

# **Glenfield to Macarthur**

URBAN RENEWAL CORRIDOR STRATEGY

# Integrated Transport Stategy







Prepared forTransport for NSWFile ReferenceGlenfield to Macarthur Corridor\_COMPLETE\_FINAL\_210715.docxDateMarch 2015

## **Contact Information**

Cardno (NSW/ACT) Pty Ltd ABN 95 001 145 035

Level 9 the Forum 203 Pacific Highway St. Leonards NSW 2065

Telephone: +61 2 9496 7700 Facsimile: +61 2 9439 5170

www.cardno.com.au

## **Document Control**

| Version           | Date     | Author                     | Author<br>Initials | Reviewer         | Reviewer<br>Initials |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Draft             | 9/3/15   | Larissa Miller / Mitch Lee | LM / ML            | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| Draft             | 20/3/15  | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Larissa Miller   | LM                   |
| Report            |          | Chris Slenders             | CS                 | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| Draft             | 29/05/15 | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Larissa Miller   | LM                   |
| Report v2         |          | Chris Slenders             | CS                 | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| Draft             | 03/06/15 | Larissa Miller             | LM                 | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| Report v3         |          | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 |                  |                      |
|                   |          | Chris Slenders             | CS                 |                  |                      |
| Final Draft       | 30/06/15 | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| V1                |          | Chris Slenders             | CS                 |                  |                      |
| Final Draft       | 20/07/15 | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Tessa Knox-Grant | TKG                  |
| V2                |          | Tessa Knox-Grant           | TKG                |                  |                      |
| Final Draft<br>V3 | 21/07/15 | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Mitchell Lee     | ML                   |
| Final             | 03/08/15 | Mitchell Lee               | ML                 | Mitchell Lee     | ML                   |
|                   |          |                            |                    |                  |                      |

© Cardno. 2015 Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to Cardno and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person other than by agreement with Cardno.

This document is produced by Cardno solely for the benefit and use by the client in accordance with the terms of the engagement. Cardno does not and shall not assume any responsibility or liability whatsoever to any third party arising out of any use or reliance by any third party on the content of this document.



## **Executive Summary**

The NSW Government, through *A Plan for Growing Sydney*, has identified urban renewal opportunities along the Glenfield to Macarthur railway corridor to accommodate additional population and support economic growth. The aim of this proposed renewal is to take advantage of the existing and planned transport network, with a focus on mixed use urban activation and increased residential density around train stations. It is intended that this approach will support higher levels of self-containment within the corridor and reduce growth in private vehicle use in areas of relatively high access to transport, jobs and services.

The proposed growth in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor is 84,500 over 20 years, approximately 13% or 9,000 residents above the previous forecast in the corridor. *A Plan for Growing Sydney* describes the need to accommodate 1.6 million more people by 2031, the corridor's growth over the same period would accommodate 5% of the 1.6 million.

This Integrated Transport Strategy supports the Glenfield to Macarthur Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy (URCS) by proposing development outcomes for transport and identifying opportunities and risks to the transport system by proposed future growth.

Following finalisation of the URCS, the Department of Planning and Environment and Campbelltown City Council will work together to identify opportunities for more detailed precinct planning along the corridor. This will involve more detailed transport assessment, including validation with detailed traffic modelling, and initiatives will be considered for new funding, reprioritisation within existing transport programs, and/or as part of regular network and other reviews.

A number of important transport challenges will need to be addressed, which are important to the success of the precincts and the ongoing functionality of the transport system, including:

- Mitigation of the interface and conflict between the important freight tasks and adjacent land uses (particularly residential). In particular, noise impacts with the 24/7 operation of the nationally significant Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) will need to be addressed with quarantining land uses to create a barrier, or by design and planning controls (e.g. double glazing of residential properties)
- > The Southern Sydney Freight Line carries a nationally significant freight task through the rail system on this corridor. Land uses adjacent to the rail corridor must not impede the option to duplicate the SSFL or augment the passenger rail task in the future.
- > The proposed increased retail and residential land uses should be located and designed so as not to jeopardise the long term viability of industrial areas in this corridor, which would create greater need for industrial uses and significant freight tasks in other, potentially less well-located locations.

## Glenfield to Macarthur corridor

The Glenfield to Macarthur corridor, shown in **Figure 1**, is located in Sydney's south-west within the Campbelltown City Council local government area (LGA) between 30 and 45 kilometres from the Sydney CBD. The corridor consists of seven precincts surrounding train stations: Glenfield, Macquarie Fields, Ingleburn, Minto, Leumeah, Campbelltown and Macarthur.



#### Figure 1 Location of the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor

Cardno

## Background and population growth

There were 53,600 people living in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor in 2011. The population is forecast to increase to approximately 75,100 by 2036 through natural/background (BTS) population growth, and to approximately 87,300 if the proposed urban activation and densification occurs. The jobs are proposed to increase from 40,000 in the 2011 estimate to 60,700 with the proposed structure plan. The proposed activation and intensification is intended to focus uplift around areas with the most potential and least constraints. The natural growth and structure plan growth forecast for each precinct is detailed in Table 1-1.

| Table 1-1         2036 background and proposed population growth |                  |                         |        |          |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------|--|--|--|
| Precinct   | Background (BTS) | Proposed Structure Plan | Change | % change |  |  |  |
| Glenfield  | 14,100           | 14,900                  | 800    | 6%       |  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields   | 7,900            | 7,900                   | 0      | 1%       |  |  |  |
| Ingleburn  | 16,600           | 17,900                  | 1,300  | 8%       |  |  |  |
| Minto  | 2,600            | 3,100                   | 500    | 20%      |  |  |  |
| Leumeah  | 9,300            | 10,000                  | 700    | 8%       |  |  |  |
| Campbelltown   | 13,700           | 18,300                  | 4,600  | 33%      |  |  |  |
| Macarthur  | 10,900           | 15,200                  | 4,300  | 39%      |  |  |  |
| Total  | 75,100           | 87,300                  | 12,200 | 16%      |  |  |  |

There were approximately 40,000 jobs in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor in 2011. This workforce is expected to increase by around 50% to 60,700 by 2036 under the proposed structure plans for the seven station precincts. The forecast employment for each precinct is detailed in Table 1-2. Jobs growth is expected to occur through the corridor over the 20 year period regardless of planned activation of the precincts. The structure plans propose an increase of 3% for employment across the corridor.

| <b>.</b>         |                  |                         |        |          |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------|
| Precinct         | Background (BTS) | Proposed Structure Plan | Change | % change |
| Glenfield        | 2,300            | 2,500                   | 200    | 9%       |
| Macquarie Fields | 2,300            | 2,300                   | 0      | 0%       |
| Ingleburn        | 15,000           | 14,800                  | -200   | -1%      |
| Minto            | 5,300            | 5,400                   | 100    | 2%       |
| Leumeah          | 7,100            | 7,100                   | 0      | 0%       |
| Campbelltown     | 15,600           | 17,300                  | 1,700  | 11%      |
| Macarthur        | 11,100           | 11,300                  | 200    | 2%       |
| Study Area       | 58,700           | 60,700                  | 2,000  | 3%       |

## Table 1-2 2036 background and proposed employment growth

## Existing travel behaviour

T-1-1- 4 0

The existing travel behaviour within the study area provides an insight into how the study area functions and consequently transport considerations.

Journey to work data for people who live in the study area indicates a high proportion of vehicle driver and passenger, 65% and 6% respectively with a total of 71% of all trips by vehicle. This is a little lower than the mode share splits for Greater Sydney, with vehicle drivers and passengers at 68% and 6% respectively. The study area has a higher mode share of public transport usage at 26% when compared to the greater metropolitan area (GMA) at 20%. Active transport use within the corridor is half that of the GMA at 3% and 6% respectively. The full mode share for the corridor and GMA is outlined in **Table 1-4**.

and the state of the state of the state of the Parket state of the sta

| Table 1-3  | 2011 Journey t | o work | mode snar | e tor peo | pie living | in the co | rridor |       |
|------------|----------------|--------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Mode split | Train          | Bus    | Ferry/    | Vehicle   | Vehicle    | Bicycle   | Walked | Other |
|            |                |        | Tram      | driver    | nass       |           | only   | mode  |

| Mode split                   | Irain | Bus | Ferry/<br>Tram | driver | pass. | вісусіе | only | mode | Total |
|------------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|--------|-------|---------|------|------|-------|
| Corridor                     | 25%   | 1%  | 0%             | 65%    | 6%    | 0%      | 2%   | 1%   | 100%  |
| Greater<br>Metropolitan Area | 14%   | 6%  | 0%             | 68%    | 6%    | 1%      | 4%   | 1%   | 100%  |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW tables 13 v1.3 & 14 v1.4 (for bicycles)

The journey to work mode shares for people working in the study area represent an even higher reliance on private motor vehicles with the proportion of vehicle drivers and passengers at 83% and 8% respectively, a total of 91% of all work trips to jobs located in the corridor. Public transport use in the corridor for employment is low at 6% when compared to the GMA at 20%. Active transport use within the corridor is half that of the GMA at 3% and 6% respectively. The full mode share for the corridor and greater metropolitan area is outlined in **Table 1-5**.

There is a significant difference between the trips to jobs located in the corridor and work trips in the GMA. This may indicate the study area's workers live in parts of Sydney that have limited public transport regional coverage and frequency and as a result public and active transport travel times are not competitive with private vehicle.

| Table 1-4 | 2011 journey to work mode share for people working in the corridor |
|-----------|--|
|           |  |

| Mode split                   | Train | Bus | Ferry/<br>Tram | Vehicle<br>driver | Vehicle<br>pass. | Bicycle | Walked<br>only | Other<br>mode | Total |
|------------------------------|-------|-----|----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| Corridor                     | 4%    | 2%  | 0%             | 83%               | 8%               | 0%      | 2%             | 1%            | 100%  |
| Greater<br>Metropolitan Area | 14%   | 6%  | 0%             | 68%               | 6%               | 1%      | 5%             | 1%            | 100%  |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table5v1.3

The proportion of people who live and work in the study area is 32% (the proportion of journey to work trips that are self-contained within the corridor).

The workplace location for residents who live in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor demonstrates a relatively local economy; the five top employment destinations for residents are Campbelltown, Sydney Inner City,

Liverpool, Bankstown and Camden. The employment for residents is located locally (approximately 45 minute public transport trip).

## Existing transport network

## Walking

The walking network in the study area varies from precinct to precinct in quality, connectivity and safety. There are some significant barriers to access some stations, including:

> Lack of footpaths in some locations;

Cardno

- > Large land parcels with limited public access;
- > Natural features, such as creeks and waterways;
- > Main roads with high traffic volumes and limited safe crossing opportunities;
- > Sporting facilities; and
- > Shopping centres.

Overall the walking network is basic and requires a clear hierarchy for infrastructure provision and connectivity.

