



# **MONTEFIORE HUNTERS HILL PLANNING PROPOSAL – TRANSPORT IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Prepared for  
**MONTEFIORE**  
30 September 2025



## URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:

|                   |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Director          | Karen McNatty    |
| Senior Consultant | Lucas Biurra-Hoy |
| Project Code      | P0037645         |
| Report Number     | Final – 30.09.25 |



The river is the symbol of the Dreaming and the journey of life. The circles and lines represent people meeting and connections across time and space. When we are working in different places, we can still be connected and work towards the same goal.

Title: Sacred River Dreaming  
Artist Hayley Pigram  
Darug Nation  
Sydney, NSW

# Acknowledgement of Country

Urbis acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the lands we operate on.

We recognise that First Nations sovereignty was never ceded and respect First Nations peoples continuing connection to these lands, waterways and ecosystems for over 60,000 years.

We pay our respects to First Nations Elders, past and present.

The planning proposal report, urban design report, development control plan and bush fire report have been updated to reflect the recommendations of the Sydney North Planning Panel determination dated 18 May 2026. Where there is any inconsistency between this report and the planning proposal report, urban design report, development control plan or bush fire report, those documents (dated June 2026) prevail to the extent of the inconsistency.

All information supplied to Urbis in order to conduct this research has been treated in the strictest confidence. It shall only be used in this context and shall not be made available to third parties without client authorisation. Confidential information has been stored securely and data provided by respondents, as well as their identity, has been treated in the strictest confidence and all assurance given to respondents have been and shall be fulfilled.

© Urbis Ltd  
50 105 256 228

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission.

You must read the important disclaimer appearing within the body of this report.

[urbis.com.au](http://urbis.com.au)

# CONTENTS

|                                                            |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Acknowledgement of Country</b> .....                    | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>1. Introduction</b> .....                               | <b>5</b>  |
| 1.1. Overview .....                                        | 5         |
| 1.2. Report Structure .....                                | 5         |
| <b>2. Existing Conditions</b> .....                        | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1. The Site .....                                        | 6         |
| 2.2. Land Use Patterns .....                               | 7         |
| 2.3. Existing Transport Network .....                      | 8         |
| 2.3.1. Road Hierarchy .....                                | 8         |
| 2.3.2. Surrounding Roads .....                             | 9         |
| 2.3.3. Surrounding Intersections .....                     | 10        |
| 2.3.4. Traffic Volume .....                                | 11        |
| 2.3.5. Crash History .....                                 | 11        |
| 2.3.6. Walking and Cycling Network .....                   | 12        |
| 2.3.7. Public transport network .....                      | 13        |
| 2.3.8. Mode Splits .....                                   | 13        |
| 2.3.9. Existing staffing levels .....                      | 16        |
| <b>3. Planning Proposal</b> .....                          | <b>17</b> |
| 3.1. Overview .....                                        | 17        |
| 3.2. Vehicle Access .....                                  | 18        |
| 3.3. Car Parking .....                                     | 20        |
| 3.4. Loading And Servicing Areas .....                     | 20        |
| 3.5. Internal Roads .....                                  | 21        |
| 3.6. Anticipated Staffing Levels .....                     | 22        |
| <b>4. Transport Impact Assessment</b> .....                | <b>23</b> |
| 4.1. Public And Active Transport .....                     | 23        |
| 4.1.1. Public Transport .....                              | 23        |
| 4.1.2. Montefiore Shuttle Service .....                    | 23        |
| 4.1.3. Active Transport .....                              | 23        |
| 4.2. Parking Provision Assessment .....                    | 23        |
| 4.2.1. State Environmental Planning Policy Housing .....   | 23        |
| 4.2.2. Hunters Hill Council Development Control Plan ..... | 24        |
| 4.2.3. TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment .....    | 24        |
| 4.2.4. Provisional Parking Requirement .....               | 26        |
| 4.3. Traffic Impact Assessment .....                       | 27        |
| 4.3.1. Traffic Generation .....                            | 27        |
| 4.3.2. Service Vehicle Generation .....                    | 27        |
| 4.3.3. Trip Distribution .....                             | 28        |
| 4.3.4. Environmental Capacity Assessment .....             | 31        |
| <b>5. Conclusion</b> .....                                 | <b>33</b> |
| <b>6. Disclaimer</b> .....                                 | <b>34</b> |

