

7th October 2015
Ref: 10028

Mr Justin James
Chief Executive Officer
Sydney Superyacht Marina Pty Ltd
E: justin@superyachtmarina.com.au

c.c. Urban Perspectives
Attention Ms Ros Read
E: ros@urbanperspectives.com.au

Dear Justin

Re: Sydney Super Yacht Marina

Super Yacht Marina

Transport and Traffic Planning Associates (TTPA) has considered the traffic and parking issues raised by the various Authorities in response to the exhibition of the Section 75W Modification Application and respond in the following manner.

1. RESPONSES AND ISSUES

Amendment to car park numbers resulting from amended gross floor area

Since the Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment report which accompanied the modification application was written, MOD2 has been approved which varied the approved GFA. The modification application now proposes a maximum building gross floor area of 6,885m², comprising:

Marine	3,689m ²
Club	1,779m ²
Providore	436m ²
Ancillary restaurants	981m ²

This amends the table in section 5 of the Report on page 22 to show that application of Council's DCP parking criteria to the proposed development indicates the following:

..... / cont'

		Minimum	Maximum
Club	1779m ² 1,260 patrons 30 staff	47 spaces	136 spaces
Commercial	3,689m ²	37 spaces	47 spaces
Retail	436m ²	9 spaces	9 spaces
Restaurant	981m ²	13 spaces	20 spaces
Outdoor seating	2,172m ²	27 spaces	44 spaces
Marina		43 spaces	43 spaces
Car Share		1 space	1 space
	TOTAL:	177 spaces	300 spaces

2. City of Sydney (Letter dated 22nd May 2015)

The traffic and parking related issue raised by the City of Sydney is that of the end use of the internal and external parking spaces and the impact on visual outcomes, traffic generation and on site movement of pedestrians, vessels and vehicles. Council assumes that 70 spaces out of 247 spaces are subject to change when it is 70 out of 307 spaces subject to change. We note that the maximum and minimum parking space requirements under Leichhardt Council's DCP is between 177 and 300 spaces. While the maximum number of proposed spaces is slightly above at 307 spaces, the calculations previously prepared using the DCP requirements was undertaken on the basis of 307 cars and therefore considered a "worst case" basis.

3. Port Authority of NSW (Letter dated 29th May 2015)

The reference to OPT is noted and assumed to refer to White Bay Cruise Terminal (WBCT).

The reference to *"the 8 year berthing schedule generally averaging 1 per week"* is taken from page 34 of the AECOM Study for the Glebe Island Interim Facility. It is now noted that the Halcrow Report for the WBCT identified projected visitations of 102 to 118 cruise ships per year with:

- infrequent use of Wharf
- general arrival before 6.00am and departure before 6.00pm

The statement by the Authority that vessels *"in the peak season sometimes use both cruise ship berths"* is accepted however this is a very infrequent event and the second vessel is usually smaller. It is understood from the cruise schedule available from the Port Authority of NSW that under the current schedule there are only 6 weeks of the year when there are more than 5 vessels using the Terminal and the average is only some 2.6 vessels per week.

The traffic circumstance of a vessel visiting the Terminal is addressed in the Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment report prepared as part of the Application with traffic surveys undertaken during those times.

It is apparent that the frequency of 2 ships being present at the same time together (with the fact that they would not arrive/depart at the same time) is extremely low. It indicates that this is not a regular event such that the traffic circumstances need to be addressed. This is particularly the case when arrivals and departures do not/will not occur:

- during peak commuter traffic times
- during peak activity times at the proposed Marina development

Another very pertinent circumstance in relation to traffic considerations is the fact that the outcome for the Glebe Island Interim Facility is that the frequency and magnitude of events (and obviously traffic consequences) is nowhere as significant as what was envisaged. The forecast contained within the traffic assessment for the facility was for 120 days of exhibition activity per year (1,000 to 9,000 persons per day) and 12 days with some 10,000+ persons.

There was estimated demand for some 2,400 parking spaces as well as substantial use of charter buses and ferries. However, it is evident that this level of usage has not eventuated nor has the assessed related traffic demands which were included in the cumulative traffic assessment.

In relation to the traffic generation of the existing port tenants this does not require assessment as these movements have already been incorporated in the traffic surveys which were undertaken. The truck movements per day are not relevant to traffic modelling of peak one hour circumstances while significant “heavy vehicle” composition are incorporated into the modelling assessments.

It is understood that there may be some future changes to the existing/former uses within the Ports site, however there is no publically available information to gauge or assess what might be envisaged.

4. Transport for NSW (Letter dated 19th May 2015)

It is noted that TfNSW have advised that they have not identified any issues.

5. Leichhardt Council (Letter dated 29th May 2015)

Traffic Generation and Parking Demand During Events

The Council submission refers to “bump in and bump out for events”. The proposed MOD 1 and the current consent event modes involving such activities in the proposed development will be minor in nature. There will be the normal seasonal, weather and social variations as occur at the club and cafés/provedore venues. These have been taken into account in the Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment report prepared for the application and are considered acceptable.

Outdoor Seating

The Council submission also refers to “a major entertainment venue”. This is not the nature or intention of the proposed development and the patronage and traffic generation from the proposed level of outdoor seating is taken into account in the Assessment.

The submission also references “very limited public transport accessibility”. This is considered not to reflect the actual situation. Public Transport is provided by bus routes, light rail and taxis. The attached diagram indicates there are numerous bus routes passing within easy walking distance of the site as well as a light rail station nearby. The bus routes along Victoria Road are very high frequency/high capacity and operate at nights and on weekends similar to the light rail. The following extract is provided from the Transport of NSW website:

“The section of Victoria Road at Rozelle is one of the busiest bus corridors in Sydney, with 19 bus routes carrying an average 40,000 passengers across the Anzac Bridge each weekday. With the opening of the new Iron Cove Bridge, transit lanes on Victoria Road have improved bus flow, providing city-bound bus commuters with travel time savings of up to 17 minutes in the morning peak period.”

These passing services connect to the nearby City providing access to/from the Metropolitan Transport System.

6. NSW Planning and Environment and RMS (Letters dated 9th June 2015 and 25th May 2015)

The adequacy of the proposed parking provision is raised as a concern. The parking assessment is based on a concurrent maximum capacity use of all use elements. The Statement of Commitments identifies the preparation of a Traffic Management Plan which would incorporate the management of parking.

The envisaged principal elements in relation to parking provision and management include the following:

- preparation of Transport Access Guide (e.g. Website) and Green Travel Plan documents (e.g. staff carpooling)
- electronic signage system to advise ingressing drivers of the availability and location of spaces in the carpark
- scrutiny to minimise non bona fide parking (e.g. number plate recognition and follow up to discourage)
- end of trip cycle facilities
- annual review of the TMP and revision if required (or as required)

The options which would be available should any unforeseen peak time shortfall eventuate would include:

- shuttle bus to/from the City
- minimising “other uses” of parking spaces
- carpark management with 3 hour free provision
- negotiate with other adjacent land owners for ‘out of hours’ use of available parking

The proposed parking provision accords to the criteria specified in Leichhardt Council’s DCP document. The assessment prepared has been guided by the experience of operators and at other venues and confirms the adequacy of the now proposed parking provision.

In conclusion I believe that I have appropriately considered and responded to all of the issues which have been raised.

Yours faithfully



Ross Nettle

Director

Transport and Traffic Planning Associates