17 March 2022

Our Reference: SYD18/01322/60
Departments Reference: SSD 9522 MOD 3

David Schwebel
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Schwebel,

**AMMENDED APPLICATION - SECTION 4.55 (2) MODIFICATION TO PROPOSED WAREHOUSE & LOGISTICS HUB - 657-769 MAMRE ROAD - KEMPS CREEK - SSD 9522-MOD 2**

Reference is made to the Department's referral dated 12 January 2022 with regard to the abovementioned modification to the State Significant Development Application (SSDA), which was referred to Transport for NSW (TfNSW) for comment.

TfNSW has reviewed the submission and notes the proposed modification consists of changes to Lots 1-4 within the Kemps Creek Estate, north of Bakers Lane and also an amendment to Condition A22 of the SSD-9522 development consent. The proposed modification includes the removal of two (2) conditions of the SSD-9522 consent, including Condition B4 and Condition B18 which are directly addressed by this modification.

TfNSW provided preliminary advice to the applicant dated 3 November 2021 (see **Attachment A**). The modification application does not appear to consider all of TfNSW comments. In this regard TfNSW request that all the comments provided in the attached email are addressed. The following comments and recommendations are provided to the Department:

**Southern Link Road – Ultimate Intersection Design**

1. Comment
   The response and the associated design does not address TfNSW' previous comments/suggestions. For instance:
   - The majority of signal configuration comments and notably the safety aspect are not addressed;
   - Pedestrian safety comments; and
   - Modelling memo for the ultimate arrangement.

TfNSW notes the alignment offset of the access road (to Lots 1-4) creates significant geometric challenges for the future intersection of Southern Link Road (SLR) and north south access road (south of SLR) as shown in Figure 22 *Asongroup* Transport Assessment.

The future intersection of SLR and north south access road forms a future key intersection to the estate and is expected to be constructed to State Road standards. It is crucial the future intersection layout is supported by TfNSW to ensure adequate land setbacks are provided, and the interim access strategy can be achieved within the design. TfNSW notes the issues raised may be resolved by aligning the access road (to Lots 1-4) at the cross section of the intersection.

Recommendation

TfNSW recommends the alignment of the access road (to Lots 1-4) be relocated to align with the future intersection of the SLR and north south access road and the comments/suggestions provided in Attachment A are addressed for further review.

**Modelling**

2. Comment

   TfNSW notes the modelling outputs provided are transposed versions and are missing key information. In order to undertake a more detailed review of the provided documentation, it is requested that all SIDRA results referred to in the supplementary traffic assessment are provided (including the Base models). This should include SIDRA output and raw SIDRA (.sip) files. This will enable our modelling and traffic teams to undertake a detailed review of the model to ensure that the inputs are accurate and supported. Further comments can be provided following the review of the models which may require the assessment to be updated.

   Recommendation

   It is requested the modelling be updated for a realigned access road (to Lots 1-4) and the SIDRA outputs and raw SIDRA (.sip) files are provided for further review. In addition, the supporting analysis for the future intersection (SLR and north south access road) is requested be provided in the same form.

**Noise Wall**

1. Comment

   The plans indicate a 1600m long 3m high noise wall is proposed on the northeastern boundary adjacent to Lot 2 and north of lot 3. It is unclear if the noise wall is located within the boundary of the development. The noise wall is to be provided within the development boundary and should not encroach the proposed road reserve for the ultimate Mamre Road design. In addition the question is raised as to how the wall

will be maintained in the future.

Recommendation

TfNSW requests clarification on where the noise wall is proposed to be located and further information is sought including civil plans showing the cross sections and clarification as to how the walls will be accessed and maintained.

**Interim scenario - access Lot 2**

2. Comment

   Items 3&4 Table 2 of the Traffic Report provides some commentary on the access points. TfNSW understands that the access/egress from Lot 2 at Bakers Lane is restricted to Left in/Left out which is supported. However there remains safety concerns with the closely spaced heavy vehicle exit and the entry/exit to the carpark.

   In addition the swept path indicates a heavy vehicle would be required to swing from the western side of the driveway in order to achieve egress from the site. It is unclear how the driver know to do this.

   Recommendation

   It is recommended the applicant address the abovementioned concerns to the satisfaction of Council.

If you have any further questions, Ms Laura van Putten would be pleased to take your call on (02) 8849 2480 or please email development.sydney@transport.nsw.gov.au. I hope this has been of assistance.