## FIGURES

|                                                    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1 Subject site .....                        | 6  |
| Figure 2 Site context .....                        | 7  |
| Figure 3 Surrounding intersections and roads ..... | 10 |
| Figure 4 Location of crashes .....                 | 12 |
| Figure 5 Public transport .....                    | 13 |
| Figure 6 Mode splits aged care workers .....       | 14 |

|                                                            |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 7 SA2 locations used to determine mode splits ..... | 15 |
| Figure 8 Mode split for local residents.....               | 16 |
| Figure 9 Indicative structure plan of the site.....        | 18 |
| Figure 10 Vehicle access points .....                      | 19 |
| Figure 11 Loading and servicing areas .....                | 21 |
| Figure 12 Trip distribution network peak .....             | 29 |
| Figure 13 Trip distribution site peak .....                | 30 |

## TABLES

|                                                                                           |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1 Characteristics of surrounding roads.....                                         | 9  |
| Table 2 Existing staffing levels .....                                                    | 16 |
| Table 3 Proposed breakdown of car parking.....                                            | 20 |
| Table 4 Characteristics of the at-grade circulation road .....                            | 21 |
| Table 5 Anticipated staffing levels .....                                                 | 22 |
| Table 6 Car parking requirements per SEPP Housing .....                                   | 24 |
| Table 7 Car parking requirements per the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment ..... | 25 |
| Table 8 Provisional Parking Requirement .....                                             | 26 |
| Table 9 Trip generation.....                                                              | 27 |
| Table 10 Environmental Capacity assessment network peak.....                              | 31 |
| Table 11 Environmental Capacity assessment site peak.....                                 | 32 |

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1. OVERVIEW**

This Transport Impact Assessment has been prepared by Urbis Ltd (Urbis) on behalf of Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home ('Montefiore' or 'the Applicant') to support a Planning Proposal seeking an amendment to the existing Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012 (LEP) applying to the Montefiore Hunters Hill Campus.

## **1.2. REPORT STRUCTURE**

This report outlines the assessment of the potential transport impacts of the likely future development associated with the Planning Proposal, including consideration of the following

- Existing transport and traffic networks serving the site.
- Existing travel behaviours and land use in the surrounding area.
- The traffic-generating characteristics of the proposed development.
- Trip distribution from the proposed development onto the surrounding road network.
- The transport and traffic implications of the proposed development and mitigation measures required to support the redevelopment.

## 2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 2.1. THE SITE

The site is located approximately 12 kilometres to the west of the Sydney CBD, in the suburb and Local Government Area of Hunters Hill. The site is approximately 4.1 ha in size and is surrounded by three roads - High Street, Gaza Avenue and Barons Crescent.

The site currently houses the existing Residential Aged Care Facility (RACF) which has a capacity of 334 beds, as well as 18 en-suite-style hostel units. There are multiple existing car parking locations on site including 85 on-grade car parking spaces and 27 basement-level car parking spaces for staff located under the existing RACF building.

Vehicular access to the site is currently from either High Street which is the primary entrance to the site; or Barons Crescent. The site is occupied by various aged care and related buildings and communal facilities. **Figure 1** details the subject site.

Figure 1 Subject site



Source: Urbis

Figure 2 Site context



Source: Urbis

## 2.2. LAND USE PATTERNS

The site is currently zoned R2 Low-Density Residential, which is typical of the Hunters Hill locale. Seniors Housing is permitted on the site under Schedule 1 of the LEP. The land surrounding the site is also zoned R2 Low-Density Residential. To the south of the site sits Boronia Park, which is a large reserve that consists of bushland, a playground, a BMX track and playing fields. There is also a parcel of land opposite the site in the northeast direction which is designated SP2 Infrastructure and houses a sewerage facility.

## 2.3. EXISTING TRANSPORT NETWORK

### 2.3.1. Road Hierarchy

Roads within NSW are categorised in the following two ways

- By Classification (ownership).
- By the function that they perform.

#### Road Classification

Roads are classified (as defined by the Roads Act 1993) based on their importance to the movement of people and goods within NSW (as a primary means of communication).

The classification of a road allows Transport for NSW (TfNSW) to exercise authority on all or part of the road. Classified roads include Main Roads, State Highways, Tourist Roads, Secondary Roads, Tollways, Freeways and Transitways.

For management purposes, TfNSW has three administrative classes of roads. These are

- **State Roads** – Major arterial links through NSW and within major urban areas. They are the principal traffic-carrying roads and are fully controlled by TfNSW with maintenance fully funded by TfNSW. State Roads include all Tollways, Freeways and Transitways; and all or part of a Main Road, Tourist Road or State Highway.
- **Regional Roads** – Roads of secondary importance between State Roads and Local Roads which, with State Roads provide the main connections to and between smaller towns and perform a sub-arterial function in major urban areas. Regional roads are the responsibility of councils for maintenance funding, though TfNSW funds some maintenance based on traffic and infrastructure. Traffic management on Regional Roads is controlled under the delegations to local government from TfNSW. Regional Roads may be all or part of a Main Road, Secondary Road, Tourist Road or State Highway; or other roads as determined by TfNSW.
- **Local Roads** – The remainder of the council-controlled roads. Local Roads are the responsibility of councils for maintenance funding. TfNSW may fund some maintenance and improvements based on specific programs (e.g. urban bus routes and road safety programs). Traffic management on Local Roads is controlled under the delegations to local government from TfNSW.

