

**Subject** WSU Bankstown – Review of Peer Review

**Date** 16 December 2019

**Job No/Ref**

263785-00

## Introduction

Arup prepared a Transport Management and Accessibility Plan (TMAP) for the proposed Western Sydney University (WSU) Bankstown City Campus (BCC) Development in July 2019. In September 2019 The Transport Planning Partnership (TTPP) undertook a peer review of the TMAP on behalf of Canterbury-Bankstown Council. This note responds to suggested deficiencies in the TMAP.

## Review of Peer Review

ID	Peer Review Finding	Commentary / Response
1	Travel surveys should be undertaken at the existing WSU Milperra Campus to understand existing staff travel behaviours, including where staff currently live and whether they would change their mode of travel from car to public transport if the site were to be relocated near Bankstown Station. This would allow for a better benchmark to assess the mode share targets for staff.	This can be updated but this data would need to be collected by WSU and provided to Arup.
2	The traffic generation assessment should be reassessed based on the updated mode share targets based on the above travel surveys.	As above.
3	The traffic model only assessed Year 2018. The traffic modelling should consider a +5 or +10-year future case scenario with and without the proposed development.	The future year sidra assessments considered traffic growth. To estimate what level of traffic growth should be applied, traffic modelling undertaken as part of the draft Bankstown Complete Streets project was considered. From this, a 2.5% traffic growth rate was applied to the AM peak but no growth in PM peak. This growth is relating to future traffic conditions in 2036 (Arup acknowledges that the year 2036 was not explicitly stated in the TMAP). Given the traffic impacts for this future year are relatively low, a +5 and +10 horizon year would be considered redundant.

**Subject** WSU Bankstown – Review of Peer Review

**Date** 16 December 2019

**Job No/Ref**

263785-00

ID	Peer Review Finding	Commentary / Response
4	The traffic modelling did not consider the impacts of the existing two driveways off Rickard Road. It is recommended that access to the site and The Appian Way access is included in the traffic modelling assessment.	The traffic signals at the intersections of Rickard Rd/Jacobs St and Rickard Rd/Chapel Rd are coordinated, resulting in there consistently being a break in traffic, allowing for access and egress movements at the two driveways. It is therefore considered unnecessary to model these intermediate intersections. Further, Arup conducted a site visit in September 2018 and observed no excessive queuing at the intersections, and they appeared to be operating satisfactorily.
5	No queue length data has been collected to calibrate the traffic models. It is recommended that queue length data be collected during AM and PM peak periods to assess the validity of the traffic models.	Whilst it wasn't mentioned in the report, calibration was part of the sidra modelling process. Arup conducted a site visit in September 2018 where queue length and phasing data was collected to calibrate the models.
6	The traffic modelling assessment should consider a wider study area to assess the wider traffic implications arising from the proposed development.	In the context of the existing surrounding traffic flows, the site is generating approximately 2% additional traffic at adjacent intersections. Given the traffic distribution assumed, the impacts would be negligible at intersections further from the site.
7	The bicycle parking spaces do not satisfy the recommended bicycle parking rates outlined in the NSW Planning for Walking and Cycling guideline. It is therefore recommended that the proposed bicycle parking be reassessed, or an area be allocated within the site to provide additional parking.	The Guidelines outline for tertiary education establishments, a bicycle parking provision rate of 3-5% for staff and 5-10% for full time students. Given the assumption of 2,000 staff and 650 students on-site on any given day, the provision of 32 secure spaces in the basement + 100 other spaces within the public domain of the site (proposed to be provided by the project) is sufficient.
8	A green travel plan should be required as part of any development consent for the proposed development, including a requirement to undertake regular travel surveys post-occupation to monitor the mode share targets. It may be the case that any future development of the site (e.g. any enrolment capacity increases) is not to progress until the mode share targets have been met for the site.	We envisage a finalised Green Travel Plan (GTP) will be prepared prior to occupation as per standard development processes. We have included some preliminary travel demand management details in the TMAP (Section 6).
9	The provision of car sharing facilities should be investigated on-site to reduce single occupancy car trips.	We understand this would be more about car pooling as opposed to car sharing (as this still implies single occupancy and is open to the public). This will be fleshed out in the GTP and a strategy put in place.

**Subject** WSU Bankstown – Review of Peer Review

**Date** 16 December 2019

**Job No/Ref**

263785-00

ID	Peer Review Finding	Commentary / Response
10	A loading dock management plan is required as part of any development consent for the proposed development to ensure all deliveries to the site are appropriately managed throughout the day.	A loading dock management plan is not required as part of the SEARs. We have checked the operations of the loading dock through swept paths and the provision is considered adequate for this development. If required, a loading dock management plan can be prepared at a later date as part of the conditions of consent.
11	The parking restrictions on Rickard Road (i.e. existing No Parking restrictions) be reassessed to manage the overall efficiency of the traffic road network following the completion of the proposed development – i.e. to ensure drop-off/pick-up activities do not occur on Rickard Road during peak periods.	No Stopping' signage can be provided on Rickard Rd by WSU, as required by Council, and a signage plan can be developed as part of the conditions of consent.
12	Arup's report notes that there would be up to 650 staff on-site at any one time. On this basis, a total of 98 car parking spaces would be required to satisfy the 15 per cent car driver mode share target of the site. It is also recommended that an additional 1-2 car parking spaces be provided for visitor use (99-100 spaces in total). TTPP understands that 84 car parking spaces are currently proposed on the site (reduced from 94 spaces). This represents a shortfall of 14 staff car parking spaces. In recognition of this, TTPP recommends that car share spaces be provided in lieu of staff car parking spaces to encourage carpooling and car share to/from the site. It is expected that one car share could be provided in lieu of say three to 12 car parking spaces. However, it is expected that these car share facilities would be shared with the public, which may not be desirable from a security perspective for the site. On this basis, the Proponent could also consider installing off-site car share locations, subject to consultation with Council and relevant car share operations (e.g. GoGet).	It is Arup's understanding that the development is still providing 94 car parking spaces (architectural drawings received 14/11/19 quote 94 spaces). To achieve a target, you need to actually provide below the target. It is proven fact that if provided, parking will be utilised. As such, to achieve a 15% car driver mode share target, you need to provide slightly under 15% in parking supply. As previously mentioned, car pooling spaces can be provided as part of the travel demand strategy (to be developed at a later stage).
13	While the peer review indicates that the updated SIDRA traffic model is unlikely to register any noticeable traffic impacts at intersections, the update may affect the traffic modelling results and should be documented accordingly for the purposes of consultation with the Roads and Maritime Services.	At this stage we haven't consulted with RMS since the development impacts are minor. RMS now has the opportunity to comment on the TMAP as it is now in the 'collate submissions' phase.

**Subject** WSU Bankstown – Review of Peer Review

**Date** 16 December 2019

**Job No/Ref**

263785-00

ID	Peer Review Finding	Commentary / Response
14	The applicant to provide a detailed response and/or justification for Council's consideration on how the proposal may address the on-site loading space requirements.	Preparation of a loading dock management plan would require input from the operations/FM team and it is best prepared at a later stage. We don't consider that it would add great value at this stage in the project – especially considering we have demonstrated the provision and access is adequate in the TMAP.