

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|--|---|--|
| AUSGRID | | |
| Ausgrid has no comments on this proposal | Noted. | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| SYDNEY WATER | | |
| <p>Water Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal does not front a suitably sized drinking water main. An amplification of the local network will be necessary. Considering the scale and land-uses proposed, adjustments an/or minor extensions may also be required. Detailed requirements will be provided at the S73 application phase. Sydney Water requires a proposed breakdown of the ultimate and annual growth numbers for all planning proposals and this should be included with any feasibility or s73 application/development application referral to Sydney Water. An example of the level of data we require is included in Appendix 1, and acknowledge that the data may be indicative and subject to change. The earlier the data is received, the better and ideally updates should be provided every quarter. <p>Wastewater Servicing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater serving should be available to serve the proposal. Multiple wastewater mains are located in the vicinity, and are available for connection. Considering the scale and land uses proposed, amplifications, adjustments and/or minor extensions may be required, and detailed requirements will be provided at the s73 application phase. At s73 application stage, the applicant must nominate the preferred connection location and if multiple connections are required, an EP loading for each connection must be submitted. | <p>Comments regarding water, wastewater and trade wastewater servicing are noted and relate to development application stage where formal approval of Sydney Water servicing requirements will be provided through s73 application.</p> <p>The request for ultimate and annual growth number data for all planning proposals will be further discussed with Sydney Water.</p> | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Sydney Water Asset</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where proposed works are in close proximity to a Sydney Water asset, the developer may be required to carry out additional works to facilitate the development and protect the wastewater main. Subject to the scope of development, servicing options may involve adjustment/deviation and or compliance with the Guidelines for Building Over/Adjacent to Sydney Water Assets. <p>Trade Wastewater Requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any proposed development is going to generate trade wastewater, the developer must submit an application requesting permission to discharge trade waste to Sydney Waters wastewater system. Approval and issue of permit must be received prior to business activities commencing. | | |
| TRANSPORT FOR NSW | | |
| Comments Dated 18 June 2021 (Attachment B) | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic control signals on Pacific Highway at Beaconsfield Parade – New traffic signals in this location will be dependent on the removal/relocation of the existing mid-block signalised pedestrian crossing on the Pacific Highway (adjacent Tryon Place), on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential see-through safety effect of closely spaced intersections Practicalities of providing a single traffic controller for intersections spaced 80m apart Insufficient storage capacity between the intersections and across the pedestrian crossings. The signalised intersection shall operate with two phases only with the right turn from the Highway north approach to Beaconsfield Parade prohibited on a full time basis. Two traffic lanes to be provided on Beaconsfield approach to Pacific Highway intersection, and length of lane to be | <p>Comments noted – see further responses to TfNSW comments below, in relation to the potential for the relocation of the mid-block signalised pedestrian crossing on Pacific Highway (adjacent to Tryon Place).</p> <p>Noted – it is not planned to introduce/permit right turn movements from Pacific Highway into Beaconsfield Parade.</p> <p>Noted. Lane lengths will be determined during traffic signal modelling/design phase.</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|---|
| <p>determined by SIDRA Modelling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian phases shall be provided on all three legs of signalised intersections. | <p>Noted – this will be incorporated into the traffic signal modelling/design phase.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocation of mid-block signalised pedestrian crossing Pacific Highway (adjacent Tryon Place) – TfNSW currently investigating feasibility of moving 15m to north (Option 3 of Traffic Impact Assessment) as alternative option. • Would minimise potential see through safety effects from closely spaced intersections • Allows the provision of the additional signalised intersection at Pacific Highway and Beaconsfield Parade without the requirement for a pedestrian bridge. • Key challenge is the relocation of existing bus stop due to limited are to north or south | <p>Subsequent to its submission to the Planning Proposal, Transport for NSW advised that its investigations have shown that if the signals are relocated 15 metres north of their existing location, this will minimise any potential see-through effect. Transport for NSW also advised that when new traffic signals at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Beaconsfield Parade are installed, the mid-block crossing is to be relocated as part of those works.</p> <p>Initial investigations by Council indicate that, if the traffic signals were relocated 15m further north, the existing bus stop on the eastern side of Pacific Highway (north of Tryon Place) would be outside the statutory No Stopping zone on the approach to mid-block pedestrian signals. There is also the potential to relocate the bus stop to the departure side of the relocated signals, in conjunction with the proposed re-design of Tryon Place at Pacific Highway.