



**ANGEL PLACE
LEVEL 8, 123 PITT STREET
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

URBIS.COM.AU
Urbis Pty Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228

29th October 2021

Ms Christine Gough
Director, Central (GPOP)
Greater Sydney, Place and Infrastructure
Department of Planning, Infrastructure & Environment

By email: Christine.Gough@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Christine,

1 CRESCENT STREET, HOLROYD PLANNING PROPOSAL (PP_2019_CUMB_002_0)

On behalf of Tiberius (Holroyd) Pty Ltd, and further to our meeting with DPIE, TfNSW and the PDU on 27th October 2021, we submit the following further information relevant to the above Planning Proposal at 1 Crescent Street, Holroyd. This information specifically relates to proposed travel demand measures aimed at reducing the impact on the surrounding road network associated with the proposed development.

While recent attention and discussions have been focussed on TfNSW's requirement for the proponent to provide a pedestrian bridge as part of the project delivery, it was noted at our recent meeting that TfNSW's primary objective is to reduce impact on the road network. To this extent, the pedestrian bridge was put forward by TfNSW as one of a number of possible measures that could support a reduction of vehicle traffic.

The proponent has provided detailed technical information to the DPIE in support of its contention that the provision of a pedestrian bridge will not support any tangible shift in transport mode preference from the private vehicle. As noted by TfNSW, the bridge location is uncertain, does not promote a modal shift and does not reduce travel distance. The bridge is likely undeliverable due to private ownership of land required and is not value for money for the NSW Government and therefore, is not in the public interest.

Therefore, arising from our recent meeting, we have prepared a number of commitments that we submit will have a tangible impact to reduce traffic impacts on the road network that satisfy TfNSW requests. These commitments include:

- A significant reduction in retail and commercial floor space that will be capped as per the revised proposal.
- Five measures to reduce travel demand and drive modal share including a green travel plan, restricted on-site parking provision, bicycle parking and end of trip facilities and the provision of shuttle bus services.



- A public benefit offer for state infrastructure contributions aligned with the Productivity Commission's recommendations.

Attached is detailed advice prepared by Ken Hollyoak of TTPP. This advice confirms that based on a previous case study, an effective green travel plan in concert with the proposed initiatives can reduce vehicle demands by more than 20%.

TTPP has modelled the implications of the proponent's project commitments and has concluded that in concert with committed reductions in the retail and commercial floor space of the project and the provision of a shuttle bus service that **vehicle traffic can be reduced by circa 50% from that modelled for the exhibited Planning Proposal.**

This is a significant and material reduction in impacts on the road network that directly meets TfNSW's objectives. We submit that such reductions can be achieved without further reductions in floorspace nor any requirement for a pedestrian bridge. The proponent's public benefit offer stands for monetary contributions towards state infrastructure.

We appreciate the ongoing dialogue between the proponent and the NSW Government authorities and would appreciate your earliest feedback on this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Blythe".

Tim Blythe
Managing Partner

Enc. TTPP advice

Cc: Holly.Villella@planning.nsw.gov.au; Jorge.Alvarez@planning.nsw.gov.au
Graham.Richardson2@transport.nsw.gov.au; rachel.cumming@transport.nsw.gov.au
cheramie.marsden@transport.nsw.gov.au; Michelle.Weiss@planning.nsw.gov.au;
James.Shelton@planning.nsw.gov.au; ilyas.i.karaman@transport.nsw.gov.au

Our Ref: 16241

29 October 2021

Tiberius (Holroyd) Pty Ltd
19-25 Cope Street,
Redfern NSW 2016

Attention: Huw Williams

Dear Huw

**RE: 1 CRESCENT STREET, HOLROYD
TRAVEL DEMAND MEASURES**

I write further to our recent meeting with Transport for New South Wales and The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. One of the outcomes of the meeting was to determine how travel demand management might assist in reducing the traffic generated by the subject site.

Travel Demand Management has been achieved primarily by Travel Plans although they are known by several other names, such as Workplace Travel Plans, Green Travel plans etc.