Yours sincerely

**Chris Millet**
A/Senior Manager Land Use Assessment West & Central
Greater Sydney

## Attachment A

**Laura Van putten**

**Subject:** FW: SSD-9522 MOD4 - Frasers/Altis 657-769 Mamre Road Kemps Creek
**Attachments:** P0036332_Aerial_0921.jpg; IF2-KC-FS-550-B.PDF; CO13362.01-SK30-A.PDF

**From:** Laura Van putten <Laura.VAN.PUTTEN@transport.nsw.gov.au>
**Sent:** Wednesday, 3 November 2021 5:10 PM
**To:** Anthony Kong <akong@urbis.com.au>
**Cc:** Paul Solomon <paul.solomon@fraserspropery.com.au>; Stephen O'Connor <stephen.oconnor@altisproperty.com.au>; Jacqueline Parker <jparker@urbis.com.au>
**Subject:** FW: SSD-9522 MOD4 - Frasers/Altis 657-769 Mamre Road Kemps Creek

Hi Anthony

AS you may be aware, following a phone conversation with Paul Solomon it was agreed that TfNSW would provide preliminary comments instead of a meeting due to time constraints. In this regard TfNSW has reviewed the attached documentation and provides the flowing comments on key issues:

SLR layout (CO13362.01-SK30-A):
It is noted that the signalised intersection design has been provided to understand how the ultimate road layout will work with the proposed layout for the Lots 1-4 and will not be constructed under this SSDA. However the design still needs to be realistic in order to ensure that adequate land is reserved for the ultimate layout. In this regard, following comments are required to be addressed as part of this Modification to SSDA

- Signal configuration:
  - TfNSW would require the signals to be designed as double diamond. This allows for better flexibility during time of heavy congestion.
  - Swept paths are required for further review. It is difficult to comment on the high angled entry without seeing the swept paths. Questions are raised as to whether a B-double could achieve the angles at the norther leg.
  - North leg:
    - The high angle of the north leg reduces visibility to the signals and is considered not acceptable
    - The major movement will dominate the other movements which raises efficiency issues.
  - Minimum distance required between turning vehicles is 2 metres – clarify distance
  - It is unclear why a bus jump was not provided for the eastbound lane
  - Why is there a chevron section on the south leg. This is not supported.

- Pedestrian safety
  - The west pedestrian leg extends over 7 lanes of traffic. There needs to be consideration of a staged crossing. Alternatively if there is low pedestrian movements, the median is to be wide enough to store a person and to include a push button. This should be provided on the west, and east leg of the intersection. This will require a larger footprint and should be identified now as the current arrangement will not be supported.
  - North leg - The angle of the left turn slip lane creates vision impairments to the pedestrian signals and not accepted on safety ground.

- A modelling memo needs to be provided with the signal design to understand what steered the design.

TfNSW suggests that investigation be undertaken into the following design considerations:

- extending the north leg straight north as opposed to following the current bakers lane alignment. This will remove most of the abovementioned concerns with regards to the obscure angle of north leg.

- Could the north leg left slip be relocated away from the signal as a separate uncontrolled intersection? If this is considered there will need to be adequate distance from the SLR/Mamre Road intersection so as to not have lane changing issues close to signals.

Proposed interim design – IF2-KC-FS-550-B

Whilst the proposed interim design is relient on the ultimate design, TfNSW provides the follwong high level comments to consider:

- The swept paths provide no indication of whether right turn movements are permitted (previous designs indicated they had right turn movements). Clarification is required, how will the right turn movements be restricted.
- Unclear of the distance from the signals to the access closest to Mamre Road – clarification requried
- Access closest to Mamre Road – in order for a 26m B-double to undertake the turn they would need to undertake the turn from the wrong side. Any access to should be able to accommodate for simultaneous entry/exit.
- 3 driveways shown in close proximity (closest to Mamre Road) – light access, heavy access and light access - concern with conflicting movements, swept paths missing.
- The heavy vehicle access to lot 4 is very close to the access to Bakers lane and may cause queuing onto Bakers Lane (this could cause possible issue with the ultimate alignment and impact to the efficiency of the signals also).

*Note: It is emphasised that the comments provided above are informal and of a Pre-DA nature, they are not to be interpreted as binding upon TfNSW and may change following formal assessment of a submitted development application from the appropriate consent authority.*

**Kind regards,**

Laura van Putten