#### Functional Hierarchy

Functional road classification involves the relative balance of mobility and access functions. TfNSW defines four levels in a typical functional road hierarchy, ranking from high mobility and low accessibility to high accessibility and low mobility. These road classes are

- **Arterial Roads** – generally controlled by TfNSW, typically no flow limit and are designed to carry vehicles long distances between regional centres.
- **Sub-Arterial Roads** – can be managed by either TfNSW or the local council. Typically, their operating capacity ranges between 10,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day. The aim is to carry through traffic between specific areas in a sub-region or provide connectivity from arterial road routes (regional links).
- **Collector Roads** – provide connectivity between local roads and the arterial road network and typically carry between 2,000 and 10,000 vehicles per day.
- **Local Roads** – provide direct access to properties and the collector road system and typically carry between 500 and 4,000 vehicles per day.

## 2.3.2. Surrounding Roads

The characteristics of the surrounding road network are detailed in Table 1. The surrounding road network is shown in Figure 3.

Table 1 Characteristics of surrounding roads

| Road                                | High Street                 | Gaza Avenue                 | Barons Crescent             | Ramleh Street               | Park Road                                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Classification</b>               | Local                       | Local                       | Local                       | Local                       | Local                                                       |
| <b>Functional hierarchy</b>         | Local                       | Local                       | Local                       | Local                       | Local                                                       |
| <b>Sealed (yes / no)</b>            | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                                                         |
| <b>Movement lanes</b>               | One lane in each direction. | One lane in each direction. | One lane in each direction. | One lane in each direction. | One lane in each direction.                                 |
| <b>Parking lanes</b>                | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                                                         |
| <b>Carriageway width (approx.)</b>  | 7.4 m                       | 4.5 m                       | 8.7 m                       | 6.68 m                      | 10.8 m                                                      |
| <b>Signposted speed</b>             | 50                          | 50                          | 50                          | 50                          | 50                                                          |
| <b>Line marking / divided lanes</b> | No                          | No                          | No                          | No                          | No                                                          |
| <b>Pedestrian pathways</b>          | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                         | Yes                                                         |
| <b>Bus stops</b>                    | No                          | No                          | Yes                         | No                          | Yes                                                         |
| <b>Other features</b>               | N/A                         | Raised parking lane.        | N/A                         | N/A                         | Roundabout at the intersection of Park Road and High Street |

Source: Urbis

### 2.3.3. Surrounding Intersections

The intersections controlling traffic access in the vicinity of the site include

- Park Road / High Street.
  - Roundabout.
- High Street / Ramleh Street.
  - Priority Controlled Intersection.
- Gaza Avenue / High Street.
  - Priority Controlled Intersection.
- Gaza Avenue / Barons Crescent.
  - Priority Controlled Intersection.
- Park Road / Barons Crescent.
  - Priority Controlled Intersection.

These intersections are shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3 Surrounding intersections and roads



Source: Urbis

### 2.3.4. Traffic Volume

Midblock traffic volumes were collected for the *Boronia Park Precinct Draft Local Area Traffic Management Plan*, which was completed in June 2021.

The PM peaks for the key midblock locations are shown below

- Park Road between Princes Street and High Street.
  - Northbound – 99.
  - Southbound – 121.
- Park Road between High Street and Barons Crescent.
  - Northbound – 36.
  - Southbound – 23.
- High Street between Farnell Street and Park Road.
  - Eastbound – 105.
  - Westbound – 79.
- Barons Crescent between High Street and Park Road.
  - Eastbound – 23.
  - Westbound – 21.

The Environmental Capacity for these segments of local roads is 300 vehicles per hour as derived from the Transport for NSW (TfNSW) Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002). None of these roads currently exceed the Environmental Capacity Limits.

### 2.3.5. Crash History

Crash and casualty statistics from TfNSW's Centre for Road Safety were analysed in the area immediately surrounding the site for the five years between 2016 and 2020. There were two crashes recorded in the five years. The detail of these crashes is described below

- A serious crash at the intersection of Park Road and High Street as a result of a manoeuvring error in dark lighting conditions. This occurred in 2017.
- A non-serious crash to the west of the intersection of Park Road and Barons Crescent as a result of leaving the carriageway and into an object in dark lighting conditions. This occurred in 2016.

The nature of both crashes suggests driver error; there are no clear trends in the crash data to suggest that the proposed development may lead to an increase in crashes on roads surrounding the site.