</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian Bridge - TfNSW would support the proposed traffic control signals at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Beaconsfield Parade subject to removal of existing mid-block signalised crossing on Pacific Highway (adjacent Tryon Place) and replacement of this by a grade separated pedestrian bridge over the highway (Option 4 in Traffic Impact Assessment) • Provision of a pedestrian bridge is subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design shall comply with TfNSW requirements • Disabled access to be in accordance with AS5100 and lifts to be provided for scooters and bicycles • Arrangement needs to be built into project for fail safe at grade gated crossing if lift out of service and customer unable to use stairs. • Pedestrian fencing to channelize pedestrians to use the bridge • Screening may be required to prevent objects being thrown onto Pacific Highway | <p>The installation of a pedestrian bridge has specific land requirements, to accommodate lift shafts and ramp or stair access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no practical space on the western side of Pacific Highway within the footpath area to accommodate lift shafts and ramp or stair access. The only practicable option is to connect a bridge directly to adjoining buildings. This would require either land acquisition by council (unfunded) or site redevelopment (current planning controls do not allow feasible redevelopment) neither of which have any degree of certainty; • A preliminary feasibility study undertaken by Council found that there were a substantial number of utilities on the western footpath of Pacific Highway, which were a constraint on any landing structure. A structure in the western footpath would severely limit pedestrian accessibility and amenity. This would also require TFNSW approval to connect to the concourse. | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to a Works Authorisation Deed between Council and TfNSW which is to be executed prior to construction • Independent road safety audit required to identify any remedial measures • Critical for pedestrian thoroughfare to be provided between Woodford Lane and Pacific Highway for bridge to be feasible. • Sufficient space on western side of Highway (opposite Tryon Place) needs to be provided for landing requirements • Council may wish to considered planning incentives for land required for the bridge to be dedicated at no cost to Council or TfNSW. TfNSW will not be the acquiring authority for any such land. | <p>The feasibility study also acknowledged that there was potential for a pedestrian bridge to divert some pedestrian movements away from the at-grade pedestrian crossing. It also concluded that a pedestrian bridge could potentially reduce the delays to general traffic on the Pacific Highway, although this is unlikely given that the constraints on the road network in Lindfield are at the boundaries of the local centre (i.e. intersection of Pacific Highway with Balfour Street and intersection with Grosvenor Road)</p> <p>From an accessibility and liveability perspective, a pedestrian bridge will cause pedestrians to by-pass the ground floor retail on both sides of Pacific Highway as the move between Lindfield station/eastern side of Lindfield and the Lindfield Village Hub site (with potential basement commuter parking). Travel paths will be longer via a bridge, which will reduce the convenience and easy access to the retail strip on Pacific Highway. The additional delay caused by the existing at-grade crossing could be offset by provision of additional crossing points (see below). Pedestrian amenity and access to retail will be affected by proposed Extended Clearways on Pacific Highway, removing kerbside access for large parts of the trading day and placing increased vehicle traffic volumes in the kerbside lane for longer periods.</p> <p>Through its preferred transport scheme for Lindfield, Council is seeking to increase the crossing opportunities along Pacific Highway and better connect the 2 sides of Lindfield, through the inclusion of at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities at new traffic signal-controlled intersection sites.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tryon Place/Pacific Highway Intersection – Tyron Place at Pacific Highway shall be restricted to left turn movements only (unsignalised). | <p>Noted. This requirement has also been incorporated in Council’s draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield, will be incorporated into the traffic signal modelling/design phase.</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic controls signals at Pacific Highway/Strickland Avenue intersection – TfNSW supports the provision of traffic control signals at the existing intersection subject to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intersection shall operate with a maximum of three phases • Pedestrian phases to be provided on all legs of the signalised intersection | <p>Noted – this will be incorporated into the traffic signal modelling/design phase.</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIDRA modelling is required to identify an appropriate length for the right turn storage bay on the south approach of Pacific Highway to the proposed Strickland Ave signalised intersection – any vehicle queue out of the storage bay will result in the northbound carriageway of the highway being restricted which is highly undesirable. • SIDRA Modelling should account for additional volumes (on top of existing turning volumes and traffic generation associated with the lane use proposals) of traffic turning right from the Highway onto Strickland as motorists will be provided a safe turning facility via the traffic signal control, creating a more desirable route choice. • Right turn movements from the Pacific Highway into Strickland Ave may need to be prohibited in the pm peak, which would be determined by SIDRA modelling. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure Bent Lane – TfNSW no objection to closure of Bent Lane subject to preparation and submission of Traffic Management Plan for dispersed vehicle trips, and endorsement by Local Traffic Committee. | Noted. | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification to Pacific Highway/Balfour St/Havilah Road signalised intersection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no objection to the proposed ban on right turn movement from Havilah Road to Pacific Highway • Proposed changes to traffic signal phasing/timing are controlled by Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System (SCATS) • Support lengthening of right storage bay on Pacific Highway south approach and extension of the left turn storage bay on Balfour Street west approach, the distance of the extensions need to be verified with SIDRA (version 8) modelling. • Consultation to be undertaken with any | Noted – this will be incorporated into the traffic signal modelling/design phase. | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|--|
