



12 January 2022

TfNSW Reference: SYD17/01529/11

DPIE Reference: SSD 8859

Team Leader
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Thomas Bertwistle

Dear Sir/Madam,

EXHIBITION OF AMENDED EIS FOR ELIZABETH DRIVE SUBDIVISION INCLUDING LEFT IN/LEFT OUT ACCESS ARRANGEMENT ON FUTURE REALIGNED WALLGROVE ROAD- 1111-1141 ELIZABETH DRIVE, CECIL PARK

Reference is made to the Department's submission dated 30 November 2021 comprising information to address the TfNSW concerns including comments made by TfNSW in its correspondence dated 12 November 2020.

It is noted, the original TfNSW comments were in response to the proponent's request to amend the application and respond to submissions for the proposed development at Elizabeth Drive, Cecil Park (SSD-8859).

TfNSW has reviewed the submitted documents and the concept plan of the proposed left in/left out access arrangement to the site from future realigned Wallgrove Road. Upon review of the documents, TfNSW requests the following information and amendments for further assessment of the development:

1. There is a safety issue of the arrangement of the development of the second kerb side lane and the proposed left turn deceleration lane.

Vehicles exiting the access road could confuse vehicles changing lanes to access the second kerb side lane with vehicles wanting to access the left turn deceleration lane and could lead to accidents. TfNSW requests that the development of the second lane be moved further back to the north in Wallgrove Road to the short straight between the reverse curves. The diverge should initiate from the centreline so vehicle continuing in the original lane is in lane one. The second lane should be fully developed prior to the second curve.

The proponent should consult with M12 project team regarding the above for the best way forward.

2. The length of the left turn deceleration lanes is too short for the design speed of Wallgrove Road. The design speed of Wallgrove as per design criteria for this section of Wallgrove Road is 70kph with a posted speed of 60kph. For a design speed of 70kph the length should be 70m (including taper) with a turn speed of 20kph.

As there is no development in the adjacent property and will be kept within the road reserve the length should be increased to be complying for the design speed.

3. Assuming that a second lane will be introduced prior to the auxiliary lane, the proponent will need to demonstrate that appropriate sight distances (AUSTROADS) are achieved to the C1 line.

A preliminary review of the design suggests this to be problematic. Note the design will be providing a G4 W Beam to protect the 2:1 batter. Given the downgrade on approach, the sight distance over the barrier may be achieved but this would need to be checked. To achieve compliance the length of auxiliary lane will need to be extended, else the verge and batter widened out which may result in works occurring outside of the project boundary.

4. The addition of the auxiliary lane will mean additional cutting into existing area which may compromise flood immunity. There is channel at the toe of the embankment. Widening out the carriageway for the auxiliary slip lane will mean that additional property acquisitions may be required as the earthworks associated with the channel will be outside of the project boundary. The same applies to the channel running further to the north- given the need to widen the carriageway to allow for the development of the second lane.
5. The 3x1500 diameter culverts will need to be extended to suit the widened formation.
6. The plan should be amended to remove all the chevroning in the entry and exit as it will get scrubbed out and it also entices pedestrians/cyclists to stand in the actual access.
7. The "No Access to Cecil Road" signs should be removed as it would be difficult to enforce.

An Operational Transport and Access Management Plan (OTAMP) should be developed for the proposed subdivision to manage this arrangement.

8. It is not clear why turning path has been provided for a B-triple (35.4m). NSW Freight and Ports Plan used 30m Performance Based Standards (PBS 2B) combinations as the target vehicles. The use of the B-triple requires the access to be wider than needed and lengthens the crossing distance for active transport users. As previously advised, PBS 30m vehicle should be used as checking vehicle.
9. The proponent is requested to update the plans and annotate with some dimensions; lane widths, path width. Information on the RT bay and whether it is of sufficient length should be confirmed.
10. The design shows the continuation of a shared user path past the intersection of the DA site. The current intent is not to continue this further to the North. The

shared user path connects the Cecil Rd crossing along Wallgrove Rd to the south, integrating in with the shared user path on Elizabeth Drive.

The proponent is requested to submit the above information for further review prior to the determination of the application and before detailed comments can be provided. Once this information is received, TfNSW will review and respond accordingly.

The applicant is aware the subject property is within the preferred corridor for the proposed M12 Motorway Project. It is noted the applicant has been liaising with the project team and should continue to do so in relation to any impacts.

If you have any further inquiries in relation to this development application Mr Simon Turner would be pleased to take your call on 8265 6363 or e: development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au. I hope this has been of assistance.

Yours sincerely



Ms Zhaleh Alamouti
A/Senior Manager Land Use Assessment