## Cycling

The cycling network is highly fragmented and does not connect key destinations within each precinct or regionally. It is likely that the disconnected network in this corridor contributes to the low mode share of cycling. Fragmented facilities are a key cause of low cycling resulting from a concern of safety and lack of connectedness.

In most cases the station is within close proximity to the precinct's main activity area for goods and services, which presents an opportunity to provide cycling facilities that connect multiple key destinations.

The high amount of private vehicle use within the study area is likely to require facilities that are of a high safety standard to encourage more people to cycle.

## Rail

The rail network within the study area serves freight and passengers. There are three lines that service the study area: T2 South Line, T5 Cumberland Line and the South West Rail Link. The study area facilitates a large amount of industrial uses and as a region it is the gateway to and from the Southern Highlands, South Western Sydney and Canberra. In this context rail provides a significant role in supporting the local economy and intermodal facilities. Future proofing for both freight and passengers is a key challenge for this rail corridor.

There are seven stations, each with specific challenges, which include:

- Access and walking: maximising walking catchments will increase the amount of people who have access between the station and their residence and employment. This will increase the likelihood of achieving mode shift to sustainable modes of transport;
- Integration with other modes: Ensuring integration with other modes of transport maximises the customer experience and increases the likelihood that people will walk, cycle and catch the bus to/from the rail station;
- Parking: balancing the supply and restrictions of parking to support the use of public transport while balancing local economic factors;
- Land use: providing a mix of land uses within close proximity of the station to encourage multi-purpose trips and maximise local access to local business; and
- With the exception of Macquarie Fields Station, all stations have step-free access provisions to all platforms.



## Freight

The study area supports a large amount of industrial uses and as a result, freight within the study area and wider region is an important service that facilitates the movement of goods to and within the Sydney region. The corridor is part of a nationally significant freight rail corridor and adjacent to a nationally significant road corridor.

Access to the railway lines and motorways is a key driver for industrial uses and maintaining and improving these access points will continue to support this activity.

### Bus

The study area includes a coverage based bus network, with route frequency varying depending on origin, destination and key destination in between. Routes connect to Wollongong and Warragamba and also connect to Appin and Oran Park. These services are considered infrequent with one service in the AM and PM peak period.

Local routes cover the study area well and generally are all day services, not just peak demand services. There is a steady frequency throughout the day to support all day use.

While coverage is considered to be good, directness is affected and as a result journey times can be lengthy. A balance of coverage and directness for the study area is a recommended consideration for future networks.

The residential land use density through the corridor is low and there are a large number of bus routes in the region. As such higher frequency services are challenging due to the limited base demand.

### **Road and parking**

The road network provides good local access with a limited number of connections to the arterial road network, in particular the Hume Motorway.

There are limited opportunities to cross the railway line on the local road network, this is considered a barrier to all transport modes.

Parking throughout the study area is provided through a mix of on and off street parking. A combination of time-based restricted and unrestricted parking currently exists in most precincts.

### Integrated transport strategy

The objectives provide a framework for achieving an efficient and supportive transport system for the residents, workers, students and visitors in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.

This set of corridor objectives was developed in consultation with key stakeholders and were developed to be consistent with the *NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan* and *A Plan for Growing Sydney*. The objectives are:

- 1. Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport
- 2. Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport
- 3. Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys
- 4. Encourage people to walk and cycle more
- 5. Increase density in key transport locations
- 6. Improve street legibility for all modes of transport
- 7. Minimise through traffic in local areas
- 8. Maximise investment in station supporting facilities
- 9. Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor
- 10. Improve connections to regionally significant areas
- 11. Improve road safety around key transport hubs

- 12. Improve personal security around key transport hubs
- 13. Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes
- 14. Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport
- 15. Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle

- 16. Support collaboration with the business community, Council and NSW Government to improve transport for all stakeholders
- 17. Develop controls that support walking, cycling and public transport

These objectives aim to maximise the use of existing infrastructure, increase walking, cycling and public transport use and support the diverse land uses within the study area.

## Improvement measures

The concept transport network is consistent with the objectives, and to complement the Glenfield to Macarthur Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy, a suite of transport initiatives are recommended for further assessment in detailed precinct planning, reprioritisation of existing NSW Transport programs, and/or implementation in council programs.

## Other investigations

It is noted that a number of investigations and projects are currently underway: Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation (south of the corridor), Outer Sydney Orbital Corridor Preservation Study, as well as the operation of the proposed Moorebank Intermodal Terminal. As more detailed precinct planning is undertaken, the relationship and impacts of potential projects to the corridor needs to be considered. In particular, if the Greater Macarthur Land Release area is to progress, the relationship between the transport needs and infrastructure for both precincts needs to be addressed.





## Figure 2 Concept corridor transport network

## Walking and cycling networks

The priority for walking and cycling in the study area is to establish a base network that is legible and connects to key destinations. The following is recommended:

- > Develop and implement a local and regional walking network and cycling network within the Local Government Area. In accordance with Sydney's Walking Future and Sydney's Cycling Future, future investment should aim to separate walking and cycling movements from each other as well as from vehicles, where practical and feasible.
- > Develop and implement green links to capitalise on open space, maximise personal security and increase the walking and cycling networks.

### **Rail Network**

The priority for the rail corridor is to support both passenger and freight movement, which includes:

- Protect integrity of passenger and freight rail and allow for growth. The Southern Sydney Freight Rail Line is a key link in the national freight network and, subject to Australian Rail Track Corporation planning and funding priorities, will require duplication in the longer term. In the medium term growth is likely to be accommodated through enhancements to the existing line including provision of freight passing loops.
- > Rail services in the corridor will increase to meet the growth needs of the broader region. The stopping patterns and level of service within the corridor will be matched to the role and function of each of the



precincts. Subject to future detailed planning and funding, infrastructure enhancements to provide additional capacity are likely to be required and would include infrastructure such as extra tracks, additional stabling capacity and upgrades to other rail related infrastructure.

> Rail augmentation to support the continued growth of freight and passenger services within and through the corridor.

### **Road Network**

Cardno

The priority for the road network is to investigate potential new links and protect freight corridors. Some key considerations include:

- > A preliminary assessment of the road network indicates that the existing road network can adequately support the future network demands based on BTS base growth forecasts and the increased population growth outlined in the structure plans (the 2036 Project Scenario). Congestion would remain in existing locations, however road capacity upgrades such as the Narellan Road upgrade already underway will lessen the impact of growing demand. The following additional concept road links across the railway line are recommended for further investigation:
  - Glenfield: connection from Glenfield Road to Campbelltown Road;
  - Macquarie Fields: connection from Victoria Road to Railway Parade;
  - Ingleburn: Chester Road to Devon Road;
  - Campbelltown: transit and active transport connection from Broughton Street to Badgally Road; and
  - Macarthur: transit and active transport connection from Menangle Road to Camden Road under Narellan Road.
- > Any new regional road linkages across the railway line must take into consideration induced traffic demand, wider regional growth, the requirement for freight links to support development and the need for transit links.
- > Protect key freight routes into major employment areas and activity centres to facilitate efficient local and regional freight movements.
- > Further evaluation must be undertaken for regional road links, particularly for public transport and freight movements.

## **Bus Network**

- > Increase bus service frequencies throughout the day and on weekends on key routes.
- > Establish direct bus routes in the corridor that are prioritised on the road network.
- > Identify key bus routes to review for service based networks. This concept is subject to feasibility assessments and further refinement to be completed by TfNSW.

### Land use

- > Ensure that land use planning controls address the critical role and function of the rail corridor through the implementation of supportive design guidelines and building standards for development adjacent to major roads and rail corridors.
- > Support key employment land uses through planning and prioritising freight movement along major corridors.
- > Develop and adopt appropriate Travel Demand Measures for key land uses and centres including management of commuter car parking along the corridor to optimise utility of assets, improve urban amenity and accommodate the needs of commuters.

### Summary

The proposed transport network responds to the existing environment future demand, and structure plan development. The walking and cycling networks have the potential to be implemented prior to the structure plan completion through NSW Government and Council programs. The proposed rail improvements are in

line with current planning for TfNSW's *Sydney's Rail Future* and therefore will be implemented as committed. The proposed bus routes in the region will be considered as part of upcoming regional bus network reviews. The potential road links identified require detailed modelling and multi-criteria analysis to ensure no adverse impacts arise as a result of new links, for example induced local demand and/or congestion.

This integrated transport strategy outlines a framework to support an increase in population and employment within the study area. However, further planning and analysis will be required in the following areas:

- Strategic road network: Further consideration of key regional road links as part of broader planning processes such as the South West Growth Centre structure plan review, Western Sydney airport planning, and Greater Macarthur land release investigations.
- > Detailed local area road network analysis: to understand local road network performance.

Cardno

- > Local area transport network: detailed planning and design of the street network to support a safe lowspeed environment, including investigation of 40km/hr high pedestrian activity areas and local area traffic management facilities.
- > Consideration and analysis of the land use and freight conflicts including Southern Sydney Freight Line duplication, noise impacts, and future viability of industrial business with shifting land use profile.

In summary, the integrated transport strategy has identified a concept transport network with planning and policy considerations to support the projected increase in population and employment in the study area.

# Table of Contents

| 1 | Introc | luction                            | 1   |
|---|--------|------------------------------------|-----|
|   | 1.1    | Study area                         | 1   |
|   | 1.2    | Report structure                   | 3   |
| 2 | The p  | lanning policy and project context | 4   |
|   | 2.1    | Strategic planning                 | 4   |
|   | 2.2    | Regional strategic planning        | 15  |
|   | 2.3    | Glenfield to Macarthur Planning    | 18  |
|   | 2.4    | Key considerations                 | 20  |
| 3 | Existi | ing land uses                      | 22  |
|   | 3.1    | Land zoning                        | 22  |
|   | 3.2    | Land uses                          | 22  |
|   | 3.3    | Key considerations                 | 31  |
| 4 | Existi | ing transport infrastructure       | 32  |
|   | 4.1    | Walking                            | 32  |
|   | 4.2    | Cycling                            | 47  |
|   | 4.3    | Rail                               | 51  |
|   | 4.4    | Station interchanges               | 53  |
|   | 4.5    | Station interchange precincts      | 55  |
|   | 4.6    | Freight                            | 64  |
|   | 4.7    | Bus                                | 66  |
|   | 4.8    | Road                               | 75  |
|   | 4.9    | Parking                            | 78  |
|   | 4.10   | Key considerations                 | 87  |
| 5 |        | ed transport network improvements  | 89  |
|   | 5.1    | Walking                            | 89  |
|   | 5.2    | Cycling                            | 89  |
|   | 5.3    | Rail                               | 89  |
|   | 5.4    | Freight                            | 90  |
|   | 5.5    | Bus                                | 92  |
|   | 5.6    | Road                               | 94  |
| 6 | Data ı | review                             | 97  |
|   | 6.1    | Population and employment          | 97  |
|   | 6.2    | Dwellings and structure type       | 98  |
|   | 6.3    | Household income                   | 99  |
|   | 6.4    | Vehicle ownership                  | 100 |
|   | 6.5    | Journey to work                    | 103 |
|   | 6.6    | Household travel survey            | 108 |
|   | 6.7    | Rail demand                        | 109 |
|   | 6.8    | Bus demand                         | 117 |
|   | 6.9    | Key considerations                 | 131 |
| 7 | Forec  | ast conditions                     | 133 |
|   | 7.1    | Forecast population                | 133 |
|   | 7.2    | Forecast employment                | 134 |
|   | 7.3    | Forecast road network operation    | 134 |
|   | 7.4    | Draft precinct structure plans     | 139 |



|    | 7.5   | Key considerations                 | 147 |
|----|-------|------------------------------------|-----|
| 8  | Cons  | 148                                |     |
| 9  | Corri | dor objectives and recommendations | 151 |
|    | 9.1   | Strategic transport objectives     | 151 |
|    | 9.2   | Recommended improvements           | 158 |
| 10 | Conc  | ept transport network              | 169 |
|    | 10.1  | Regional network                   | 169 |
|    | 10.2  | Precinct network plans             | 174 |
|    | 10.3  | Multi-criteria assessment          | 217 |
| 11 | Sumn  | nary and conclusion                | 218 |

