

WOODVILLE ROAD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE DPE CHRONOLOGY

| Date | Description |
|----------------------|---|
| 04/09/2020 | TfNSW submission to exhibited proposal – Attachment A of submission states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>TfNSW has a medium-to-long term option to promote active transport and improve connectivity to Granville Station and bus stop on the eastern side of Woodville Road via provision of a pedestrian bridge. Preliminary investigations have identified constraints to achieving this outcome, and TfNSW is happy to work with the developer to investigate the feasibility of these options prior to the further consideration of the planning proposal, to encourage a mode shift away from private vehicles to public transport.</i> |
| Late 2020 – mid 2021 | Ongoing liaison between proponent and TfNSW to resolve traffic modelling issues as outlined in TfNSW submission, dated 04/09/2020. |
| 02/08/2021 | Meeting: DPE (GPOP, PDU), TfNSW & Proponent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponent set out proposed amended planning proposal for reduced development density (50% reduction in retail/ commercial component) and outstanding traffic modelling issues. TfNSW provided verbal acceptance of proponent's traffic modelling and amended proposal. Agreement on next steps to progress the proposal. |
| 06/08/2021 | Amended Planning Proposal lodged with DPE. |
| 17/08/2021 | TfNSW provides endorsement of the amended proposal to DPE, subject to requirements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reduction in vehicular traffic generation of the residential component by encouraging a mode shift towards public transport, walking and cycling via the following measures:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The provision of a pedestrian bridge across Woodville Road in order to improve pedestrian connectivity and provide safe access to Granville Station from the development. The full cost for the pedestrian bridge shall be provided at no cost to Government. The funding mechanism for the pedestrian bridge should be identified, addressed and agreed prior to the making of the plan.</i> |
| 19/08/2021 | Proponent accepts TfNSW conditional 'in principle' support position, outlining major obstacles to delivery of pedestrian bridge across Woodville Road. |
| 20/08/2021 | Meeting – DPE (GPOP, PDU) & Proponent Proponent reiterates acceptance of TNSW conditional 'in principle' support letter, except pedestrian bridge requirement. Issues for delivery of bridge discussed as outlined in proponent's correspondence 19/08/2021. |
| 23/08/2021 | DPE brief Panel via email on amended proposal and next steps. |
| 14/09/2021 | Meeting: TfNSW & DPE (GPOP, PDU) re: pedestrian bridge issues TfNSW stated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are unwilling to meet with the proponent at this time. A contribution to the bridge is not acceptable, TfNSW do not want to deliver it. The pedestrian bridge is required to help mode share options for new residents to access Granville Station (express / interchange station). |
| 22/09/2021 | Meeting: DPE (GPOP, PDU, Infrastructure Agreements) & Proponent Discussion points: State VPA timing and process. |

WOODVILLE ROAD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE DPE CHRONOLOGY

| Date | Description |
|------------|--|
| 30/09/2021 | Proponent provides Pedestrian traffic modelling and Walkability comparison to support their position on the pedestrian bridge |
| 13/10/2021 | Letter of offer for State VPA received from proponent. |
| 27/10/2021 | Meeting: DPE (GPOP, PDU), TfNSW & Proponent Agreement for proponent to document the suite of travel demand management measures discussed for TfNSW review. PDU Meeting minutes attached. |
| 29/10/2021 | Proponent provides Travel Demand Management Statement to DPE and TfNSW |
| 23/11/2021 | Meeting: DPE (GPOP, PDU), TfNSW & Proponent TfNSW provided verbal general agreement to the travel demand management measures proposed, and requested further detail of the operation of the shuttle bus. TfNSW highlighted the preference for the pedestrian bridge remains and further investigation is required from the proponent – including negotiations with landowner on Woodville Road re: ability to use their land. DPE requested further justification from TfNSW for the need for the bridge. PDU meeting minutes attached. |
| 30/11/2021 | Proponent provides correspondence demonstrating they have exhausted all options and measures for the bridge and brings to attention issues with reliability of the Stantec review of traffic modelling (prepared for TfNSW) – details obtained through proponent's GIPA request. |
| 27/01/2022 | Proponent letter to Director, TfNSW – further request for feedback from TfNSW to work towards a practical solution regarding the pedestrian bridge. Includes attached letter from Woodville road landowner advising they will not sell part of their site to enable construction of the bridge (required for the landing on eastern side of Woodville Road) |
| 31/01/2022 | Email from DPE Infrastructure Agreements team confirms current State VPA offer is satisfactory. |
| 31/01/2022 | Proponent letter to Executive Director, DPE – outlining pedestrian bridge issue, matters raised to date ahead of upcoming Panel meeting. |
| 08/02/2022 | TfNSW correspondence to Panel – response to previous proponent briefings. |
| 18/02/2022 | Proponent correspondence to TfNSW – direct response to TfNSW correspondence of 08/02/2022. |

PDU / TfNSW / Proponent

Meeting Minutes



Details

Meeting: 1 Crescent Street, Holroyd

Location: Microsoft Teams

Date/time: Wednesday, 27 October 2021, 2 - 3:00pm

Chairperson: Michelle Weiss, DPIE, Planning Delivery Unit

Attendees

1. Planning Delivery Unit – Michelle Weiss, James Shelton
2. TfNSW – Graham Richardson, Cheramie Marsden, Rachel Cumming, Ilyas Karaman
3. DPIE – Christine Gough (from 2.30pm), Holly Villella, Jorge Alvarez
4. Proponent – Huw Williams Tim Blyth, Ken Hollyoak, James Turnbull