Figure 4 Location of crashes



Source: TfNSW Centre for Road Safety Website

### 2.3.6. Walking and Cycling Network

There are footpaths connecting to the site from both the primary entrance on High Street and the secondary entrance of Barons Crescent to the surrounding neighbourhood. The footpath network connects to the Boronia Park town centre which is approximately a one kilometre walk away from the site. the Boronia Park town centre includes local shops and cafes, supermarkets, specialty retail and two supermarkets. Closer to the site, there is Boronia Park reserve which is across the road from the site.

There is limited cycling infrastructure surrounding the site. While cycling on the street is permitted and the nature of the surrounding road network is that of local streets, residents from the site are seniors and may feel more comfortable being separated from other traffic on the road.

### 2.3.7. Public transport network

There are two bus stops on Barons Crescent that service the site directly. Both stops are serviced by the 538, which runs between Woolwich and Gladesville. Route 538 operates at a one-hour frequency seven days a week, with some increases in frequency during peak hour on weekdays. Figure 5 shows the public transport stops and routes close to the site.

Figure 5 Public transport




Source: Urbis

### 2.3.8. Mode Splits

Mode splits for workers to the site were determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the site Destination Zone (DZN), 114993611. The mode split only considers occupations that may have been undertaken by workers of the site such as care workers and cleaners. It is assumed that all residents living on site are retired, given the site is a RACF. Figure 6 highlights the mode splits for the site while Figure 7 highlights the location of the DZN.

Figure 6 Mode splits aged care workers



Source: ABS Tablebuilder

Figure 7 SA2 locations used to determine mode splits




Source: Urbis

As shown by the mode split, the majority of workers (63 per cent) will drive private vehicles to the site. Another six per cent of those workers were driven to work. This reflects the limited public transport connectivity and cycling connectivity to the site.

A second analysis was undertaken considering the residents living within the ABS DZN to determine how local residents travel to work. This is shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8 Mode split for local residents



Source: ABS Tablebuilder

Similarly to workers accessing the site, the majority of residents within the surrounding area chose to drive to work, reflective of the poor active and public transport connections in the local area relative to key employment areas. 14 per cent did catch the bus to work, however it is likely that these residents live close to the bus routes running along Ryde Road and Pittwater Road.

### 2.3.9. Existing staffing levels

The existing RACF currently operates on a shift basis for the majority of staff. There are also some administration and office workers who work regular office hours (9:00 AM to 5:00). Table 2 shows the existing shift staffing levels

Table 2 Existing staffing levels

| Shift time                       | 6:30 am – 9:00 am | 9:00 am – 2:30 pm | 2:30 pm – 5:00 pm | 5:00 pm – 10:30 pm | 10:30 pm – 6:30 am |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Number of shift staff            | 60                | 60                | 30                | 30                 | 10                 |
| Office staff (9:00 am – 5:00 pm) | 0                 | 10                | 10                | 0                  | 0                  |
| <b>Total staff</b>               | <b>60</b>         | <b>70</b>         | <b>40</b>         | <b>30</b>          | <b>10</b>          |

Source: Montefiore

## **3. PLANNING PROPOSAL**

### **3.1. OVERVIEW**

The current Planning Proposal primarily seeks to amend (increase) the building height that applies to the site, particularly the central and northern parts of the site. It also seeks to amend the FSR on the site so that the lots fronting Gaza Avenue have the same FSR as the predominant portion of the remainder of the site.

The Planning Proposal is supported by an indicative draft Masterplan that establishes a possible future development outcome on the site that responds to the proposed amendments to height and FSR, as well as other site constraints. This Masterplan is shown in Figure 9 and has been used to determine potential future traffic impacts and requirements for parking.

The Masterplan shows the retention of much of the existing RACF as well as various new buildings of different scales. This Masterplan indicates the provision of 194 RAC beds (reduced from 334) and 112 ILUs associated with Buildings A, C and D. The ultimate use of Building B will be determined at DA stage and could include various communal and ancillary facilities associated with seniors housing, including staff accommodation. For the purposes of this Traffic Impact Assessment, we have assumed that the ground floor of Building B will be used for communal facilities used by the residents of the site and that the three upper levels are accommodated by staff associated with the site equating to approximately 21 x 2 bedroom units (given the approximate floor plate of this building).

The Masterplan indicates the provision of 205 spaces at a single basement level and an additional 13 on grade (total 218). Notably this is an indicative figure that could be increased through the provision of an additional part basement level to meet ultimate parking demands.

Figure 9 highlights the indicative draft Masterplan for the site.

