



24 August 2017

Roads and Maritime Reference: SYD16/00527/03 (A18618599)  
DP&E Ref: SSD7610

Team Leader  
Social Infrastructure Assessments  
Department of Planning and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Peter McManus

Dear Sir/Madam

EXHIBITION OF EIS FOR ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS INNER SYDNEY HIGH SCHOOL  
SURRY HILLS

Reference is made to the Department of Planning and Environment's (DP&E) correspondence dated 19 June 2017 and 26 July 2017, regarding the abovementioned application which was referred to Roads and Maritime Services (Roads and Maritime) for comment in accordance with Schedule 3 of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007*.

Roads and Maritime has reviewed the application and cannot provide an informed comment on the proposed development based on the information submitted. In this regard, detailed comments and additional assessment requirements are provided in **Attachment A** for consideration.

Should you have any questions or further inquiries in relation to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact Rachel Nicholson on telephone 8849 2702 or by email at [development.sydney@rms.nsw.gov.au](mailto:development.sydney@rms.nsw.gov.au)

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Neil Forrest', written over a horizontal line.

Neil Forrest  
A/ Director CBD & East Precinct  
Network Sydney

## Attachment A Detailed Comments and Assessment Requirements

1. A significant number of vehicles and pedestrians will access the site at the start and end of the school day. An assessment of the pedestrian impacts should be undertaken to assess the capacity of pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the site to cope with the increase in students (ultimately 1,200-1,500 students).
2. Roads and Maritime requests that electronic copies of the Sidra intersection modelling undertaken for the Cleveland Street/Chalmers Street intersection is submitted for review and verification. The modelling should account for the peak pedestrian demand at the traffic signals for the ultimate student population.
3. The survey data underpinning the mode share assumptions for the development, as set out in the Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment Report (the traffic report), appears to include erroneous mode splits for one of the sites surveyed. *Table 4 - JJ Cahill Memorial High School Mode of Travel Survey Results* infers that a high proportion of students travel home by motorcycle and 'self-drive' (including students in years 7 – 10). This data should be reviewed and corrected where required.

*Table 5 – South Sydney Secondary High School Mode of Travel Survey Results* shows that almost 40% of students/staff travelled to school by private vehicle (car drop off plus self-drive) for the first survey result and 26% travelled to school by private vehicle for the second survey result. *Table 3 - Sydney Secondary College Leichhardt Mode of Travel Survey Results* shows the vast majority of teachers drive to work.

It is noted that it has been assumed that 12.5% of the additional 840 students will travel to school as a passenger by car and the additional car passenger trips have then been discounted by 50% on the assumption that half of the trips would be linked with existing commuter trips. This discount is likely to significantly understate the likely total private vehicle trips to the site associated with the additional 840 students. These assumptions should be reconsidered as this does not provide a conservative assessment of the additional trips on the surrounding network.

4. Concern is raised with regard to the proposed use of the existing loading zone/No Parking zone on the eastern side of Chalmers Street for the provision of a 'pick-up/drop-off' zone. As the kerbside drop off would be on the driver's side of vehicles, students on the passenger side of vehicles would exit into traffic lanes. This arrangement presents significant pedestrian road safety concerns.
5. The proposed location of the main pedestrian gates opposite the 'pick-up/drop-off' location may encourage students to cross Chalmers Street mid-block directly, rather than using the existing crossing at the signalised intersection of Cleveland Street/Chalmers Street. The proposed pedestrian access gate locations should encourage students to use appropriate pedestrian facilities.

As the proposed 'pick-up/drop-off' zone is located opposite the school, this may generate significant pedestrian crossing demand at the Cleveland Street/Chalmers Street intersection. This should be considered in the intersection modelling.