## Tables

| Table 1-1  | 2036 background and proposed population growth  |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 1-2  | 2036 background and proposed employment growth  |     |
| Table 1-3  | 2011 journey to work mode share for people living in the corridor                                       |     |
| Table 1-4  | 2011 journey to work mode share for people working in the corridor                                      |     |
| Table 2-1  | Sydney's Bus Future - route tiers   |     |
| Table 4-1  | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor train services per hour   | 52  |
| Table 4-2  | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor bus route description   |     |
| Table 4-3  | Bus route operations  |     |
| Table 4-4  | Parking facilities at interchanges  |     |
| Table 4-5  | Campbelltown and Parramatta City Council parking control comparison                                     | 79  |
| Table 6-1  | Estimated population (ERP)  | 97  |
| Table 6-2  | Estimated resident workforce  | 98  |
| Table 6-3  | Estimated existing employment   |     |
| Table 6-4  | Aggregate dwelling structure distribution by precinct (count) 2011                                      | 99  |
| Table 6-5  | Aggregate dwelling structure distribution by precinct (%) 2011  | 99  |
| Table 6-6  | Household income comparison   | 100 |
| Table 6-7  | Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, all dwelling structures 2011                       | 101 |
| Table 6-8  | Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, separate dwelling structure 2011                   | 101 |
| Table 6-9  | Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, semi dwelling structure                            | 102 |
| Table 6-10 | Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, FUA dwelling structure                             | 102 |
| Table 6-11 | Journey to Work origin mode shares with comparison areas  | 104 |
| Table 6-12 | Journey to work destination mode shares with comparison areas   | 105 |
| Table 6-13 | Top twenty destinations of corridor's resident workers  | 106 |
| Table 6-14 | Top twenty origins of workers within study area   | 107 |
| Table 6-15 | Proportion of corridor's resident workers who also work in the corridor                                 | 107 |
| Table 6-16 | Corridor's workers' mode shares for JTW – all origins and origins of those who live and with e corridor |     |
| Table 6-17 | HTS sample by purpose to, from study area and within GMA  | 109 |
| Table 6-18 | HTS weighted trip estimates by purpose to, from study area and within GMA                               | 109 |
| Table 6-19 | Household travel survey weighted proportions by purpose to, from study area and within the              |     |
| Table 6-20 | Historic station barrier counts, 24 hours total ins and outs on weekdays                                | 110 |
| Table 6-21 | Station barrier counts, AM peaks 'ins' on weekdays  |     |
| Table 6-22 | Station barrier counts, AM peak 'outs' on weekdays  |     |
| Table 6-23 | Top 5 busiest locations by passenger volume bus stops   |     |
| Table 6-24 | Vehicle ownership comparison  |     |
| Table 7-1  | Comparison of natural growth and structure plan growth of population for 2036                           | 133 |

| Table 7-2 | Estimated and projected employment by precinct  | 134 |
|-----------|---|-----|
| Table 7-3 | 2036 Project Scenario additional population   | 135 |
| Table 8-1 | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor transport constraints                                       | 149 |
| Table 8-2 | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor transport opportunities                                     | 150 |
| Table 9-1 | NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan objectives  | 151 |
| Table 9-2 | A Plan for Growing Sydney's Goals   | 152 |
| Table 9-3 | Strategic transport objectives, measures and indicators for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corr |     |
| Table 9-4 | Example of on street parking controls   |     |
|           | Proposed regional routes  |     |
|           | Core pedestrian network to/ from station  |     |
|           | Core pedestrian network to/from station   |     |
|           | Core pedestrian network to/from station   |     |
|           | Core pedestrian network to/ from station  |     |
|           | Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station  |     |
|           | Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station  |     |
|           | Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station  |     |
|           | MCA precinct and mode scores  |     |
|           | - Equivalence deck: TZ to Precinct and study area   |     |
|           | - Equivalence deck: SA1 to Precinct   |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Glenfield Precinct's resident workers                         |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Macquarie fields Precinct's resident workers                  |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Ingleburn Precinct's resident workers                         |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Minto Precinct's resident workers                             |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Leumeah Precinct's resident workers                           |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of Campbelltown Precinct's resident workers                      |     |
|           | Top ten destinations (sa4) of MacArthur Precinct's resident workers                         |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Glenfield Precinct                                  |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Macquarie fields Precinct                           |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Ingleburn Precinct                                  |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Minto Precinct                                      |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Leumeah Precinct                                    |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Campbelltown Precinct                               |     |
|           | Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within MacArthur Precinct                                  |     |
|           |   |     |

Cardno<sup>®</sup>\_\_\_\_\_

# Figures

| Figure 1   | Location of the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor                     | iv |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 2   | Concept corridor transport network                                  | ix |
| Figure 1-1 | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor - Greater Metropolitan Area Context | 2  |
| Figure 1-2 | Glenfield to Macarthur precincts and station catchments             | 2  |
| Figure 2-1 | A Plan to Grow Sydney – south-west subregion                        | 7  |
| Figure 2-2 | Sydney metropolitan freight rail network                            |    |
| Figure 2-3 | NSW Freight and Port Strategy Framework                             | 11 |
| Figure 2-4 | Sydney Road Freight Hierarchy                                       | 13 |
| Figure 2-5 | South west growth centre proposed                                   | 17 |
| Figure 2-6 | Campbelltown CBD Traffic Study Area                                 |    |
| Figure 3-1 | Glenfield precinct land uses  | 23 |
| Figure 3-2 | Macquarie Fields precinct land uses                                 | 24 |
| Figure 3-3 | Ingleburn precinct land uses  | 26 |
| Figure 3-4 | Minto precinct land uses  | 27 |

| Figure 3-5  | Leumeah precinct land uses  |      |
|-------------|---|------|
| Figure 3-6  | Campbelltown precinct land uses   |      |
| Figure 3-7  | Macarthur precinct land uses  |      |
| Figure 4-1  | Glenfield Station walking catchments  |      |
| Figure 4-2  | Existing footpaths at Glenfield   |      |
| Figure 4-3  | Macquarie Fields Station walking catchments                                       |      |
| Figure 4-4  | Existing footpaths at Macquarie Fields  |      |
| Figure 4-5  | Ingleburn Station walking catchments  |      |
| Figure 4-6  | Existing footpaths at Ingleburn   |      |
| Figure 4-7  | Minto Station walking catchments  |      |
| Figure 4-8  | Existing footpaths at Minto   |      |
|             | Leumeah Station walking catchments  |      |
| Figure 4-10 | Existing footpaths at Leumeah   | . 42 |
| Figure 4-11 | Campbelltown Station walking catchments   | . 43 |
| Figure 4-12 | Existing footpath at Campbelltown   | . 44 |
| Figure 4-13 | Macarthur precinct walking catchments   | . 45 |
| Figure 4-14 | Existing footpaths in Macarthur   | . 46 |
| Figure 4-15 | Existing cycling routes   | . 48 |
| Figure 4-16 | Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor in Sydney Trains suburban network context         | . 51 |
| Figure 4-17 | Glenfield to Macarthur corridor rail train lines                                  | . 54 |
| Figure 4-18 | Glenfield Station interchange features  | . 55 |
| Figure 4-19 | Macquarie Fields interchange features   | . 56 |
| Figure 4-20 | Ingleburn interchange features  | . 57 |
| Figure 4-21 | Minto interchange features  | . 58 |
| Figure 4-22 | Leumeah interchange features  | . 59 |
| -           | Campbelltown interchange features   |      |
| -           | Macarthur interchange features  |      |
| -           | Restricted Access Vehicle Roads and Areas   |      |
|             | Existing bus routes in the study area   |      |
|             | Glenfield to Macarthur road hierarchy   |      |
| Figure 5-1  | Proposed Moorebank intermodal terminal location                                   |      |
| Figure 5-2  | Planned future bus routes   |      |
| Figure 5-3  | Narellan road upgrade   |      |
| Figure 6-1  | Analysis of directional split of AM peak barrier counts, Ins as % of total - 2013 |      |
| Figure 6-2  | Top five rail origin to destination trips for the study area                      |      |
| Figure 6-3  | Top six most common rail destinations from stations in the corridor               |      |
| Figure 6-4  | Intra-corridor trips in February 2015   |      |
| Figure 6-5  | Station alighting's in February   |      |
| Figure 6-6  | Time of day tap ons in February   |      |
| Figure 6-7  | Day of tap on in February 2015.   |      |
| Figure 6-8  | Glenfield precinct main bus stops   |      |
| Figure 6-9  | Macquarie Fields Precinct main bus stops  |      |
| -           | Ingleburn Precinct main bus stops   |      |
| -           | Minto Precinct main bus stops   |      |
| -           | Leumeah Precinct main bus stops   |      |
|             | Campbelltown Precinct main bus stops  |      |
| -           | Macarthur Precinct main bus stops   |      |
| Figure 7-1  | Draft Glenfield Structure Plan  |      |
| Figure 7-2  | Draft Macquarie Fields Structure Plan   |      |
| Figure 7-3  | Draft Ingleburn Structure Plan  |      |
| Figure 7-4  | Draft Minto Structure Plan  |      |
| Figure 7-5  | Draft Leumeah Structure Plan  |      |
| Figure 7-6  | Draft Campbelltown Structure Plan   |      |
|             |   | 170  |



| Figure 7-7   | Draft Macarthur Structure Plan            | 146 |
|--------------|---|-----|
| Figure 10-1  | Corridor proposed regional cycle network  | 170 |
| Figure 10-2  | Indicative connections to bus network     | 173 |
| Figure 10-3  | Glenfield proposed walking network        | 177 |
| Figure 10-4  | Glenfield proposed local cycleway         | 179 |
| Figure 10-5  | Macquarie Fields concept walking network  | 183 |
| Figure 10-6  | Macquarie Fields concept local cycleway   | 185 |
| Figure 10-7  | Ingleburn concept walking network         | 189 |
| Figure 10-8  | Ingleburn concept local cycle network     | 191 |
| Figure 10-9  | Minto concept walking network             | 195 |
| Figure 10-10 | DMinto concept local cycle network        | 197 |
| Figure 10-1  | 1Leumeah concept walking network          | 201 |
| Figure 10-12 | 2Leumeah concept local cycle network      | 203 |
| Figure 10-13 | 3Campbelltown concept walking network     | 207 |
| Figure 10-14 | 4Campbelltown concept local cycle network | 209 |
| Figure 10-1  | 5Macarthur concept walking network        | 213 |
| Figure 10-16 | 6Concept cycle network Macarthur          | 215 |
|              |   |     |

# Appendices

Appendix A Land zoning Appendix B Traffic modelling report summary Appendix C Multi-criteria assessment

## 1 Introduction

Cardno

The Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) together with TfNSW seek to identify urban activation and intensification opportunities along the Glenfield to Macarthur railway corridor to support target population and economic growth. An opportunity has been identified to further utilise the existing rail provision to provide land uses for an increasing population while reducing the required investment in new transport infrastructure and services.