Figure 9 Indicative structure plan of the site



Source: Jackson Teece


## 3.2. VEHICLE ACCESS

The Masterplan indicates two vehicle access points to the site, one of which is from the existing vehicle access point on High Street and the other is from a new (re-located) access point on Barons Crescent. Both access points will provide ingress and egress to the proposed basement-level car park. Access to the existing basement off High Street will be retained as per the current configuration. The existing northern access near the bus stop on Barons Crescent will be removed and reinstated as kerbside parking. Further, all driveways associated with the existing standalone residences fronting Gaza Avenue (except for No. 2 Gaza Avenue) will be removed, minimising conflict points along Gaza Avenue.

Vehicles servicing the site (except waste collection vehicles) will access the basement loading area via the Barons Crescent driveway which is appropriately located away from any intersections. Further, Barons Crescent at the frontage of the proposed driveway to the basement car park is in straight alignment which provides safe levels of sight distance for the drivers exiting the site. The loading dock will incorporate a turning bay to ensure that all vehicles will be entering and exiting the site in a forward direction. A loading dock management plan can be prepared in conjunction with the operational management plan to ensure that servicing occurs outside of the network and site peak periods to ensure minimal impact on the surrounding road network. Waste servicing is anticipated to continue from within the site (at the existing on-grade car park) as per the current operations.

Figure 10 highlights the vehicle access points of the site.

Figure 10 Vehicle access points



Source: Jackson Teece

### 3.3. CAR PARKING

A total of 218 car parking spaces are provided within a single basement and on-grade car park, with additional parking available in a part second level basement if required. A breakdown by user type for the proposed car park is shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Proposed breakdown of car parking

| Car parking type                  | Number of Spaces |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| RACF staff                        | 30               |
| RACF Visitors                     | 14               |
| ILU Residents                     | 131              |
| ILU Visitors                      | 23               |
| <b>Total car parking provided</b> | <b>218</b>       |

Source: Jackson Teece


### 3.4. LOADING AND SERVICING AREAS

The proposed loading area for vehicles will be at an on-grade location accessed off Barons Crescent using the same driveway that is used to access the basement. All vehicle loading and servicing (except general waste) will occur at this location.

Waste vehicles will access the site from High Street and service the site from the at-grade car park that is to be retained as per current arrangements. It is unlikely the proposal will increase the number of service vehicles accessing the site. Service and delivery vehicles (except waste removal) will access the site from Barons Crescent. The current servicing arrangement off Barons Crescent is not optimal from a safety perspective as vehicles have to reverse into the site. The proposed servicing area accessed from Barons Crescent will have a turning bay to allow for forward-in and forward-out movements for all service and delivery vehicles accessing the site. Further, the new Barons Crescent driveway is located away from intersections and is in straight alignment which provides safe levels of sight distance for the drivers.

Figure 11 outlines the loading and servicing areas of the proposal.

Figure 11 Loading and servicing areas



Source: Jackson Teece

### 3.5. INTERNAL ROADS

The only surface-level road that is expected to be retained is the existing circulation road located at the High Street entrance.

Table 4 Characteristics of the at-grade circulation road

| Road width | Number of lanes         | Pedestrian facility                  | Other features                                                                                       |
|------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4.7 m      | One (one way clockwise) | Footpaths on both sides of the road. | 13 x 90-degree car parking spaces and a pick-up / drop-off point for the Montefiore community buses. |

Source: Urbis

### 3.6. ANTICIPATED STAFFING LEVELS

The staffing levels of the proposed development are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Anticipated staffing levels

| Shift time                             | 6:30 am –<br>9:00 am | 9:00 am – 2:30 pm | 2:30 pm –<br>5:00 pm | 5:00 pm –<br>10:30 pm | 10:30 pm –<br>6:30 am |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Number of<br>shift staff               | 63                   | 63                | 32                   | 32                    | 10                    |
| Office staff<br>(9:00 am –<br>5:00 pm) | 0                    | 10                | 10                   | 0                     | 0                     |
| <b>Total staff</b>                     | <b>63</b>            | <b>73</b>         | <b>42</b>            | <b>32</b>             | <b>10</b>             |

Source: Montefiore

The Planning Proposal will result in a likely increase of five staff members, all of which will be a part of the shift worker cohort. The anticipated traffic and transport impact as a result of the increase in staff is quantified in **Section 4**.

## 4. TRANSPORT IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 4.1. PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT

#### 4.1.1. Public Transport

There is one bus route that currently services the site. This service connects the site to both Gladesville and Woolwich and operates at a frequency of approximately one service per hour in each direction with increases in services during peak periods. Further details of this service are shown in Section 2.3.7.