In my experience of over 25 years of being involved in such Travel Plans, there are, in my experience two distinct types of travel plans:

- To change the travel behaviour at an existing site (i.e., reduction of car use, especially if only used by one person). Such plans would typically be implemented at large existing administrative buildings (e.g., hospital government). This would aim to achieve a modal shift when compared against a stated historic benchmark. This would include monitoring the plan over a period after opening with more measures introduced if stated objectives were not achieved.
- To influence the travel behaviour of a site prior to it being occupied. This can include such measures as locating the site next to a railway station, reducing on-site parking etc, providing information and ensuring the development ties in with the sustainable active travel initiatives outside of the site. This travel plan would aim to achieve a lower car driver mode upon occupation compared with comparable sites.

The GTP at Crescent Parklands would fall into the latter category where the majority of green travel initiatives would be provided as part of the development and prior to occupation of the site. Such plans are generally significantly more successful as they have the ability to influence travel behaviour before it occurs rather than retrospectively try and change an existing travel behaviour.

Such travel plans have been proven to significantly influence the traffic generation at a site. One recent example of this in which the undersigned was involved was the development of Harold Park Paceway. Modal splits and traffic generation rates were recorded through the development of the site to establish whether the modal split targets would be achieved and whether the anticipated traffic impacts were realised.

A Green Travel Plan (GTP) was implemented by Mirvac at Harold Park and monitored over the period of occupation from 2012 to 2018. It aimed to encourage the use of alternative transport choices to single car use and encourage a shift to public transport, cycling and/or walking by:

- Compliance with the stringent parking controls applicable to the site.
- Creation of street networks and associated cycle ways, footpaths and links to encourage cycling and walking.
- Provision of a Transport Access Guide which would be given to every new occupant of dwellings.
- Provision of public transport noticeboards to make residents and visitors more aware of the alternative transport options available to them. The format would be based upon the Transport Access Guide.
- Provision of membership to a GoOccasional car share which would have dedicated cars and dedicated parking spaces reasonably close to the proposed development.
- Provision of free weekly light rail and travel ten bus tickets (And subsequently pre-loaded Opal cars when they became acceptable for light rail in 2015) for the initial occupation of dwellings so that residents will be encouraged to make public transport their modal choice from the day they occupy the property.
- All properties will be provided with high quality telecommunication points which will provide residents with the opportunity to work at home and to reduce the need to travel.
- Provision of bicycle parking spaces both for residents and for visitors to the site.
- Provision of a half yearly newsletter to residents to promote local travel initiatives.

All residents were given this travel information and any associated information about ticketing/membership in the owner's pack for new residents. It was important that this plan, and all of the measures incorporated within it, were available to residents upon moving in to the proposed dwellings. This would allow the plan to influence the residents travel behaviour from the first day of occupation.

It is also important to note that the development of the master plan layout was undertaken with sustainable travel in mind, minimising walking distances to the bus stops and light rail station whenever reasonably possible. The proposed layout, supplemented by the measures contained in the GTP, aimed to encourage a sustainable outcome.

As well as recording modal split, the study recorded the trip generation of vehicles not only resulting from the basement car parks but also from the precinct.

The precinct count included all traffic generated by the site (e.g., garbage trucks, deliveries, visitors) as the site has easily recordable cordons,

A comparative summary of the trip generation rates obtained from these surveys and the trip rates assumed during the planning / assessment stages of the development is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Residential Peak Hour Vehicle Trip Generation Comparison

Source	Residential Trip Rate (trips per dwelling)	
	Driveway Ramps	Precinct
Arup ¹	0.37	
Halcrow ²	0.29	
Bitzios ³	0.29	
Roads and Maritime TDT 2013/04a	0.19	
TTPP 2018	0.13 (AM Peak) 0.13 (PM Peak)	0.24 (AM peak) 0.23 (PM peak)

¹ Harold Park Paceway Transport, Traffic & Access "Addendum" Study (Arup, 16 November 2010)

² Harold Park Redevelopment Traffic, Transport and Parking Masterplan Report (Halcrow, 23 June 2011)

³ Paramics Modelling Report Harold Park – Stage 1 (Bitzios Consulting, 17 July 2012)

The survey data indicated the following key points in relation to the traffic generation:

- The precinct rates recorded are around 20% lower than rates predicted by Arup, Halcrow and Bitzios during the planning stage of the development.
- It is also noted that the "Roads and Maritime Rate" was based upon surveys of car park ramps and consequently did not include the additional demand created by off-site/on-street parking in a precinct. The "ramp" rates are some 30% less than the RMS (now TfNSW) figures.
- **It is clear therefore that the Travel Demand Management Strategies have assisted in reducing the traffic generation at the site by some 20%-30% compared with the anticipated traffic generation figures.**

In order for Crescent Parklands to achieve similar results, it is proposed that the following commitments would be made

Commitment #1 - Reduce and Set Maximum Car Parking Ratios

The Planning Proposal as exhibited sought to apply the Cumberland DCP provisions which sets minimum car parking rates for residential development and therefore had the potential to drive higher parking provision. It is proposed to **set maximum rates** as part of the revised planning controls for the site derived from the guidelines accompanying the Parramatta Road Corridor Transformation Strategy, which would comprise the following:

- Studio – 0.6 spaces per dwelling
- 1 Bedroom – 0.9 spaces per dwelling
- 2 Bedroom – 1.2 spaces per dwelling
- 3 Bedroom – 1.5 spaces per dwelling
- Visitor – 0.2 spaces per dwelling

By way of a comparison with the parking rates proffered by the planning proposal (and included in TPPP's Traffic report) with the PRCUTS parking rates, the proposed parking levels would be significantly lower than the DCP rates

Use	Size	DCP Parking Rates		DCP Parking Requirements		TfNSW Parking Rate	TfNSW Parking Requirement
		Min.	Max.	Min.	Max.		
Residential (R4 zone)							
1-bedroom unit	221-250 units	1 space/unit	1.5 space/unit	221-250	331-375	0.9 spaces/unit	199-225
2-bedroom unit	199-225 units	1 space/unit	2 space/unit	199-225	398-450	1.2 spaces/unit	239-270
3-bedroom unit	22-25 units	1.2 space/unit	2 space/unit	27-30	44-50	1.5 spaces/unit	33-38
Visit or space	-	0.2 space/unit	0.5 space/unit	89-100	221-250	1 per 5 units	88-100
Residential (B4 zone)							
1-bedroom unit	332-376 units	0.8 space/unit	1 space/unit	265-300	331-375	0.9 spaces/unit	299-338
2-bedroom unit	299-339 units	1 space/unit	1.2 space/unit	298-338	357-405	1.2 spaces/unit	359-407
3-bedroom unit	35-39 units	1 space/unit	1.2 space/unit	34-38	40-45	1.5 spaces/unit	50-59
Visit or space	-	0.2 space/unit	0.2 space/unit	132-150	132-150	1 per 5 units	133-151
Total				1,570-1,736	2,871-3,117		1,399-1,587

Commitment #2 – Provide Cycle Parking Facilities/E Bikes

It is proposed to amplify current bicycle parking requirements. The Cumberland DCP requires the provision of one bicycle space per 3 dwellings.

The proponent proposes that:

- Each apartment dwelling be provided with bicycle storage as part of a common area storage area; or
- That this provision be met for an apartment with a basement storage area on title that is large enough to accommodate a bike and is no smaller than a Class 1 bike locker.
- Visitor bicycle parking be provided at the rate of 1 space per 10 dwellings.

Commitment #3 – Car Share

The proponent agrees to the provision of a car share arrangement to be implemented as part of the site development. This would include dedicated car spaces on site for car share operators and a mechanism to support free membership (see Green Travel Plan below).

It is of note that recent LEC court cases, that the undersigned has participated in, have equated the provision of 1 car share space as being equivalent to 5 residential parking spaces in a precinct (although GoGet claim this to be 1 space is equivalent to 10-12 car spaces)

Commitment #4 – Green Travel Plan

A Green Travel Plan can promote and encourage sustainable travel and reducing reliance on the private car.