Transport for NSW (TfNSW) commissioned Cardno to prepare an Integrated Transport Strategy in March 2015.Within the corridor there are seven passenger train stations and their surrounding precincts. Each train station and the surrounding 800m radius forms the principle focus of this study as outlined in **Section 2**. This Integrated Transport Strategy also considers how these precincts link to each other and the surrounding broader region.

This strategy helps to implement *A Plan for Growing Sydney* by shaping its implementation in a targeted area for growth, which is indicatively supported by council. It identifies opportunities and issues for subsequent detailed planning and implementation in NSW Government transport programs.

The key transport modes included in the strategy in order of priority are walking, cycling, public transport (mass modes), freight (all modes) and other road based modes.

These priorities have been set in accordance with the government's strategic objective for integrated land use and transport. This will improve sustainability and the environment and the physical health of residents and supporting local prosperity. This will also maximise the value of investment in transport infrastructure and services.

## 1.1 Study area

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is located in the south-west of Sydney, approximately 35-40 kilometres (depending on location within the corridor) from Sydney CBD. The corridor is approximately 16 kilometres in length (north-south).

The corridor consists of the following seven precincts surrounding train stations:

- > Glenfield
- > Macquarie Fields
- > Ingleburn
- > Minto
- > Leumeah
- > Campbelltown
- > Macarthur

The corridor is shown in the context of Sydney's Greater Metropolitan Area and the suburban railway network in **Figure 1-1**. The corridor is also shown in more detail in **Figure 1-2**, including the 400 and 800 metre walking catchments to the stations in each precinct.



Figure 1-1 Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor - Greater Metropolitan Area Context







## 1.2 Report structure

**Section 2** provides an overview and summary of existing development strategies and planning frameworks and current proposals. This includes those within the study corridor and for the surrounding region most notably the neighbouring proposed South West Growth Centre. These strategies include proposed land use development and transport initiatives and proposals.

**Section 3 – Existing land uses:** provides an overview of population, employment, dwellings, existing land uses of the study corridor and precincts.

**Section 4 – Existing transport infrastructure:** provides an overview of the existing physical transport infrastructure by transport mode including a general overview of its condition.

Section 5 examines transport network and infrastructure improvements that have been proposed before the commencement of this study.

**Section 6 –Data review:** provides a comprehensive review of demographics, employment and transport data. This section establishes the relationship between these factors.

**Section 7** uses the relationship established in Section 6 to forecast the likely operation of the transport network into the future. This establishes the potential constraints of the existing network and is used to develop recommendations to maintain an effective transport network.

**Section 8** summarises the constraints and opportunities of each transport mode in terms of condition and capacity discussed in Sections 4 - 7.

**Section 9** ties the relevant objectives identified in the *NSW Long Term Transport Masterplan* and goals from *A Plan for Growing Sydney* and expands these into a series of corridor specific objectives to guide the development of this strategy. These objectives have been developed together with specific corridor measures and indicators relevant for transport in the study corridor and precincts.

**Section 10 – Concept transport network:** outlines recommendations to achieve the objectives from Section 9. This details how each objective relates to each relevant transport mode. These are considered on both a regional and precinct basis.

Proposed measures including infrastructure and service improvements developed as part of this study. All proposals are tested against the objectives which has formed the criteria for the multi criteria analysis.

This section focuses on improvements based on the potential of the existing transport network.

It also considers and ensures the concept transport network integrates with the proposed structure plans incorporating proposed changes and intensification and changing of land uses within each station precinct.

**Section 11** provides guidelines and considerations to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy and ensuring the land use planning adopts strategy measures. This includes a summary of typical data collection methods and the purpose they serve.

**Section 12** provides the summary of the key objectives, analysis and recommendations of this transport strategy.

## 2 The planning policy and project context

## 2.1 Strategic planning

A number of state and local planning policies are relevant to the development of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor Integrated Transport Strategy (GMCITS). These documents provide objectives and frameworks for development and transport within the regional and local area.

## 2.1.1 NSW State Plan- NSW 2021 (2011, NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet)

The NSW State Plan 2021 is the NSW Government's ten year plan to rebuild the economy, provide quality services, renovate infrastructure, restore accountability to government, and strengthen the local environment and communities in NSW. The plan sets priority goals for action and provides guidance for NSW Government resource allocation in alignment with the NSW Budget. There are five strategy areas outlined in NSW 2021, of them two are directly relevant to the GMCITS:

- > Return quality services: by providing the best transport, health, education, policing, justice and family services, with a focus on the customer.
- > Renovate infrastructure: by building the infrastructure that makes a difference to both our economy and people's lives.

Sitting underneath the five strategy areas of the NSW State Plan 2021 are 32 goals that explicitly state desired outcomes from each strategy. They include the following four 'return quality services' and two 'renovate infrastructure' goals that are relevant to the transport considerations of this study:

> Goal 7 – Reduce travel times (Strategy area: Return quality services)

*Relevance for the GMCITS:* Aims to improve the efficiency of the road network and ease congestion through provision of real-time information, road infrastructure and incident management. This goal also aims to reduce the time people wait for public transport by increasing frequency, improving coordination between modes and providing accurate schedules.

 Goal 8 – Grow public transport by making it a more attractive choice (Strategy area: Return quality services)

*Relevance for the GMCITS:* Aims to increase the attractiveness of public transport through on-time running across the public transport network. Provision of bus priority measures and accurate travel information will help to achieve this. Specific targets include an increased share of commuter trips by public transport to 28% by 2016, an increased share of all walking trips to 25%, and a doubling of cycling trips also by 2016. The mode share shifts will be driven by new services, expansion of light rail, strategic bus corridors, upgrade of supporting infrastructure, timetable changes, electronic ticketing and extension of walking and cycling routes.

> Goal 9 – Improve customer experience with transport services (Strategy area: Return quality services)

Relevance for the GMCITS: Improved real-time information to customers.

> Goal 19 – Invest in critical infrastructure (Strategy area: Renovate infrastructure)

*Relevance for the GMCITS:* Proposes to remove barriers to private sector partnerships and create an infrastructure project pipeline utilising best practice procurement and funding models while supporting councils to provide local infrastructure. This also targets to double the proportion of container freight movement by rail through NSW ports by 2020. Industrial land use intensity is anticipated to increase in the study corridor which would assist in doubling the proportion of freight rail movements.

> Goal 20 – Build liveable centres (Strategy area: Renovate infrastructure)

*Relevance for the GMCITS:* Aims to deliver a metropolitan strategic planning framework to ensure customer needs inform the planning process, and transport infrastructure supports travel demands and accommodates land-use changes. This will result in increases to the percentage of the population living within a 30 minute public transport trip of a major centre in Sydney.

 Goal 29 – Restore confidence and integrity in the planning system (Strategy area: Return quality services) *Relevance for the GMCITS:* This goal aims for a clear and transparent planning system to provide better understanding of the planning processes for the community and stakeholders.

#### Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

Cardno

- > The NSW State Plan 2021 supports the uptake of public and active transport. It has set solid goals for travel mode share that should be referenced when setting travel targets for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.
- > A clear and transparent strategic planning framework and transparent planning system will support the development of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor and provide certainty for residents and developers as to the aims of the corridor's urban renewal.
- Industrial land use intensity will increase in the Freight Activity Precinct creating increased volumes on the freight road and rail networks.

### South Western Sydney – Regional Action Plan (2011, NSW Department of Premier and Cabinet)

The South Western Sydney Regional Action Plan is a regional sub-report of the NSW State Plan. It contains a two year action plan that sets out the initiatives and projects that will help achieve the 2021 goals in the south western areas of Sydney.

A key regional priority for the south western area is improvement of road and public transport connections to and from other regions of Sydney. The upgrade and construction of public transport links and infrastructure such as the South West Rail Link and Glenfield transport interchange upgrade are acknowledged as major projects that will support the area.

The Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) is described in the Regional Action Plan as a dedicated freight line between Birrong and Macarthur stretching 36 kilometres between these stations. The project, completed in 2013, involved the construction of a third track within the rail corridor to separate the freight services from passenger rail.

As noted in the Regional Action Plan, the Campbelltown Hospital redevelopment will provide additional capacity to deliver paediatric outpatient, inpatient and ambulatory care. Construction has begun on this redevelopment which is due for completion in 2016. There will also be an increase in capacity for mental health patients. Due to the redevelopment of Campbelltown Hospital, and upgrades to other hospitals in the South Western Sydney Local Health District, 98 additional nurses were employed in the region in 2013.

#### Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > Upgrades to public transport infrastructure and services will reduce travel times and will enhance public transport in the study area.
- > Upgrades to the freight infrastructure will lead to an improvement in reliability for both passenger and freight services.
- > The redevelopment of Campbelltown Hospital will increase demand on the road and public transport network.

## 2.1.2 A Plan for Growing Sydney (2014, NSW Department of Planning and Environment)

A Plan for Growing Sydney, prepared by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, presents the latest version of the NSW Government's vision for Greater Sydney in the year 2031. The Plan identifies the economic, lifestyle and cultural goals of Sydney and connects them to the interaction of "City Shapers", such as the Global Economic Corridor. To achieve this vision the goals include:

- > Goal 1: A competitive economy with world-class services and transport.
- > Goal 2: A city of housing choice, with homes that meet our needs and lifestyles.
- > Goal 3: A great place to live with communities that are strong, healthy and well connected.
- > Goal 4: A sustainable and resilient city that protects the natural environment and has a balanced approach to the use of land and resources.

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is located within the south western region of Sydney that is identified in the plan as the fastest growing subregion in Sydney. The plan refers to the Macarthur to Liverpool urban

corridor, an extension of the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor. The plan's south west subregion is shown on **Figure 2-1**.

