

Emma Viljoen

From: Andrew Hulse <Andrew.Hulse@arup.com>
Sent: Friday, 18 January 2019 1:50 PM
To: Emma Viljoen
Subject: FW: RMS comments for SYD16/01626/09 - Operational & Green Travel Plan for Lindfield Learning Village Centre (former UTS) - 100 Eton Road - Lindfield - SSD 8114.

Importance: High

Hi Emma,

Comments received from RMS. Nothing major and can be incorporated in updated reports. Key concern is the bus services which is our concern as well.

Regards,

Andrew Hulse
Associate Principal | Transport Planning
MIEAust CPEng NER APEC Engineer IntPE(Aus) FAITPM

Arup
Barrack Place, 151 Clarence Street Sydney NSW 2000
d: +61 2 9320 9431 m: +61 402 381 489
www.arup.com



From: AMIN Ahsanul <Ahsanul.AMIN@rms.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Friday, 18 January 2019 12:06 PM
To: Andrew Hulse <Andrew.Hulse@arup.com>
Subject: [External] RMS comments for SYD16/01626/09 - Operational & Green Travel Plan for Lindfield Learning Village Centre (former UTS) - 100 Eton Road - Lindfield - SSD 8114.
Importance: High

Dear Andrew,

Please find the following comments from Roads and Maritime in regard to your submitted Operational Traffic Management Plan and Green Travel Plan.

OTAMP

Section	Page	Comments
2.1.2 Proposed arrangements for the Phase 1 school	5	Table 2 lists out current bus services. The frequency is low. School operating times are not established and accordingly it is not presumed that the earlier services will be of much assistance to students. If it is anticipated that 72% of

		<p>students will be catching the bus then this is approx. 250 students under the assumption that the respondents represent the remainder that did not respond to the initial survey.</p> <p>What is to suggest that the arrival times of the students will be spread out? The capacity of the bus services will not be great enough to service general public that may utilise the 565 service, and a concentrated level of students arriving or departing at similar times.</p> <p>This service is also noted in the GTP as servicing Beaumont Road Public School. Again adding potential capacity constraints on these services. Staggered start times have not been implemented / approved and accordingly it is unreasonable to plan as if this will be implemented.</p>
	5	<p>It is mentioned that if new school buses are introduced that they will share the bus bay with the existing 565 services. The bus bay is noted as having additional capacity for up to 4 buses to queue without impacting Eton Rd traffic.</p> <p>RMS notes that the available width is not great enough to allow buses to pass each other which may not be an issue now, but could be if additional services are added AND they arrive out of order. This is not likely to be an issue with an increase in 565 frequency, however potentially an issue if dedicated or shared school bus services are introduced. As the school grows this will become more and more crucial. If buses arrive out of order they have no opportunity to leap the queue and the current bay does not allow for students to access any bus other than the bus at the front of the queue.</p> <p>It is referenced that the Bus strategy will change over time as the school expands. What is suggested to address the above and further issues in comments below pertaining to the bus bay area?</p>
2.3.1 Footpath upgrades at the school	7	<p>The document references 2.5m footpaths but the plan below only references a width of 2m. Perhaps old plans but please ensure information is the latest and correct so there is no discrepancy.</p> <p>It is also mentioned that a waiting area will be set up on the footpath south of the bus bay. What is the size of this? Is there any street furniture / benches? Site inspection shows that currently there is no clear area, just a wide footpath. While potentially large enough at Phase 1, again, when the school grows how will this be managed to ensure that queuing students do not impact the footpath availability? There is no clear delineated area.</p>
2.4 Cycling	9	<p>Are bike racks and end of trip services provided? If so, potentially a place to include such information, even if only brief. NOTE: Potentially better placed in Section 4.5 Walking and cycling on page 13.</p>
3.1 Student travel	10	<p>It is mentioned that bus mode is likely to be reduced in Phase 1. This then suggest that bus services should not be utilised before the usage is determined and will likely ensure that greater emphasis will be on vehicular travel.</p>
4.2 Parking and drop-off and pick-up	12	<p>Spelling mistake in title showing “drop-of” instead of “drop-off”.</p> <p>Figure 8 could be better illustrated with respect to the route for accessing the drop off / pick-up area.</p>
4.3 Mobility Impaired Students	12	<p>How will the access / gate be managed? Is there sufficient distance between gate and road to Carpark 2 so that waiting vehicle(s) do not stick back into the intersection.</p>
4.5 Walking and Cycling	13	<p>As per 2.4 Cycling above; Are bike racks and end of trip services provided? If so, potentially a place to include such information, even if only brief.</p>
4.8 Bus access and management arrangements	15	<p>It is noted that a waiting area will be designated on the footpath leaving room for passing pedestrians as shown in Figure 10.</p> <p>There is no clear delineated area. While potentially large enough at Phase 1, again, when the school grows how will this be managed to ensure that queuing students do not impact the footpath availability?</p>

Additional concerns.

