

Background traffic growth needs to be considered for future intersection and road network analysis, when the development is anticipated to be operational.

2. Loading/unloading area for the Masters store

There are a number of outstanding matters with the design of the loading/unloading area. This includes potential traffic conflicts between delivery vehicles servicing the Master store and other traffic using the proposed road (new street), apart from potential traffic conflicts in Woodriff Street. Due to the matters identified below, in particular in points (c) to (f), the current design arrangements for the loading/unloading area and deliveries to the Masters store need to be reviewed, and may not be supported. The suitability of other options should be considered, including provision of separate access to the loading/unloading area off Woodriff Street.

- a) Swept paths have not been shown for the reverse loading movements on the southern side of the loading area (adjacent to the new central access road and to the rear of the trade centre).
- b) The reverse movement on the northern side of the loading area appears to show vehicles encroaching outside the gate at the exit driveway, to enable reversing into the loading dock. Clarification is required as to whether this will occur, and whether this reversing movement will result in any safety issues for pedestrians in Woodriff Street which needs to be addressed.
- c) The swept paths diagrams should show traffic lanes on Woodriff Street as well as the proposed road (the new street) to determine whether these turn movements encroach across the centrelines of the roads.
Parking restrictions may be required along Woodriff Street, on either side of driveway access points, to cater for the swept paths of longer vehicles turning into and out of the site, so as to avoid them crossing the Woodriff Street centreline. Also, right-turn in and left-turn in movements off Woodriff Street appear to cross over the centreline area of the proposed road (the new street), which is undesirable and sub-standard for the main loading access point.
- d) It is unclear how conflicts would be managed resulting from longer vehicles turning from Woodriff Street needing to wait for any vehicles exiting and turning out of the site and the proposed road.
- e) It is unclear how vehicular access to the site is to be managed to ensure that service vehicles, in particular semi trailers up to 19m in length, only enter and exit the Masters Store loading area to and from Woodriff Street, rather than trying to access the loading area via Station Street and the central access road.
- f) It is unclear how heavy vehicles (long semi-trailers) entering the loading bay area from the central access road are to be managed so that they do not block other vehicles entering the proposed

road, waiting to turn right.

3. Deep soil zones

While the PPR has indicated that suitable deep soil zones will be provided for the residential component of the concept plan, the department has ongoing concerns about the adequacy of these areas, due to the extent of basement parking, the limited overlap of deep soil zones with communal open space areas, as well as the staging of the development. The provision of deep soil zones needs to be considered in relation to the stages and provision across the site. Outside the plaza area, there would be limited deep soil zones for some of the proposed stages, and in particular this would be limited within stage 2. The department believes this matter could be addressed by a reduction in the extent of the basement for stage 2 (outside of the apartment building footprints) adjacent to the Jamison Road setback, so as to provide for a greater area overlapping into the communal open space for this stage.

4. Stormwater management

The department notes ongoing issues that have been raised by council and in public submissions, in response to the EA and the PPR, regarding stormwater management and overland flows, despite the further details provided with the PPR (Mott MacDonald Civil Engineering, Infrastructure and Stormwater report, June 2013). Further consideration of the issues raised is required.



16 August 2013

Your Reference: MP09_0192

Our Reference: SYD12/01223/03 (A5025856)

The Director – Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Ray Lawlor

**CONCEPT PLAN FOR A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AND STAGE 1 PROJECT
APPLICATION FOR A HOME IMPROVEMENT STORE AT 164 STATION STREET PENRITH
MP09_0192**

Dear Sir/Madam

I refer to your letters of 8 October 2012, 17 June 2013 and email dated 31 July 2013 (Department Ref: MP09_0192) concerning the abovementioned development application which was referred to Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) for comment in accordance with Clause 104 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007* and the transitional Part 3A provisions of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979*.

RMS has reviewed the additional information submitted on 31 July 2013 and provides the following comments:

1. SIDRA modelling:

RMS has checked the submitted SIDRA modelling and raises no objection to all models except the modelling of the Station Street and Ransley Street intersection in the "EX Sat mid + dev" scenario. Some of the priority settings are incorrect which have critical implications for the movement delay calculations at the junction including its Level of Service (LOS) and Degree of Saturation (DOS). Once corrected, RMS found the LOS to be "E" and DOS to be 1.071. This indicates that the intersection will not perform satisfactorily under the proposed scenario.

2. Warrants for Signalisation:

In RMS's response to the Department dated 4 July 2013, RMS requested that the proponent demonstrate that the Warrants for Signalisation were met for the proposed traffic signals at the Ransley Street and Station Street intersection, particularly for "each of four one-hour periods of an average day". The revised traffic information has included surveys of the Ransley Street and Station Street intersection on a Friday and Saturday.

Roads & Maritime Services

Point 9 in Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes response to matters raised by RMS, states:

"Therefore, based on the Saturday traffic flows, the RMS traffic demand warrant for signalising the intersection is effectively met. For other times of the week, the warrant would not be met."

RMS does not support the signalisation of the Ransley and Station Street intersection at this time as the warrant for signalisation, (which requires that the traffic demand is for four, one-hourly periods on an average day), has not been met. RMS's interpretation of an average day is that of a Tuesday or Wednesday outside of school holiday periods or days with abnormal traffic demand, and not a Friday or Saturday.

3. Options for access control:

Point 9 in Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes response states:

"Analysis with SIDRA indicates that sign controls would not have capacity to cater for traffic flows through the intersection. A roundabout would not be practicable as it cannot be provided within the available space."

RMS requests that the applicant justifies the above statement by submitting the analysis which was carried out for the alternative options, particularly for the roundabout option.

As previously stated, once the amended traffic report has been received and assessed by RMS, RMS's comments and requirements for the development will be provided to the Department.

Any inquiries can be directed to Dianne Rees by telephone on 8849 2237.

Yours sincerely



Pahee Sellathurai

A/Senior Land Use Planner
Transport Planning, Sydney Region