Campbelltown and Macarthur are together nominated as one of Sydney's 28 strategic centres and a regional city centre. Strategic centres are Sydney's important business and employment hubs with a mix of intense economic and social activity built around transport networks. They have a range of major public infrastructure including hospitals and key education and sporting facilities. Campbelltown-Macarthur will also service the growing South West Growth Centre (SWGC).

The plan recognises the challenges in this area, noting that the average vehicle kilometres travelled per person in Campbelltown is twice that of people who live in inner Sydney or the eastern suburbs. There are fewer jobs than workers in western Sydney and the region is lacking in knowledge-based jobs in particular.

Priorities for the south-west subregion:

Cardno

- > Protect land to serve Sydney's future transport needs, including intermodal sites and associated corridors.
- > Investigate pinch-point connections between north-south and east-west road links.
- > Identify and protect strategically important industrial-zoned land

The plan identifies specific actions for the future development of the corridor including:

- > Continued growth of the Campbelltown Macarthur region as a regional city centre to support the surrounding communities. Actions include additional housing, employment and services.
- > Work with Council to retain a commercial core in the Campbelltown Macarthur region for long-term employment growth.
- > Work with Council to concentrate capacity for additional mixed-use development around train stations, including retail, services and housing.
- > Support the development of a major health and education precinct in Campbelltown-Macarthur, capitalising on Campbelltown Hospital and the University of Western Sydney.
- > Work with Council to investigate business park opportunities on the western side of the train line.
- > Work with Council to improve walking and cycling connections to train stations on the western side of the train line, and to Campbelltown Hospital and Queen Street.

In addition to the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor, a new mixed use strategic centre is planned for Leppington. The Leppington Town Centre is a planned development focused around the new train station, which will include retail, employment and housing. Sydney's second airport at Badgerys Creek will be located 17 kilometres from the corridor to the west of the SWGC and will provide employment and economic opportunities.

### Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > With fewer jobs than workers in western Sydney, many people living in the corridor are likely to have to travel outside the area to access employment.
- > As Campbelltown-Macarthur is the regional city centre and strategic centre set to service the SWGC, efficient transport connections between the areas located on the east and west sides of the Hume Motorway will be needed.
- > More jobs will be available in or close to the corridor through development of Leppington, Badgerys Creek airport and enhancement of Campbelltown-Macarthur as a regional city and strategic centre.
- > New public and active transport connections will be needed to support this growth in the currently underutilised and poorly connected areas and it is logical that transport links between Campbelltown and Leppington will require strengthening.
- > Investigations will be required to determine the optimal location for land use intensification and transport corridors in relation to each other.





Figure 2-1 A Plan to Grow Sydney – south-west subregion

Source: Extract from A Plan for Growing Sydney (pg12) NSW Department of Planning and Environment, 2014



The *NSW State Infrastructure Strategy* (SIS), prepared by Infrastructure NSW presents a vision for NSW in 2031 and makes recommendations for infrastructure investment over the next 20 years, grouped by short, medium and long-term priorities. The 2014 update to the Strategy provides detail of the proposed funding strategy for infrastructure projects, Restart NSW Fund, and identifies additional priorities for transport infrastructure.

The Strategy indicates that south west Sydney's transport infrastructure deficiency in 2011 was road congestion that adds to freight costs and commute times. The strategy also identifies the need for a western Sydney Airport, discussed further in **Section 5.6.2** 

The SIS discusses the short to long term priorities of the South West Rail Link (SWRL) which opened in early 2015. Currently this train link is running as a shuttle service between Leppington Station and Liverpool Station. In the short term, the SWRL is to be integrated into the Sydney Trains network. The linking of Leppington to the rail network will provide a convenient method for workers to travel to new employment opportunities in this area, and residents of the SWGC to access the wider Sydney public transport network. In the long term, this line may be extended towards St Marys via the second Sydney Airport at Badgerys Creek.

The SIS also mentions "pinch points" in the road network that will be under greater pressure in the future. Infrastructure NSW has reserved \$300 million to relieve these traffic pinch points. Local to the corridor, Campbelltown Road, between Campbelltown and Cross Roads has been nominated for minor or major works by the RMS.

The strategy also discusses the proposal of an orbital transport corridor to connect the SWGC to the North West Growth Centre (NWGC). This proposal, not planned to be constructed within the next 20 years, will also link to the future second Sydney Airport and would provide a flood evacuation route for the Hawkesbury Region. The Sydney Outer Orbital Transport Corridor would increase capacity on Sydney's transport network, and the local road network within the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor by directing through traffic onto the motorway.

The proposed Western Sydney Freight Line corridor and Eastern Creek Intermodal Terminal are identified, however these are uncommitted and the impact on the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor cannot be assessed at this time.

The Sydney metropolitan freight rail network, both existing and proposed features is reproduced in **Figure 2-2**. It identifies the study corridor as being partially within a significant freight activity precinct.





Figure 2-2 Sydney metropolitan freight rail network

Source: The State Infrastructure Strategy 2012 - 2032, Infrastructure NSW, 2012

Key freight transport nodes include:

- > The proposed Moorebank Intermodal Terminal
- > Macarthur Intermodal Shipping Terminal.
- > Minto and Ingleburn Vehicle Processing and Storage Facilities.

These facilities would support freight movement in NSW and have the potential to reduce freight traffic, particularly on inner Sydney roads.

#### Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > The pinch points program will deliver improved road capacity on the road network on Campbelltown Road between Campbelltown and Cross Roads through improvements in intersection design, lane approaches, and lane widening and bus priority treatments.
- > The integration of the SWRL will provide workers along the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor with rail access to the new employment opportunities that will develop in the Leppington Town Centre and in the long term through the Badgerys Creek airport.
- > The long term proposal of the extension of the SWRL to St Marys, via the second Sydney Airport will encourage rail travel to the airport and St Marys region.
- > The Sydney Outer Orbital Transport Corridor will increase capacity along Sydney's transport network in the long term and reduce delays for vehicle drivers and freight.

## 2.1.4 Long Term Transport Master Plan (2012, Transport for NSW)

The *NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan* (LTTMP) identifies strategies and actions for integrated transport across the state over the next 20 years. It provides a framework to identify challenges and to prioritise actions to meet population demands on the transport system to 2031. The LTTMP sits beneath the *NSW State Plan 2021* and alongside *A Plan for Growing Sydney* and the *State Infrastructure Strategy*.

Integrating transport and land use planning is a strong theme throughout the LTTMP, acknowledging that developments generate travel demand and existing transport networks can be drivers for different types of developments. Convenient commutes improve quality of life and the local development pattern contributes to determining the attractiveness of walking and cycling for short trips.

The Plan sets out eight objectives for the NSW transport system that will guide the delivery of the LTTMP:

- > Improve quality of service.
- > Improve liveability.
- > Support economic growth and productivity.

Cardno

- > Support regional development.
- > Improve safety and security.
- > Reduce social disadvantage.
- > Improve sustainability.
- > Strengthen the transport planning process.

The LTTMP's vision for Sydney over the next 20 years is to deliver a compact and connected city with several centres with a transport system that is quick and convenient with frequent services to other cities. Connecting urban centres is an important aspect within plan.

The LTTMP presents future active, public and private transport upgrades for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor which include:

- > Redesign of bus networks to provide buses to the South West Growth Centre and Liverpool to Campbelltown via Leppington.
- > Encouraging high density development in suitable locations, particularly along major transport corridors such as the South West Rail Link.
- > Improve the public transport links between Liverpool and the Campbelltown and Macarthur regions. New road links and bus priority between Campbelltown and the South West Growth Centre.

Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > The LTTMP's objectives are relevant for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor and should guide the development of the strategic transport objectives.
- > The provision of additional transport links across the rail line to the South West Growth Centre and bus priority will increase public transport connectivity and improve travel times.

## 2.1.5 NSW Freight and Ports Strategy (2013, Transport for NSW)

The NSW Freight and Ports Strategy specifies the Actions required to address the forecast doubling of the NSW freight task by 2031. The Strategy's structured in three Strategic Action Programs: Network Efficiency, Network Capacity and Network Sustainability. The framework for the strategy is reproduced in **Figure 2-3**.



In the context of the study area, most factors of the framework could have an impact on the transport network.

An efficient freight network is a key requirement for stimulating economic growth and activity. Currently, rail freight is considered 'unreliable' and 'expensive' due to infrastructure limitations. A program for strategic actions is proposed to occur over three stages; network efficiencies, network capacity and network sustainability. These stages will be completed by changes to scheduling, building of infrastructure and policy.

The Strategy identifies intermodal terminals and freight activity precincts throughout NSW. The precincts typically cluster around the intermodal terminals and also international gateways such as airports and ports. A freight activity precinct is identified in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor between Moorebank and Minto. The precinct connects to intermodal terminals at Minto and the proposed facility at Moorebank.

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is a component of the busiest freight corridor in NSW's freight network. Both the railway line and Hume Motorway form part of greater regional and interstate networks. Approximately 41 million tonnes of freight moved between NSW and Victoria in 2011, the majority passing through this corridor. 92% of the freight was moved by road and 8% by rail.

As part of Stage 1 Network Efficiencies, the South Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) was completed. This project increased the capacity of the line by separating the passenger services from freight services. Prior to this project, there was a freight curfew during peak hour commuter travel, and commuter trains always had priority. The SSFL was able to provide network efficiencies to increase capacity and frequency for freight movements.

Implications for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

Cardno

- > The freight corridor has national significance and the addition of freight generation within the corridor and nationally will have cumulative effects on the corridor.
- > Upgrades to the rail freight infrastructure in the corridor will lead to an improvement in reliability for both passenger and freight services.
- > Rail and road freight services growth will increase freight noise footprints in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.
- > The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor includes a freight activity precinct and two intermodal terminals.

## 2.1.6 Metropolitan Road Freight Hierarchy

The Metropolitan Road Freight Hierarchy identifies where the need for freight movement is greatest and assists in land use planning. The objectives of the metropolitan road freight hierarchy are:

- > To support the pattern of industrial lands and activities that lead to varying freight flows on the road network by providing suitable road infrastructure.
- > To provide for the specific needs of freight vehicles in operating the road network as a safe, sustainable and efficient road transport system for all road users
- > To supplement the administrative classification of roads by recognising the varying intensity of freight generating activities and heavy freight vehicle demand on roads within the State Road classification.

In the context of the study area, the Hume Motorway forms part of the primary road freight network. The Sydney metropolitan road freight network is reproduced in **Figure 2-4**.



Source: Metropolitan Road Freight Hierarchy on the State Road Network Practice Note, TfNSW, June 2011

## 2.1.7 Sydney's Rail, Bus, Walking, Cycling Futures

To support the LTTMP, a number of mode-specific strategies have been developed for the Sydney metropolitan area.