#### 4.1.2. Montefiore Shuttle Service

Montefiore runs multiple shuttle bus services a week for the benefit of the residents of the RACF. These services operate Tuesday to Friday, once in the morning and once in the evening, and are used to pick up / drop off visitors to the RACF. There are a maximum of three of these services per day. There are also ad hoc trips bus trips completed to take residents of the RACF on day trips. Not all of the proposed ILU component of the development is expected to utilise these shuttle bus services.

#### 4.1.3. Active Transport

There are no direct cycling connections to the site, however, due to the quiet residential nature of the local road network, some residents and staff may feel comfortable riding on the road. It is likely that most cycling use from the site will be of leisurely nature, likely occurring outside of the peak period of the local road network.

There are good walking connections to the site with footpaths on both High Street and Barons Crescent that connect to Boronia Park Reserve and Boronia Park town centre.

### 4.2. PARKING PROVISION ASSESSMENT

#### 4.2.1. State Environmental Planning Policy Housing

The *State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) Housing* outlines *Division 7 Clause (k)* outlines a non-discretionary car parking rate to be applied to the ILUs and RACFs. This rate is as follows:

ILUs

- 0.5 parking spaces for each bedroom.

RACF

- At least one parking space per 15 beds in the facility.
- At least one parking space per two employees who are on duty at the same time.

Table 6 outlines the number of parking spaces required by the facility.

Table 6 Car parking requirements per SEPP Housing

| Type | Anticipated Number of Beds | Rate                                                    | Parking required | Parking provided by proposal | SEPP Housing Compliance. |
|------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ILU  | 262 (bedrooms)             | 0.5 spaces per bed                                      | 131              |                              |                          |
| RACF | 194 (beds) and 73 staff    | 1 space per 15 beds<br><br>1 space per 2 staff on shift | 50               | 218                          | Yes                      |

Source: SEPP Housing (2021)

## 4.2.2. Hunters Hill Council Development Control Plan

The Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 (DCP) does not specify car parking rates for Seniors Living.

The DCP indicates that for land uses that are not listed in the parking provisions provided by the DCP, to refer to the rates provided by the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002).

## 4.2.3. TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment

The TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment (2024) provides parking rates for ILU's, Hostels and medium density residential development

A Hostel is defined by the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002) as “a residence which houses aged or disabled persons, and provides cooking, dining, laundering and other care facilities on a shared basis. Hostels are maintained on a full-time basis by persons who have nursing, social work or other similar experience”. This has been considered for the existing RACF component.

In addition, the ancillary staff accommodation has been considered as medium-density development under the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment (2024)

The rates for self-contained dwellings ILUs, medium density (staff accommodation) and hostels (RACF) provided by the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment are as follows

### ILUs

- Two spaces per three units (residents) plus.
- One space per five units (visitors).

### RACF

- One space per 10 beds (visitors).
- One space per 2 employees on shift at the same time.
- One space per ambulance.

Staff Accommodation (medium density category 2)

- One space per dwelling
- One space per five dwellings for visitors

Table 7 outlines the parking provision required by the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment.

Table 7 Car parking requirements per the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment

| Type                       | Quantum               | Rate                                                                                                                   | Parking required | Parking provided by proposal | Proposal complies |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>ILU</b>                 | 112 units             | 2 spaces per 3 ILUs (resident)<br><br>1 space per 5 ILUs (visitor)                                                     | 98               | 218                          | Yes               |
| <b>RACF</b>                | 194 beds and 73 staff | 1 space per 10 beds (visitors)<br><br>1 space per 2 employees on shift at the same time<br><br>One space per ambulance | 57               |                              |                   |
| <b>Staff accommodation</b> | 21 two bedroom units  | 1 space per dwelling plus<br><br>1 space per 5 dwellings for visitors                                                  | 26               |                              |                   |

Source: TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002), Guide to Transport Impact Assessment (2024)

#### 4.2.4. Provisional Parking Requirement

Table 8 outlines the car parking requirement for the planning proposal based on the worst case of SEPP Housing and the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment.

Table 8 Provisional Parking Requirement

| Use                 | Document     | Required Parking | Provided Parking | Compliance |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|------------|
| ILUs                | SEPP Housing | 131              | 218              | Yes        |
| RACF                | GTIA         | 57               |                  |            |
| Staff Accommodation | GTIA         | 26               |                  |            |

Source: SEPP Housing, Guide to Transport Impact Assessment

218 spaces are proposed, complying with the requirements set out in SEPP Housing and the Guide to Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the increased internal car parking, all staff and visitors who are currently parking on the street will be able to park their cars in the internal basement, reducing the impact of the site on the surrounding on-street car parking.

## 4.3. TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 4.3.1. Traffic Generation

Traffic generation estimates for the proposal have been calculated based on the TfNSW *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments Technical Direction TDT 2013 / 04 Guide to Traffic Generating Developments Updated traffic surveys* (TDT 2013 / 04).