Minutes

- TB outlined the history of the proposal and recent changes in GFA to reduce traffic demand and retain employment growth.
- JT explained the additional documentation on customer and resident profiles, along with journey to work and catchment analysis. This included a comparative walkability analysis of the Granville and Harris Park train stations.
 - The analysis did not find any significant benefits in the pedestrian bridge to Granville Station.
 - Did not see the correlation with the bridge and the traffic reduction = residential yield reduction.
- TB emphasised the aim to reduce car demand and increase shifts to other travel modes.
- The proponent recognised the other pedestrian bridge options further south and the difficulty in meeting design and safety standards due to the environment and gradients.
- TfNSW outlined the difference in assumptions used in the different models, i.e. STFM compared to the Stantec model, which provides a significant difference in traffic network congestion.
- Proponent outlined their methodology/assumption regarding journey to work and catchments.
- There was no consensus on which set of journey to work catchment assumptions should be used.
- Proponent identified a suite of measures to reduce car travel demands such as travel plans, walking, shuttle bus, end of trip facilities, cycleway network connections and a reduction in car parking rates.
- GR recognised that these measures may have a reduction, but needed to see the analysis and benefits from these measures.

- CG outlined the timeframe pressures to have the matter reported to the Panel to enable finalisation decision this year.

Outcomes

There was consensus that the preference would be to go to the Planning Panel with an agreed strategy to protect the traffic network against negative impacts from the development.

1. Proponent to provide further information on the range of traffic reduction benefits from the suite of proposed measures to TfNSW ASAP in the next week, allowing TfNSW at least a week to review.
2. TfNSW (CM) to coordinate a meeting with internal stakeholders (week of 8th of November) to review the proponent's submission and provide this to the regional team and proponent ASAP.
3. PDU to Schedule a follow up meeting of all parties Wed 17th November as a backup but may not be required.

DRAFT

1 Crescent Street, Holroyd - Travel Demand Management Response



Meeting actions

Details

Meeting: 1 Crescent Street, Holroyd

Location: Online via Microsoft Teams

Date/time: Tuesday 23 November 2021 2:00pm – 3.00pm

Chairperson: Michelle Weiss

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--|---|
| Attendees | Holly Villella, DPIE Jorge Alvarez, DPIE Seela Lotam, DPIE | Graham Richardson, TfNSW Ilyas Karaman, TfNSW Rachel Cumming, TfNSW James Hall, TfNSW | Huw Williams Ken Hollyoak Naomi Daley |
| | | | |
| Apologies | Christine Gough, DPIE James Shelton, DPIE Cheramie Marsden, TfNSW Tim Blythe, Urbis | | |

Meeting Actions

| No. | Description | Action |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1 | Welcome and introductions Acknowledgment of Country by the Chair. | |

1 Crescent Street, Holroyd - Travel Demand Management Response



Meeting actions

2

Discussion

- Transport has reviewed the proponent's response.
- Transport is seeking a reduction in traffic from the residential component and has confirmed that the pedestrian bridge is their preferred option.
- Transport is also seeking that the developer make further effort to further explore the pedestrian bridge option. It is understood that the developer has cited several constraints, particularly that the land required to facilitate the bridge belongs to a third party. Transport noted that there was no evidence of an attempt by the proponent to negotiate with this third party re the development of the pedestrian bridge
- Transport is seeking information upfront, e.g. preliminary costing, and design options for the bridge.
- The second option of a shuttle bus on the southern side on the Railway bridge on Woodville Road was also discussed. Transport would like further advice on this option including evidence that it would be ongoing. There were issues raised as to this being a temporary rather than permanent solution and that a twenty-year commitment and associated might need to be conditioned.
- It was highlighted that the investment in the bridge would have long term benefit to the wider community whereas the shuttle bus option would benefit the residents of the development alone and be managed as part of an ongoing body corporate commitment.
- Transport has gone through a high-level analysis of the pedestrian bridge and provided some locations.
- Transport noted they prefer a permanent structure to encourage walking and/or cycling to Granville station. They emphasised that Granville train station is the preferred location for the bridge.
- The proponent responded noting that the land is owned by other parties.
- The proponent advised the shuttle bus option is their preferred option, (one of four mitigation strategies outlined) to go to Harris Park, and then to Parramatta, therefore the proponent disagreed with Transport's preferred option for a pedestrian bridge which was they consider is not the safest or most intuitive route.
- It was discussed that data from Opal cards show that Granville is the preferred train station and is mostly used. KH noted that this data may however be outdated.

TfNSW to draft up report this week and expected to have finalised subject to this being signed off by their Executives.

Material to be provided to Holly V who will go back to the planning panel to confirm a date.

1 Crescent Street, Holroyd - Travel Demand Management Response



Meeting actions

| No. | Description | Action |
|-----|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- It was also discussed that there are more frequent services to Sydney from Harris Park, the travel time is less, and the walking distance is shorter. | |
| 3 | Recommendations – Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">- DPIE agreed to go back to the planning Panel – they will ultimately review all submissions and make a determination.- DPIE will put forward the information received from the proponent and Transport in their brief to the panel.- Further evidence from Transport is encouraged to provide evidence for their preference for the pedestrian bridge to ensure an informed panel decision.- The aim for DPIE is to get a panel date before 25 Dec 2021. DPIE will liaise with the panel secretariate and confirm a date and advise.- The information and evidence that will be brought to the panel will need to be finalised and provided two weeks prior to the panel date, for the panel to review.- It was further added if there are any other submissions that needs to be submitted to DPIE, to do so ASAP. | <p>Transport is encouraged to provide evidence for their preference for the pedestrian bridge and assessment of other mitigations in their submission to ensure an informed panel decision. TfNSW will work to finalise their submission within a week.</p> <p>Holly V to keep the forum informed on the panel's response and any other required information.</p> |
| 7 | Next steps, actions, and next meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">- TBC | |