## Sydney's Rail Future (2012, Transport for NSW)

Cardno

Sydney's Rail Future, released in June 2012, is a strategic document that highlights the long term plan to increase the capacity of Sydney's rail network through the investment of new services and upgrades of existing infrastructure. The document outlines a number of areas of improvement, comparing Sydney's rail network to those of other major cities around the world; it identifies complex train timetables, crowded trains, crowded stations, narrow platforms and traditional signalling technology as potential future areas of development to ensure that Sydney's rail network can accommodate the growing population and trend towards public transport in Sydney.

The future of Sydney's rail network is set out in five stages which are operating efficiencies, network efficiencies, new rapid transit system, Second Harbour Crossing and southern sector conversion.

Most of the stages in this five stage program will affect the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor, except for Stage 3, which relates mainly to the North West Rail Link.

To support the five stage program, the following key upgrades to the Sydney Trains network will specifically affect the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.

- > Upgrades to power supply and safety aspects of the Airport Line will allow services from Glenfield and the South West regions to be doubled to 16 trains per hour during peak times.
- > A second harbour crossing will enable more services to the south-west by unlocking the CBD bottleneck through the building of new train stations in the CBD. There will be an additional 60 train services per hour through the CBD during peak times across all lines.

The plan notes the 2013 timetable change which provided more regular services between Parramatta and Liverpool to south western Sydney via the Cumberland Line. Services will also be faster due to modern train fleets servicing this line.

#### Implications for Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

Cardno

- > Improvements to rail along the corridor are focused on increasing frequencies and alleviating the bottlenecks on the network that cause delays. The improved reliability of the train service will promote public transport use.
- Increased number of services on the T2 Airport, Inner West and South Line will improve the attractiveness of public transport.

### Sydney's Bus Future (2013, Transport for NSW)

Sydney's Bus Future, released in December 2013 is the strategic document that will shape Sydney's bus network in the long term. The document includes the NSW Government's step-by-step actions to deliver fast and reliable bus services for commuters within Sydney. The Plan aims to provide a simpler, faster and better bus network that will be reliable and well integrated into the public transport network.

The plan sets out a three-tiered network of rapid routes, suburban routes and local routes. The characteristics of each tier are presented in **Table 2-1**.

| Route            | Rapid  | Suburban  | Local  |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Objective        | Fast and reliable journeys,<br>connect major centres,<br>current or future high<br>demand, existing priority<br>infrastructure | Provide cross metropolitan routes               | Complete the network and<br>provide local shopping<br>services, CBD shuttles and<br>peak expresses |  |  |  |
| Infrastructure   | Bus priority   | Bus priority at key pinch points                | Local streets and roads, bus<br>priority for peak express<br>connections                           |  |  |  |
| Frequency        | Very frequent - 'turn up and go'   | Mix of 'turn up and go' and timetabled services | Timetabled services  |  |  |  |
| Number of routes | 13   | 20 initially                                    |  |  |  |  |
| Stops            | Every 800 metres to one kilometre  | Every 400 metres                                | Every 400 metres   |  |  |  |

### Table 2-1 Sydney's Bus Future - route tiers

Specific changes to bus services through the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor include:

- > Introductions of new suburban bus routes to support the SWRL.
- > Rapid bus routes will be developed for the SWGC. Propose over 150 new services, including more early morning, evening, night time and weekend services. In the long term this route may be converted to a Bus Rapid Transit.
- > A South West rapid route will be investigated between Liverpool and Campbelltown via Leppington.
- > Bus priority projects for the rapid routes between Liverpool and Campbelltown and suburban routes.
- > Upgrades to bus facilities at Glenfield transport interchange.

#### Implications for Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > A simpler and more frequent bus service along the corridor will make bus travel more attractive.
- > Bus connections to the SWGC and the Leppington town centre from the corridor will need efficient east-west routes to support access to jobs and services. Upgraded facilities and infrastructure will reduce delays and will encourage bus use within the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.

## Sydney's Cycling Future (2013, Transport for NSW)

Sydney's Cycling Future presents a city-wide approach to supporting cycling as a means of transport and making it safer and more accessible to people across Sydney. The plan commits to separated cycleways



wherever possible, cycle connections to major centres and transport interchanges, promotion of the network and engagement with cycle infrastructure providers and users.

Campbelltown-Macarthur is identified in the plan as a Major Centre which will have a bicycle network plan developed, in collaboration with the relevant councils, for a five kilometre catchment as part of the Connecting Centres Program. The program supports local councils to develop bicycle plans and fund infrastructure. The five kilometre catchment will be expanded to cycling links within a ten kilometre catchment in the long term.

Specific improvements for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor:

- > Priority cycleway routes proposed between Liverpool and Glenfield.
- > Installation of secure bicycle facilities at Campbelltown Station.
- > Bicycle Network Plans will be developed with councils within 5 kilometre catchments of various centres.

Implications for Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > A Bicycle Network Plan will be developed for Campbelltown-Macarthur to plan and fund cycling infrastructure to encourage cycling as a mode of transport.
- > Cycling infrastructure at train stations in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor will encourage public transport customers to ride to the station.

## Sydney's Walking Future (2013, Transport for NSW)

The NSW Government is focused on supporting customers to walk more often for short trips, understanding that increased walking activity will benefit the community's heath and the environment and relieve pressure on local road networks. Sydney's Walking Future sets out a strategy and actions to make walking an attractive mode in Sydney's centres. The plan states that walking infrastructure will be prioritised in the development of new transport and urban development projects.

Campbelltown-Macarthur has been identified as a major activity centre as part of the Connecting Communities Program which aims to encourage people to walk at these centres. In addition to this, the program will prioritise the development of pedestrian infrastructure within a two kilometre catchment of major centres and interchanges.

There are currently no specific plans for major infrastructure in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor that are identified in this plan.

Implications for Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

- > The attractiveness of walking in Campbelltown and Macarthur will increase as the Connecting Communities Program is implemented.
- > Improving pedestrian infrastructure within two kilometres of transport interchanges through the corridor will encourage public transport customers to walk to their closest station.

## 2.2 Regional strategic planning

## 2.2.1 <u>Maldon – Dombarton Rail Link</u>

The Maldon – Dombarton Rail Link has long been proposed to provide an alternative link between Western Sydney and Port Kembla. Preliminary construction work began in the 1980's before the project was indefinitely suspended. A feasibility study was released in 2011 generally supporting the proposal on the ground to provide an alternative link as other areas of the rail network are approaching capacity.

TfNSW is conducting a Registration of Interest process for the construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed Maldon-Dombarton Railway. The Registration of Interest closed on 10 April 2015.

TfNSW is currently reviewing submitted Registrations of Interest. The outcome of the review will inform the next steps TfNSW takes on the project.

Future construction of the Maldon-Dombarton Railway would provide relatively direct access to Port Kembla, creating additional freight rail traffic through the Corridor. Demand for rail-served industrial land is likely to strengthen as a result.

## 2.2.2 South West Growth Centre (SWGC)

Cardno

The SWGC is 17,000 hectares of largely greenfield area proposed for new urban development to be included in the Sydney metropolitan region. It is anticipated the region will eventually contain 110,000 new dwellings and 300,000 residents. It is located adjacent to and the south of the Western Sydney Employment Area (WSEA). The precinct neighbours the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor to the north-west. The South West Rail Link spur from Glenfield provides the growth centres only current rail linkage.

TfNSW is investigating corridor protection for a South West Rail Link Extension. This could extend the rail catchment within the region and assist in reducing the reliance on private vehicles.

The South West Growth Centre is a long term proposal, however much of the master planning has been undertaken and this includes proposed transport networks that provide an opportunity to integrate with the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor. This includes a grid network of roads that are proposed to link with Campbelltown Road.

## SWGC Road Network Strategy

Spakman Mossop Michaels completed the SWGC Road Network Strategy for the RMS (formerly RTA) in June 2011. The strategy is based on three major road categories developed by the RMS for growth centres which are principal arterials, transit boulevards, and sub-arterials.

The planning of the road network is intended to avoid future consequences of land use conflicts due to the change of the roads function and use. Bicycle and pedestrian network integration is to be provided for all road categories.

The proposed SWGC Road Network in context with the Glenfield to Macarthur rail corridor is shown in **Figure 2-5**.



### Figure 2-5 South west growth centre proposed



Source: South West Growth Centre Road Network Strategy, Spacman Mossop Michaels, 2011

As shown in **Figure 2-5** a number of major roads, both existing and proposed would provide links towards the Glenfield to Macarthur rail corridor. These include:

- > Denham Court Road, a sub arterial to link with the Hume Motorway.
- > St Andrews Road a sub arterial linking to Campbelltown Road.
- > Raby Road, a Transit Boulevard linking to Campbelltown Road.
- > Badgally Road a Transit Boulevard linking to Campbelltown Road.
- > Narellan Road, a principle arterial linking to Campbelltown Road.

These are generally based on existing roads with proposed improvements and links. Most of these do not continue further east of Campbelltown Road or cross the railway corridor in the study area.

## 2.3 Glenfield to Macarthur Planning

Cardno

The GMCITS is located in the Campbelltown Local Government Area (LGA). Strategic planning, local planning, land use, land zoning and development control are all governed by Campbelltown City Council.

Relevant planning documentation was reviewed to assess existing controls and policy in regards to transport provisions. This review included:

- > Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2002
- > Draft Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2014
- > Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2014
- > Glenfield Road Urban Release Area Development Control Plan 2002
- > The Link Site Development Control Plan 2002
- > University of Western Sydney Development Control Plan 2008
- > Campbelltown Regional Structure Plan
- > Campbelltown-Macarthur Structure Plan
- > Campbelltown-Macarthur Precincts Structure Plan
- > Campbelltown-Macarthur Access

Each of the transport plans' components generally align with the state, metropolitan and regional plans regarding integration of land use and transport, with objectives aligned with providing higher density developments close to existing public transport facilities and improving transport networks including pedestrian, cyclist and roads.

Specifically the aim of the Draft LEP 2014 plan are to:

- Provide a comprehensive planning framework for the sustainable development of land in Campbelltown LGA.
- > Facilitate Campbelltown LGA's development as the compact and vibrant primary business centre for the Macarthur Region, with distinct limits to urban growth and a clearly defined separation between urban and non-urban areas.
- > Reinforce a hierarchy of centres and strengthen the role of the Campbelltown Macarthur Centre as the primary business centre for the Macarthur Region.
- > To optimise the integration of land use and transport and encourage safe, diverse and efficient means of transport throughout Campbelltown and to other places.
- > Medium and high density residential housing is to be placed in close proximity to commercial centres, transport hubs and routes.
- > Neighbourhood, local and community centres are planned to provide retail, business and community uses which will support public and active modes of transport.

> Building floor space ratio and heights are to reflect their proximity to public transport facilities.