Both the reduced RACF component and the proposed ILUs have been considered. Traffic generation calculations were undertaken for both the PM network peak period and the site peak period. The network peak hour trip generation was derived from the data for sample site three (SH3) for seniors housing in TDT 2013 / 04. The site peak period traffic generation was derived from the summary table for seniors housing in TDT 2013 / 04.

Estimates of traffic generation were undertaken and are shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Trip generation

| Time period            | Number of dwellings    | Traffic Generation Rate | Peak Hour Traffic Generation Estimate |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>PM network peak</b> | RACF: 194<br>ILUs: 112 | 0.05 trips per dwelling | 16                                    |
| <b>Site peak</b>       | RACF: 194<br>ILUs: 112 | 0.4 per dwelling        | 123                                   |

Source: TDT 2013 / 05

Note that the above estimates are conservative (on the high side) since they have not discounted the traffic generation level due to the existing RACF. The traffic impact of the anticipated peak hour traffic generation is shown in Section 4.3.4. While there is additional staff housing provided to support the RACF, the total number of staff associated with the RACF is not increasing. Therefore, these trips are captured within the trip generation above.

### 4.3.2. Service Vehicle Generation

There are three types of service vehicles that will typically enter the site on a regular basis. These are

- Medical Waste disposal vehicles.
- General Waste disposal vehicles.
- Delivery vehicles.

These vehicle types are consistent with what is currently servicing the site and would not change as a result of the proposal.

These vehicles will typically service the proposed development outside of the peak periods and will have a negligible impact on surrounding local traffic conditions.

### 4.3.3. Trip Distribution

The expected distribution of the traffic volumes likely to be generated by the proposed development are shown in Figure 12 and Figure 13 for the network peak hour and the site peak hour periods. The network PM peak hour is generally between 5:00 pm and 6:00 pm, while the site peak hour is likely to be during the afternoon shift changeover between 2:00 pm and 3:00 pm, which accounts for staff arriving for the afternoon shift and morning shift staff leaving.

The directional distributions of traffic generated during the network peak was calculated using the following assumptions:

- The traffic generated within each peak hour period includes a 50 per cent / 50 per cent split across inbound / outbound trips.
- 50 per cent of all trips were assumed to use High Street while the other 50 per cent of the trips were assumed to use Barons Crescent for site access.
- Of all trips exiting the site via Park Road / High Street roundabout, 50 per cent were assumed to use High Street West while the other 50 per cent were assumed to use Park Road south, and vice versa for the trips entering the site.
- Of all trips exiting the site via Park Road / Barons Crescent intersection, 50 per cent were assumed to use Barons Crescent West while the other 50 per cent were assumed to use Park Road, and vice versa for the trips entering the site.

The directional distributions of traffic generated during the site peak was calculated using the following assumptions:

- The traffic generated within each peak hour period includes a 50 per cent / 50 per cent split across inbound / outbound trips.
- All trips were assumed to follow the Park Road south route from the High Street intersection. This is because they are staff trips accessing Ryde Road or Victoria Road.

Figure 12 Trip distribution network peak



Source: Urbis

Figure 13 Trip distribution site peak



Source: Urbis

Trips generated to / from the site will also be distributed evenly between the two entry points to the site based on the location of the car parking spaces relative to the location of elevators in the basement. It is unlikely that during both the site and network peak periods, vehicles generated by the site will use Gaza Avenue to access or egress the site. Vehicle access to the site from Barons Crescent will likely use Park Road and then Barons Crescent to access the site as the recently changed traffic conditions on Gaza Avenue promote low-speed movement and make bidirectional travel challenging. Vehicles accessing and egressing the site via Barons Crescent will also have priority when accessing Park Road. On Gaza Road, these vehicles would not have priority as they need to give way to other vehicles on High Street and Barons Crescent.

### 4.3.4. Environmental Capacity Assessment

The TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments outlines the Environmental Capacity Limits for local roads. Environmental Capacity is a metric that is used by TfNSW to determine the vehicle capacity of local streets based on factors characteristics such as traffic composition, road condition, property setbacks, vehicle noise, traffic speed and the type of building fronting the street.

The Environmental Capacity on local roads as defined by TfNSW is 300 vehicles per hour.

The 300 veh / h limit is a requirement stated in the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development as the point where it is no longer considered safe for aged pedestrians to cross the average street.

The impact of the development on the Environmental Capacity of local roads was assessed using the midblock traffic volumes found in Section 2.3.4 of this report. The midblock volumes for the site peak were derived using a reduction factor applied to the PM network peak volumes. This reduction factor was the percentage of average yearly light vehicle traffic at 1:00 pm on a weekday and the network peak traffic (5:00 pm) from the TfNSW vehicle classifier found on Victoria Road 70 metres east of Cressy Road in Ryde (Station ID: 9836-PR) in 2019.