By 2019, there will be about 350 residences on and adjacent to the site. With a lack of public transport to the area, there is likely a higher % of trips by residents to access shops and via public transport.

The current Bus Bay is not adequate to accommodate the students, likely at Phase 1, and even more so as the school grows.

GTP

Section	Page	Comments
2.1.2 Proposed arrangements for Phase 1	5	<p>It is mentioned that if new school buses are introduced that they will share the bus bay with the existing 565 services. The bus bay is noted as having additional capacity for up to 4 buses to queue without impacting Eton Rd traffic.</p> <p>RMS notes that the available width is not great enough to allow buses to pass each other which may not be an issue now, but could be if additional services are added AND they arrive out of order. This is not likely to be an issue with an increase in 565 frequency, however potentially an issue if dedicated or shared school bus services are introduced. As the school grows this will become more and more crucial. If buses arrive out of order they have no opportunity to leap the queue and the current bay does not allow for students to access any bus other than the bus at the front of the queue.</p> <p>It is referenced that the Bus strategy will change over time as the school expands. What is suggested to address the above and further issues in comments below pertaining to the bus bay area?</p>
2.1.2 Proposed arrangements for Phase 1	5	<p>School start and finish times are noted as being flexible which contradicts the statement on page 4 that they are not yet finalised.</p> <p>It also references that 88 students will utilise buses for school travel, noting that this is as per Section 3. How is this determined. Table 5 in Section 3 shows the responses of the travel survey. The document references that 170 students will be travelling by bus and train. It then states 134 students will catch the bus. How is this justified where the students that are catching a train will also still need to catch a bus? It is unlikely students will then walk 2km to the school.</p> <p>The GTP also suggests a third point of a Shuttle bus that the OTAMP does not reference.</p>
2.3.1 Existing footpath conditions	7	<p>Figure 4 suggests that crossings facilities are missing. While they may not exist, warrants must be met for the provision of pedestrian crossings and where a pedestrian refuge is suggested it still must go through an approval process. GTP feels like it is saying that these facilities are missing where it would be more appropriate to note these locations as being 'potential locations' or 'opportunities' for such facilities.</p>
2.3.2 Footpath upgrades at the school	8	<p>The document references 2.5m footpaths but the plan below only references a width of 2m. Perhaps old plans but please ensure information is the latest and correct so there is no discrepancy.</p>
3.1 Student Travel	11	<p>Table 5 shows the responses of the travel survey. The document references that 170 students will be travelling by bus and train. It then states 134 students will catch the bus. How is this justified where the students that are catching a train will also still need to catch a bus? It is unlikely students will then walk 2km to the school. Accordingly this feels misrepresented.</p> <p>If it is anticipated that 72% of students will be catching the bus then this is approx. 250 students under the assumption that the respondents represent the remainder that did not respond.</p>
3.1.4 Public bus	13	<p>Recommendation is made that the frequency of bus services is increased up to 3 buses an hour. Who is this directed to and what action has been taken. Other information in the GTP and OATMP seems to suggest that this is not likely to happen.</p>
3.1.5 Parking and drop-off and pick-up	14	<p>Spelling mistake in title showing "drop-of" instead of "drop-off".</p> <p>Figure 10 does not illustrate the route for accessing the drop off / pick-up area. This is shown in the OATMP (and could be shown better) and while it references that the way it operates can be flexible, can the proposed arrange not be shown noting the flexibility as well.</p>

5.2.5 Walking	25	Suggest that footpaths and crossings are well connected. This goes against Section 2.
---------------	----	---

Any further enquiry can be directed to Mitch Ryan on 02-8849 2685 or e-mail at mitchell.ryan@rms.nsw.gov.au or to Peter Carruthers on 02-8849 2216 or e-mail at Peter.CARRUTHERS@rms.nsw.gov.au.

Kind regards,

Ahsanul Amin
Land Use Planner
Sydney Division | North West Precinct
T 02 8849 2762 | M 0427 941 329
www.rms.nsw.gov.au
Every journey matters

Roads and Maritime Services
Level 5, 27 Argyle Street, Parramatta, NSW 2150



Before printing, please consider the environment

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This email and any attachment to it are intended only to be read or used by the named addressee. It is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistaken transmission to you. Roads and Maritime Services is not responsible for any unauthorised alterations to this email or attachment to it. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of Roads and Maritime Services. If you receive this email in error, please immediately delete it from your system and notify the sender. You must not disclose, copy or use any part of this email if you are not the intended recipient.

Electronic mail messages entering and leaving Arup business systems are scanned for viruses and acceptability of content.