## 2.3.1 Campbelltown CBD Traffic Study

Cardno

Hyder Consulting completed the "*Traffic Study for Campbelltown CBD*" in December 2014. Campbelltown City Council commissioned the study to identify road network capacity constraints that would occur as a result of the then forecast land use intensity increase scenario in the Campbelltown CBD over the next 20+ years. The roads and area assessed in the study is shown in **Figure 2-6**.





Source: Traffic Study for Campbelltown CBD Volume 1, Hyder Consulting, 2014

The study considered only the road network and vehicular traffic. Growth scenarios were modelled on the assumptions in the Strategic Travel Model (STM) and the then proposed development density increase within the study area. Proposed road network improvements were based on accommodating the forecast demands and reducing congestion. Current thinking also considers managing demand and reducing our mode share.

Key intersections were modelled in the Campbelltown CBD with additional movements indicating 18 intersections would experience a poor level of service. Within the forecast future scenario the traffic study identifies 20 intersections that will require road improvements and specifies the approximate timeframe for improvement, either short, medium or long term.

Many of the concept improvements relate to the implementation of clearways and lane amplifications leading up to and at signalised intersections.

A major option identified is a rail bridge to link Badgally Road and Broughton Street. Hurley Street would then run under the proposed bridge and link to Queen Street via Langdon Avenue. Another concept is to extend Beverley Road to form a link between Broughton Street and Campbelltown Road. None of these concepts have been committed to.

Implications for Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

Cardno

> The proposed road network changes should be considered in the development of the G2MITS.

## 2.4 Key considerations

The NSW Government and Campbelltown City Council have created a framework for the planning and delivery of transport infrastructure and services. Key considerations for the study area include:

## Strategic

- > The NSW State Plan 2021 supports the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport. It has set goals for travel mode share that should be referenced when setting travel targets for the study area.
- > A clear and transparent strategic planning framework and planning system will support the development of the corridor and provide certainty for residents, businesses and developers.
- > Planning for additional employment within the corridor to provide opportunities work close to home will reduce the pressure on the wider transport network.
- > The development of Leppington, Western Sydney Employment lands, Badgerys Creek airport and enhancement of Campbelltown-Macarthur as a regional city and strategic centre is likely to provide additional employment opportunities within and close to the study area.

### Planning and development

- > The Draft Campbelltown LEP supports the vision of planning medium and high density housing close to public transport and commercial centres. This will improve accessibility, shorter journeys and encourage use of public transport.
- > The encouragement of self-contained local centres that provide a mix of land uses will encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use for short trips to and within local centres.
- > Development in the study area should be located close to railway stations to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use.
- > High density residential use should be supported by active street frontages and enhanced active transport networks surrounding railway stations.
- > The integrity of freight routes and the ability to increase capacity on both freight and passengers along the rail corridor must be maintained.

### Transport

> As Campbelltown-Macarthur is the regional city centre and strategic centre set to service the SWGC, efficient transport connections between the areas east and west of the Hume Motorway will be needed.

### > Walking and cycling

- New and amended active transport connections will be required to improve accessibility and support growth in the study area.
- Well-connected, direct and prioritised infrastructure for walking and cycling should be provided to promote active transport access to educational facilities, town centres, key destinations and public transport.

### > Public transport

 New and amended public transport connections will be required to improve accessibility and support growth in the study area.
- Upgrades to public transport infrastructure and services should be provided to reduce travel times and enhance public transport attractiveness in the study area.
- The integration of the SWRL will provide workers along the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor with rail
  access to the new employment opportunities that will develop in the Leppington Town Centre and
  through the proposed Badgerys Creek airport.
- The provision of additional public transport links across the rail line to the SWGC will increase public transport connectivity and improve travel times.
- Improvements to rail along the corridor are focused on increasing frequencies and alleviating the bottlenecks on the network that cause delays. The improved reliability will promote public transport use.
- A simpler and more frequent bus service along the corridor will make bus travel more attractive.
- Integration improvements between bus and rail will encourage more people to use public transport, including transferring from one mode to another.

#### > Freight

Cardno

- Protect the integrity of the freight corridor to maintain and increase capacity for freight on rail and road networks.
- Upgrades to the rail freight infrastructure in the corridor will lead to an improvement in reliability for passenger and freight services.
- Increased rail freight services and reliability will provide an attractive alternative to road freight through south-western Sydney.
- Freight activity within the study area is high and includes two intermodal terminals that require good freight connections to arterial road and rail networks.

#### > Roads

- New and amended road connections will be required to improve local and regional accessibility and support growth in the study area. Road upgrades will improve connectivity and safety.
- The pinch points program will deliver improved road capacity on the road network on Campbelltown Road between Campbelltown and Camden Valley Way/ Hume Highway through improvements in intersection design, lane approaches, lane widening and bus priority treatments.
- The Sydney Outer Orbital Transport Corridor will increase capacity on Sydney's transport networks in the long term and reduce delays for vehicle drivers and freight.

These key considerations will be used to develop objectives and measures to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use while seeking to support the corridor's key employment uses, freight activity and strategic role within Metropolitan Sydney.



## 3 Existing land uses

## 3.1 Land zoning

The current zoning for each station and surrounding lands under the Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2002 is shown in **Appendix A**. At the time of preparation of this report, Campbelltown Council was undertaking the implementation of a new Local Environmental Plan in response to a state-wide requirement to adopt new planning controls of the standard instrument.

## 3.2 Land uses

The land uses in terms of key trip generators within each precinct are discussed in the following sections. It is assumed that most people have a broad idea of the trip generation characteristics of common land uses.



## **Glenfield precinct**

The Glenfield precinct surrounds Glenfield Station on both sides of the railway line. The suburb's village centre, adjacent to the east of train station, provides local cafes, shops, newsagents and health services for the surrounding residential area. Low density residential housing and the Glenfield Public School are within the vicinity of the station to the east. By way of land use and density, the east side of the station is the higher trip generating area.

The western side of the station contains a commuter car park, Hurlstone Agricultural High School, and two schools for specific purposes; Ajuga School and Campbell House School for students with a disability or behavioural needs respectively. Hurlstone Agricultural High School is an item of heritage significance within 400 metres vicinity of the station. North of the education precinct is the Glenfield urban release area, which was released for low density housing in 2008.

The key land uses in the Glenfield precinct are shown on Figure 3-1.



## Figure 3-1 Glenfield precinct land uses

## Macquarie Fields

The Macquarie Fields precinct is located east of the railway line and all trips to the station currently access from the east side. Macquarie Fields Station, on the railway line, is within a low density and residential only area of the precinct. A commuter car park is provided to the south east of the station. There is no customer access to the west of the station due to the Bunbury Curan Creek easement and boundary of the Macquarie

Links International Golf Club. A pocket of the industrial land precinct of Ingleburn is located on the west side of the railway line to the south-west of the station. This area is not directly accessible from Macquarie Fields with road access provided to Henderson Road in Ingleburn.

The town centre is approximately one kilometre east of the station where a significant shopping centre is located. One kilometre south of the station is Macquarie Fields Public School and High School, adjacent to an indoor sports complex. One kilometre east of the train station is James Meehan High School and the Glenquarie Shopping Centre and the TAFE. The key land uses in the Macquarie Fields precinct are shown on **Figure 3-2**.



#### Figure 3-2 Macquarie Fields precinct land uses

Cardno





#### Ingleburn precinct

The Ingleburn precinct surrounds Ingleburn Station to the east and the west of the railway line. The area features local shops, restaurants, cafes, banking, supermarkets, and the Ingleburn Hotel. The area east of the town centre is largely low density residential with one and two storey dwellings.

To the west of the station is a commuter car park, with surrounding uses that include large showrooms and industrial uses.

Further west between the train station and the Hume Motorway is the Ingleburn industrial precinct with large warehousing, manufacturing and transport distribution facilities. The largest, by area land use is the Patrick Autocare vehicle storage area. The Ingleburn industrial precinct represents a significant employment precinct in the study corridor. As a result of the land uses, the precinct accommodates a higher proportion of freight vehicle movements in the region. Vehicular connections to the Hume Motorway to the north, to the south and from the north are relatively direct, however connections from the south to the precinct are circuitous under the existing road network configuration. While being located adjacent to the SSFL, there are no intermodal facilities that provide access between the freight rail line and industrial land uses.

Items of heritage significance within the 400 metre vicinity of the station include a sandstone water trough (Oxford Road, Ingleburn), and Ingleburn Community Hall (72 Oxford Road, Ingleburn).

The key land uses in the Ingleburn precinct are shown on Figure 3-3.



Ingleburn Industrial Area **R** Whac Allen Fi nglehurr Fair Shoppin Centre al Shops Ingleburr Public choo Holy Famil Primary School Legend Education **Open Space** Local Shops/retail centre Industrial uses **Train Station** 

#### Figure 3-3 Ingleburn precinct land uses

#### Minto precinct

The Minto precinct surrounds Minto Station on both sides of the railway line. The station is adjacent to the Minto town centre with small local shops and businesses operating close to the station entrance. Minto Marketplace is approximately 500 metres east of the station. Large commuter car parks are located on both sides of the railway line. To the north-east, land is characterised by low density residential.

To the south and west of the station is the Minto industrial area providing warehousing, manufacturing and distribution facilities. The Macarthur International Shipping Terminal (MIST) is located to the south-east of the station and is a significant intermodal facility for the region. This is currently the only railway freight interchange facility within the study corridor. The MIST facility is located on the east side of the railway corridor, as such freight trains must use the passenger rail lines to access the facility. No access (track point crossovers) to the SSFL is available along the study corridor.

Access to and from the Hume Motorway is available to and from the north, however there are no nearby on and off ramps to the south.

The key land uses in the Minto precinct are shown on Figure 3-4.



Figure 3-4 Minto precinct land uses





#### Leumeah precinct

The Leumeah precinct surrounds Leumeah Station on both sides of the railway line. The station is surrounded by large car parks and local shops including supermarkets, liquor shop, a pharmacy, and post office. West Leagues Club, Campbelltown Sports Stadium and an apartment building are immediately north of the station. Nearby residential dwellings are typically medium density, two-storey buildings. West of the train station is predominantly commercial and light industrial uses with bulky goods and wholesale outlets amongst large warehousing facilities. The area also includes several fast food restaurants, homemaker retail facilities and two hotels.

North of the precinct, industrial land uses include a large car storage, processing facility (Prixcar Services) and the Keylink Industrial Centre.

The key land uses in the Leumeah precinct are shown on Figure 3-5.



## Figure 3-5 Leumeah precinct land uses

## Campbelltown precinct

Campbelltown Station is in the main activity centre of the Campbelltown precinct. It has the greatest range of land uses and is also a regional strategic transport hub. The precinct extends to the Hume Motorway in the west and to residential areas in the east. The train station is on the edge of the Campbelltown town centre, a



large commercial core in Sydney's south west. To the east of the station is Campbelltown Council Administration Centre, Campbelltown Court House and Police Station, various service stations, local cafes and small businesses servicing locals and visitors to the area. Campbelltown Mall, a large shopping centre is located to the south-east of the station. Large commuter car parks are located on Railway Street and Hurley Street on the eastern side and Farrow Road on the western side.

