

Our ref 86673/JPH
Date 21 January 2010

Level 10 201 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Tel +61 2 9320 9320
Fax +61 2 9320 9321
Direct Tel +61 2 9320 9387
john.hanlon@arup.com

www.arup.com

Clive Gunton
University of Technology Sydney
235 Jones Street
Ultimo NSW 2007

ARUP

Dear Clive

**UTS Kuring-gai Campus
Major Project Modification 2 - Traffic and Parking Implications**

Introduction

University of Technology Sydney (UTS) Kuring-gai Campus – Lindfield, Concept Plan - Campus Redevelopment (MP 06_0130) was approved on 11 June 2008. The approved concept plan involved:

- 382 dwellings (note: the Arup traffic report of September 2007 assessed 440 dwellings, response to RTA issues letter February 2008 assessed 382 dwellings)
- the gymnasium (stage 3) will be replaced by new residential accommodation
- retention of the main campus building for education or adaptive reuse - 27,167 m² (exact land use mix is not specified)

UTS is seeking to modify the concept plan – “Modification 2 - Reconfigure Precincts 2&3, gym retention, updating concept plan - Adequacy Test”. The proposed modifications involve:

1. Retention of existing gymnasium building;
2. Reconfiguration of Precinct 3 of the proposed redevelopment to delete Block F and incorporate the dwellings of this block into a large Block E;
3. Reconfiguration of Precinct 2 to delete Blocks C and D and enlarge Block B; and
4. Updating the submitted Concept Plans to incorporate the modifications outlined in 1 and 2 above, as well as those imposed by the Minister in the Instrument of Approval dated 11 June 2008 in accordance with Modification B16(1).

Ku-ring-gai Council, in a letter dated 7 December 2009 addressed to University of Technology Sydney, raised the following issue:

“The traffic and parking implications of retaining the gymnasium should be assessed, as it could be perceived as a further intensification of uses on site when compared to the approved concept plan.” (paragraph 9)

Arup Response

The original Arup traffic report (September 2007) assessed a range of different adaptive land use scenarios, with a mix of commercial and educational usage, to test a range of possible traffic generation outcomes. The report also assumed that the gym would be retained - "3,880 m² GFA taken up by relocation of the existing gymnasium to the main building" (see section 3.1). The traffic generation forecasts included in the previous Arup assessment, for the purposes of assessing cumulative impacts of the overall changes to the campus, therefore included a component for gymnasium (see section 3.3.2.3).

The traffic analysis undertaken as part of the approved concept plan made a number of conservative assumptions to ensure that traffic generation was not underestimated. One of these assumptions was the retention of the gymnasium. Furthermore, the proponent has stated that future use of the gymnasium will be closely linked to the future use of the main campus building. The traffic generation consequence is that a significant proportion of users would be generated from within the site rather than external to the site.

The retention of the gymnasium, as proposed in Modification 2, does not change the conclusions of the previous Arup traffic report, and therefore the findings remain unchanged as summarised in the DoP Assessment Report (June 2008).

Yours sincerely



John Hanlon
Associate