| residents/businesses affected by the loss of parking | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road widening Grosvenor Road – TfNSW supports the road widening to create three approach lanes to the Pacific Highway. • Recommended Council prepare a strategic road design plan overlaid on a survey plan to ensure the road widening can occur within the road reserve and comply with minimum requirements (e.g. lane and footpath widths, turning paths) | Noted | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic control signals at Lindfield Ave/Tryon Road intersection – TfNSW no objection to the provision of traffic control signals at existing intersection, subject to geometric layout within existing footprint of intersection. • Design and constructed to TfNSW requirements under S87 Roads Act. • SIDRA Modelling should be undertaken to inform the full extent of parking restrictions adjacent to the intersection to ensure efficient operation | Noted. This would not form part of the Planning Proposal, although traffic signal modelling/design in accordance with Transport for NSW requirements is currently underway at this site | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One-way movements on Woodford Lane – No objection to conversion of Woodford lane to one way, subject to the preparation and submission of Traffic Management Plan for dispersed vehicle trips and endorsement by Local Traffic Committee. | Noted | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works Authorisation Deed – Any proposed works on Pacific Highway or proposed traffic control signals on the local road network require Council to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed with TfNSW, which is to executed prior to commencement of any road works | Noted | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location and design of kiss and ride facility for Lindfield Station should be investigated in consultation with TfNSW. Consideration needs to be given to identifying the feasibility of a kiss and ride facility on Lindfield Avenue • Active transport links should be enhanced and investigated in consultation with TfNSW | Noted. Council's draft Public Domain Plan makes provision for kiss and ride, cycling and bus stop facilities around Lindfield station, and is the subject of ongoing discussions with Transport for NSW and the other stakeholders (including Transdev and Bike North). Relevant considerations for this project are proposed kiss and ride facilities in an upgraded Woodford Lane, cycling links, and impacts to bus stops on Pacific Highway as a result of the proposed intersection modifications/traffic signal installations at Beaconsfield Parade and | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any road network changes should not encroach on the rail corridor Existing bus operation on the Pacific Highway and Lindfield Avenue (including infrastructure) should not be impacted by the proposed traffic management measures. If impacts are identified, consultation should be undertaken with TfNSW to determine appropriate mitigation measures. | <p>Tryon Place, which are the subject of ongoing discussions with Transport for NSW.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All works at no cost to State Government – All above mentioned management measures (including the pedestrian bridge) shall be at no cost to the State Government. Identified infrastructure should be funded through S94 Developer Contribution Plan and/or Planning Agreement TfNSW willing to negotiate with Council regarding possibility of Council have temporary advertising rights on the pedestrian bridge to recover upfront capital costs associated with construction of bridge (subject to approval of advertising under SEPP 64). Once construction costs are fully recovered by Council, the bridge is an asset of TfNSW and Council will no longer be entitled to advertising rights. | <p>Noted regarding traffic management infrastructure and measures. However, the cost of a pedestrian bridge is unfunded. In 2015 Council conducted a feasibility study into a possible pedestrian bridge connecting to the station concourse. The study estimated the cost of a bridge in 2014 to be up to \$4.6 million including contingencies excluding any potential land acquisition. More recently comparison with similar bridges such as the new one at Hornsby rail station puts cost in the vicinity \$10M. This price does not include any consideration of land acquisition.</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking provision – Noting the sites proximity to frequent public transport (bus and rail) and services, it is encouraged to investigate opportunities to minimise the provision of on-site parking through reduced maximum parking rates. This will assist with mode shift away from private vehicles and reduce potential traffic demand in the area. | <p>This is a matter for a future development application, and although Council's DCP specifies minimum and maximum parking rates for the various land uses, it would be expected that parking would be provided at the lower end of the range given the site's proximity to Lindfield station and other key facilities and amenities. There is the possibility of reducing parking provision further through various strategies such as the provision of car share vehicles, and efficiencies from shared parking from non-conflicting land uses/parking peaks (e.g. retail/office uses, and restaurant/dining uses).</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |
| Comments Dated 11 August 2021 (Attachment A) | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site Servicing – recommended that service vehicle access to future development ensures an 8.8m Medium Rigid Vehicle (MRV) can access from all approaches. For a supermarket safe access suitable for a 19m Articulated Vehicle (AV) should be provided in loading dock. All servicing should be accommodated | <p>Noted. This is a matter for a future development application</p> | <p>No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p> |

STATE AGENCY SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE – Lindfield Village Hub Planning Proposal

| MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION | COMMENT | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|--|--|
| within the site. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car share spaces – traffic assessment should identify the exact number of car share spaces that will be provided | Noted. This is a matter for a future development application | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sydney Trains – Council should provide notification to Sydney Trains about any DA for this site. | Noted. This is a matter for a future development application | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification 3(b) from Attachment B – the statement in section (b) of item 3 (traffic control signals at Pacific Highway/Strickland Avenue intersection) have been inserted by mistake and should be disregarded. | Noted. This reference relating to Beaconsfield Parade has been removed from the summary. | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |
| SYDNEY TRAINS | | |
| Issues were included in the submission from TfNSW | Noted. Refer to comments in response to TfNSW submission. | No change to planning proposal or site specific DCP. |