6. The proposed 'pick-up/drop-off' zone being on the departure of the signalised intersection of Cleveland Street/Chalmers Street has the potential to impact on bus operations and intersection efficiency. It is likely that parents/caregivers would queue at this location particularly at the end of the school day. If the capacity of the 'pick-up/drop-off' zone is insufficient, this may lead to queuing through to the intersection of Cleveland Street/Chalmers Street and parking compliance issues on Chalmers Street.

Once mode share assumptions and traffic generation has been verified, the capacity of the proposed 'pick-up/drop-off' zone should be assessed to demonstrate that it can cater for the demand associated with the ultimate student population of the school.

7. Surrounding businesses should be consulted in relation to the proposed 'pick-up/drop-off' zone and the loss of any allocated loading zones.
8. The EIS and traffic report should identify any infrastructure improvements proposed to mitigate potential safety and efficiency impacts as a result of the proposed development (ie upgrades to pedestrian facilities and measures to corral pedestrians to appropriate crossing locations).
9. The proposed use of existing public bus zones/lanes for school buses for special events may have adverse impacts on public bus services. Transport for NSW should be consulted in this regard.
10. Section 4.3 of the EIS discusses clauses of SEPP Infrastructure 2007 (ISEPP) applicable to the development site, however omits Clause 101 and 102 of ISEPP. Clause 101 of ISEPP states:

*"(2) The consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that:*

- a. where practicable, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road, and*
- b. the safety, efficiency and ongoing operation of the classified road will not be adversely affected by the development...and*
- c. the development is of a type that is not sensitive to traffic noise or vehicle emissions, or is appropriately located and designed, or includes measures, to ameliorate potential traffic noise or vehicle emissions within the site of the development arising from the adjacent classified road."*

The EIS and traffic report should address clauses 101 and 102 of ISEPP, and provide details on how these requirements have been considered and addressed.

11. Details of the number of anticipated daily service vehicle movements associated with the operation of the school should be provided (including tuck-shop, grounds keeping, waste removal, stationery supplies and other deliveries).
12. The proposed vehicular access shall allow all vehicles to be accommodated on site before being required to stop. Any security gate will need to be recessed such that the largest vehicle can be contained wholly on site before being required to stop in order to prevent queueing onto the footpath of Cleveland Street.
13. The swept path of the longest vehicle (including garbage trucks, maintenance and delivery vehicles) entering and exiting the subject site, as well as manoeuvrability through the site to loading areas, is to be in accordance with Austroads requirements.

The vehicle swept path plan provided does not show detail of the vehicle crossover on Cleveland Street. The swept path plan should be amended to show detail of the crossover and driveway to demonstrate that the largest design vehicle can enter and exit the site in a forward direction, and manoeuvre to loading areas. Should any driveway adjustment works be required, this should be identified in the plans and submitted for Roads and Maritime's review.

It should be noted that any works on Cleveland Street will require the concurrence of Roads and Maritime under Section 138 of the *Roads Act 1993*.

14. It is noted that service vehicles will undertake reverse movements in the general car parking areas. Pedestrian facilities should be provided within car parking areas to provide safe passage for pedestrians to the school from car parking spaces to eliminate potential pedestrian conflicts with heavy vehicles as far as practical (particularly for pedestrians with a mobility impairment).
15. Parking provision should be in accordance with Council's requirements and AS2890.1-2004, AS2890.6-2009 and AS2890.2 – 2002 for heavy vehicle usage.
16. Consideration should be given to whether the one on-site accessible car parking space proposed will be sufficient for a school accommodating up to 1,200 students and up to 100 staff. This is likely to be inadequate.
17. Careful consideration should be given to ensuring that landscaping and fencing does not restrict driver sightlines to pedestrians and other road users, both within the car park and on the frontage roads.
18. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be prepared in consultation with TfNSW Sydney Coordination Office, City of Sydney Council and Roads and Maritime.
19. All buildings and structures, together with any improvements integral to the future use of the site are to be wholly within the freehold property (unlimited in height or depth), along the Cleveland Street boundary.