The proponent commits via a DCP requirement to implement a GTP to the consent authority's satisfaction that would set out a range of initiatives such as:

- Creation of street improvements to encourage cycling and walking.
- Provision of a Transport Access Guide which would be given to every new occupant of a dwelling.
- Provision of public transport noticeboards to make residents and visitors more aware of the alternative transport options available.
- Provision of yearly membership to a car share scheme which would have dedicated cars and dedicated parking spaces within or adjacent to the proposed development.
- Provision of free weekly rail and travel ten bus tickets (via Opal cards) for the initial occupation of the dwellings so that residents will be encouraged to make public transport their modal choice from the day they occupy the property.
- All properties provided with high quality / high speed internet which will provide residents with the opportunity to work at home and to reduce the need to travel.
- Provision of bicycle parking spaces both for residents and for visitors to the site.
- Provision of a half yearly newsletter to residents to promote local travel initiatives

The provision of high quality / high speed internet will be a key initiative with industry commentators indicating that workers attending the office for 2-3 days per week is likely to be the norm for many going forward.

Evidence from the Harold Park example shows that the assembly of such a suite of initiatives can have a material impact on reducing private vehicle trips.

Commitment #5 – Promoting Public Transport Access via Shuttle Bus

The proponent proposes a free Crescent Parklands shuttle bus running between an on-site bus stop and Harris Park Station (and possibly Parramatta Station) during peak times. This would serve to further enhance and encourage public transport usage. This is a commitment over and above the normal reference of a travel plan and will provide additional incentives for residents and workers to travel by means other than the car.

These buses could easily carry in excess of 40 people per hour to Harris Park. Its use would be by residents wishing to commute by train and/or work in Parramatta and the service could also be used by people in Harris Park and Parramatta who would work at the subject site and could use the buses on their return journey.

Indeed, Green Travel Plan surveys at Australian Catholic University campus in Strathfield undertaken by the undersigned show that their shuttle bus which runs from the train station to the campus now carries 31% of all attendees (students and staff) at the University. This service started as a single shuttle bus and is now, on my latest count, operating five peak hour services.

Summary

With the previously proposed reduction in commercial / retail GFA and proposing a travel plan which would result in trip generation rates 20% lower than typical rates, this would result in a 43-45% reduction in traffic compared to the Planning Proposal scheme.

These figures however make no allowance for the commitment to provide a shuttle bus with a twice hourly peak hour service to Harris Park & Parramatta. In my view the provision of such a shuttle bus would reduce the traffic levels still further result and, based upon the figures above would result in a 50% reduction in vehicle travel when compared to the planning proposal scheme.

	Planning Proposal				Previously proposed Commercial area reduction				Residential Reduced with "Harold Park" Travel Demand Management Measures (20% Reduction) plus Commerical GTP 20% reduction				Percentage Reduction from Planning Proposal Scheme			
	Rate	Yield	AM	PM	Rate	Yield	AM	PM	Rate	Yield	AM	PM				
Residential units	0.29 trips/unit	1255	364	364	0.29 trips/unit	1255	364	364	0.29 trips/unit	1255	291	291				
Retail GLFA	TfNSW Small Suburban Shopping Centre (Table 4.6 Sydney Average)				TfNSW Small Suburban Shopping Centre (Table 4.6 Sydney Average)				TfNSW Small Suburban Shopping Centre (Table 4.6 Sydney Average)							
Supermarket GLFA	7.84trips/100m2 in AM	5625	397	545	7.84trips/100m2 in AM	2125	150	206	7.84trips/100m2 in AM	2125	150	206				
Speciality GLFA	10.77trips/100m2 in PM	2625	185	254	10.77trips/100m2 in PM	1125	79	109	10.77trips/100m2 in PM	1125	79	109				
		3000	212	291		1000	71	97		1000	71	97				
Office GFA	2.75 trips/100m2 in AM 1.2 trips/100m2 in PM	7503	196	86	2.75 trips/100m2 in AM 1.2 trips/100m2 in PM	5000	131	57	2.75 trips/100m2 in AM 1.2 trips/100m2 in PM	5000	105	46	AM	PM		
Total GFA & trips excl. Residential GFA		13128	957	995		7125	645	627		7125	546	543	43.0	45.4		
Additional Effects of Shuttle Bus										Employee Reduction in car use by shuttle bus			22	22		
										Resident Reduction in car use by shuttle bus			44	44		
										TOTAL TRIPS			480	477		
													49.9	52.1		

We trust the above is to your satisfaction. Should you have any queries regarding the above or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on 8437 7800.

Yours sincerely,



Ken Hollyoak
Director