Table 10 shows the Environmental Capacity assessment undertaken for the network peak period and Table 11 shows the site the site peak period (the figures presented within the table indicate the number of vehicles).

Table 10 Environmental Capacity assessment network peak

| <b>Network Peak Period</b>                             |                                                         |                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Midblock Site</b>                                   | <b>Park Road between Princes Street and High Street</b> | <b>Park Road between High Street and Barons Crescent</b> |
| <b>Existing traffic (two-way veh / h)</b>              | 220                                                     | 59                                                       |
| <b>Development generated traffic (two-way veh / h)</b> | 16                                                      | 8                                                        |
| <b>Traffic with development (two-way veh / h)</b>      | 237                                                     | 68                                                       |
| <b>Environmental Capacity (veh / h)</b>                | 300                                                     | 300                                                      |
| <b>Under / Over Capacity</b>                           | Under                                                   | Under                                                    |

Source: TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002)

Table 11 Environmental Capacity assessment site peak

| <b>Site Peak Period</b>                                |                                                           |                                                               |                                                           |                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| <b>Midblock Site</b>                                   | Park Road<br>between<br>Princes Street<br>and High Street | Park Road<br>between High<br>Street and<br>Barons<br>Crescent | High Street<br>between<br>Farnell Street<br>and Park Road | Barons<br>Crescent<br>East of Park<br>Street |
| <b>Existing traffic<br/>(two-way)</b>                  | 154                                                       | 42                                                            | 129                                                       | 31                                           |
| <b>Development<br/>generated traffic<br/>(two-way)</b> | 62                                                        | 31                                                            | 31                                                        | 31                                           |
| <b>Traffic with<br/>development<br/>(two-way)</b>      | 216                                                       | 72                                                            | 160                                                       | 62                                           |

Source: TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002)

Based on the results in Table 11, the development will not result in exceeding the environmental capacity limits on the local roads immediately surrounding the site and the traffic generated by the proposal can effectively be absorbed into the local road network. No volume on any of the local roads directly surrounding the site during the site and network peak will exceed 300 veh / h, suggesting that the traffic conditions will remain within the recommended threshold.

Based on the above, the traffic impact of the proposal is minimal and will not have a material effect on the surrounding community.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This report provides a transport and traffic assessment of the Planning Proposal for the proposed LEP amendment at the Montefiore Hunters Hill Campus. The Masterplan supporting this Planning Proposal is anticipated to have the following transport and traffic related impacts.

The proposal will provide two vehicle access points to the site, one of which is the existing vehicle access point on High Street and the other is from a new access point on Barons Crescent. Vehicles servicing the site (except for general waste) will use the Barons Crescent access point. A turning bay will be provided in the service area to ensure that vehicles access and egress the site in a forward direction. This will be an improvement of the existing situation as service vehicles currently using the existing Barons Crescent access need to reverse into the site. It is unlikely that there would be an increase in service vehicles accessing the site. The existing northern access off Barons Crescent near the bus stop will be removed.

The peak periods for the trip generation to and from the site will likely be outside of the general network commuter peak periods given the type of development and that staff work on a shift-based roster. Trips generated to/from the site will also be distributed evenly between the two entry points to the site based on the location of the car parking spaces relative to the location of elevators in the basement. Based on the above, the traffic impact of this planning proposal is expected to be minimal.

The majority of trips away from the site will be towards Ryde Road, based on staff returning home from their shifts and residents departing the site to undertake activities. Some trips during the site peak period have been distributed towards the Boronia Park town centre, acknowledging that residents may choose to shop in this local centre as there are two supermarkets.

The car parking provision provided by the development complies with the relevant controls in the TfNSW Guide to Transport Impact Assessment and the SEPP Housing. Car parking sufficiently caters for staff, residents, and visitors within the site, removing the need for staff and visitors to park on Barons Crescent, Gaza Avenue and High Street. This will reduce the existing traffic impact the site has on the local road network and will free up on-street parking for other local residents.

Based on the above, the proposed development is expected to have a minimal traffic impact on the surrounding road network due to:

- The proposed development will not exceed the environmental capacity limits for local roads set out by TfNSW.
- The impact of parking will be reduced as all parking will be contained on-site.
- The impact of service vehicles will be negligible as it is unlikely that there will be an increase in the number of service vehicles accessing the site. Safety is improved for service vehicles using Barons Crescent due to the addition of a turning bay in the proposed service area, allowing forward-in and forward-out movements.

## 6. DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 30 September 2025 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Ltd (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions and for the benefit only, of Montefiore (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Transport Impact Assessment (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