The western side of the station land uses mainly comprise of light industrial and large scale/ bulky retail land uses. Given the scale of the precinct, notable freight vehicle movements would be generated by the precinct. The closest access to the Hume Motorway is via Blaxland Road and Narellan Road to the south and Raby Road to the north in Minto. The industrial land precinct is bisected by Badgally Road which passes under the Hume Freeway, however no motorway access facilities are located at this location.

The key land uses in the Campbelltown precinct are shown on Figure 3-6.

## vuga eser ndustrial us goog oulky ampbelltow ligh School amp ampbellto OWI Bowing Creel Legend Campbellte Public Education Schoo Open Space Local Shops/retail centre Industrial uses Train Station

#### Figure 3-6 Campbelltown precinct land uses



### Macarthur precinct

The Macarthur precinct surrounds Macarthur Station on both sides of the railway line. The train station is adjacent to Macarthur Square, a regional shopping centre providing retail and leisure services and facilities. There is direct access to Macarthur Station from Macarthur Square via a pedestrian footbridge. There is a commuter car park to the north and south of the station, either side of Macarthur Square. Campbelltown hospital is located to the east of Macarthur Square and is separated by a park and residential precinct.

To the north and west of the station is the University of Western Sydney, and TAFE NSW Campbelltown Campuses. More recently low and medium density residential development has been zoned immediately south and west of the station. Pedestrian access to the station from the western side is through the University Basin Reserve.

The key land uses in the Macarthur precinct are shown on Figure 3-7.



## Figure 3-7 Macarthur precinct land uses



## 3.3 Key considerations

The existing population, workforce and land uses provide an insight into how the study area functions and consequently transport considerations. Key considerations for the study area include:

- > Resident populations within the study area's precincts vary significantly, from approximately 2,100 in Minto to 14,500 in Ingleburn. While some precincts are large in area, the key driver of residential population size is land use.
  - Minto's low residential population is an indicator of the precinct's role within the corridor. Minto is dominated by industrial, retail and commercial land uses, leaving little land for residential uses within close proximity to key transport hubs. This provides good access to employment within the Minto area.
  - Ingleburn is a more balanced precinct, with industrial land uses adjacent to the Hume Motorway that provides good access to the arterial network and reduces through routing within retail and residential areas.
  - Campbelltown and Macarthur are each smaller than Ingleburn, yet combined these form the study areas largest centre for business, education, health, retail land uses and other major services.
  - Other precincts provide a mix between Minto and Ingleburn. This structure and residential density provide opportunities for uplift and additional land uses to support the local area. Improved transport accessibility within the precincts will enable changes in land use, density and structure.
- > Campbelltown Station is the regional transport hub with Glenfield also servicing as a lower order transport hub being located at a junction between two railway lines.
- > The resident workforce for the study area also varies significantly, from approximately 930 for Minto to 7,300 for Ingleburn. This indicates that Ingleburn may have the residential and employment demand to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use through improved infrastructure and services. For Minto, opportunity may be limited as a result of low residential and employment demand, which results in a relatively unconstrained transport network, particularly road network. When this occurs achieving mode shift to more sustainable modes of transport becomes cumbersome and costly.
- > Other precincts provide a mix of employment within each area. It should be noted that the residential and employment proportions for each precinct are very similar, for example Ingleburn has 27% of the employment population and 27% of residential population for the study area. Although not everyone will live and work within the same precinct, this provides an opportunity for self-containment of trips and an increase in walking, cycling and public transport in the corridor.
- Land use throughout the study area is mixed, with a variety of residential, commercial, retail and industrial. There is a distinct light to medium industrial use throughout most precincts. In particular for Ingleburn, Minto and Leumeah where the western side of the rail is majority industrial uses.
- > There are also significant accessibility barriers, particularly to the west as a result of large land parcels at Glenfield and Macquarie Fields surrounding the stations.
  - Glenfield has a large agricultural school that restricts permeability and activation on the western side of the railway line. This also limits the size of the residential population able to live in proximity to the station.
  - Macquarie Fields has a golf course to the west of the station that results in no access from this side. There is residential housing on the western side within 800m of the station, however access is restricted as a result of the golf course. This presents an opportunity to improve public transport accessibility.

These key considerations will be used to develop objectives and measures to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use while seeking to support the corridor's key employment uses, freight activity and strategic role within Metropolitan Sydney.





## 4 Existing transport infrastructure

This section describes each precinct's transport network s by mode. This provides an initial indication of the strengths and opportunities for each mode.

## 4.1 Walking

Walking is a typically a local transport mode that connects people to local goods and services, other modes of transport or facilitates multi-purpose trips. Walking is a viable option for distances under two kilometres (approximately 25 minutes) and is often quicker for short trips door to door. Walking is also the most space efficient mode of transport for short trips and presents the highest benefits. Co-benefits where walking replaces a motorised trip include improved health for the individual, reduced congestion on the road network and reduced noise and emission pollution.

Throughout the study corridor, the footpath network, where provided is generally constructed to minimum design standards of 1.2 metres wide. In many locations, footpaths are not provided, or are provided on one side of the street only. In retail and commercial precincts paths are generally quite generous, typically extending the full width between the road and property boundary.

In many instances, the road network has been designed to prioritise vehicle movements, including many intersections with roundabouts. These often provide positive safety outcomes for vehicle movements however pedestrians have no priority and are at greater risk crossing when compared with other intersection layouts. Crossing at roundabout intersections also deviate from pedestrian desire lines.

Footpaths and crossing facilities are generally provided to higher standards near each station, with wider paths, zebra crossings or pedestrian refuges.

Each study area has a footpath network that differs depending on the precinct and the land use.

## 4.1.1 <u>Glenfield</u>

The five minute (400 metre) and ten minute (800 metre) walking catchments to Glenfield Station are shown on **Figure 4-1**. Customers arriving on foot will typically access the station from the eastern side where there is an established road and footpath network. Customers accessing the station from the western side will generally arrive via taxi, bike, or car via drop-off or commuter car park.





#### Figure 4-1 Glenfield Station walking catchments

Source: Cox Architects

Glenfield has a well-developed footpath network around the station. Footpaths in these areas are offset from the property boundary, this increases sight distance at driveways, providing a safety benefit compared to paths adjacent to property boundaries or fence lines.

Signalised crossings are provided on all legs of the intersection of Railway Parade and Hosking Crescent. Railway Parade forms the main retail street of Glenfield and it runs parallel to the railway line on the southeast side. Adjacent to the interchange it has a posted 50 kilometre per hour speed limit.

Recent improvements include a new footpath adjacent to a bike path on the north-west side of the interchange. This provides a sheltered link between the interchange and the multi-level commuter car park. A raised zebra crossing is provided from the commuter car park across the private access road.

No footpaths are provided linking to the new residential development north of the interchange and footpaths are not provided in the lower order streets.

Overall the pedestrian network is considered safe with improvement potential by way of expanding the network to cover more area and complete missing links.

Figure 4-2 shows the current footpath network within the Glenfield precinct



#### Figure 4-2 Existing footpaths at Glenfield



#### 4.1.2 <u>Macquarie Fields</u>

Cardno

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Macquarie Fields Station are shown in **Figure 4-3**. Pedestrians accessing the interchange by foot can only access the station from the eastern side where there is an established road and footpath network. A golf course, the Bunbury Curan Creek and the Macquarie Links gated residential development restricts movements from the west.





Footpaths are generally provided on one side of the carriageway close to the station. The footpath catchment is limited by way of Redfern Creek with the nearest crossing of the creek provided from Alexander Crescent to Windsor Street.

Where footpaths are provided, kerb ramps are provided at intersections with priority controlled crossing points. There is no formal crossing of Railway Parade between the station and the main commuter car park.

Access to the west of the railway line is severed by the Bunbury Curan Creek and a golf course between the station and Macquarie Links Estate.

As no crossing of Redfern Creek is provided north of Railway Parade, the north-east walking catchment is effectively cut off from easy access to the station. The existing footpath facilities are provided in **Figure 4-4**.

Source: Cox Architects



#### Figure 4-4 Existing footpaths at Macquarie Fields



# Cardno<sup>®</sup>

## 4.1.3 Ingleburn

The Ingleburn precinct's footpath network along with the street network is developed in a grid configuration with relatively high levels of permeability with the exception of the railway line which reduces the permeability to the station, where it is the only crossing in the town centre.

Pedestrians accessing Ingleburn Station on foot can do so from both the eastern and western sides where there are established road and footpath networks. The station's pedestrian bridge provides a cross corridor connection between the retail activity centre on the east of the railway line and the industrial and employment lands to the west. This pedestrian connection is the only rail crossing within the Ingleburn town centre. In relation to the station, the nearest other rail crossings are an informal crossing under a railway bridge 1.4 kilometres to the south at Bow Bowing Creek and over the Henderson Road bridge 900 metres to the north.

The south-east side of the station contains the Ingleburn town centre. Pedestrian paths are generally the full width between the road and property boundary. Key roads within the town centre are designated as 10 kilometre per hour speed limited shared zones. The street environment is not in the form of a shared zone, however traffic management is configured to encourage low vehicle speeds and raised crossings are provided near intersections.

Away from the core precinct, in the residential and industrial areas, pedestrian paths, where provided are generally on one side of the carriageway only. The walking environment also has a large number of roundabouts and these typically provide pedestrian crossing facilities of reduced safety.

Notable pedestrian facilities include the Treelands Walk along Redfern Creek to the south of the interchange and Koala Walk to the east. These walks through park areas offer link benefits but generally have low passive surveillance.

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Ingleburn Station are shown in **Figure 4-5** and the footpath network is shown in **Figure 4-6**.

At the time of writing, Ingleburn Station was undergoing an upgrade under the Transport Access Program, as discussed in **Section 5.3.2**. This could reasonably be expected to provide pedestrian improvements in the interchange precinct at completion.



## Figure 4-5 Ingleburn Station walking catchments

Source: Cox Architects



#### Figure 4-6 Existing footpaths at Ingleburn





#### 4.1.4 <u>Minto</u>

Minto Station separates industrial land uses to the west and retail, recreational and residential uses to the east of the railway line. The small retail precinct to the east is provided with full road to property line width footpaths. On approach to Minto Station from the east crossing pedestrian crossing facilities are provided. On the western side a zebra crossing on Somerset Street connects the station entrance with the commuter car park. The footpath network connects to Minto Marketplace, the main retail precinct approximately 675 metres east of the interchange along Redfern Road. Shared paths are also provided through the Coronation Park recreational facility to the south-east of the interchange and these provide shorter links to residential land uses to the south-east of the station.

Residential streets within the 800 metre walking catchment generally only have a path on one side of the carriageway, some residential streets do not have any footpaths. There is also a lack of pedestrian paths to industrial land uses to the west of the station.

Connectivity to the station from the industrial lands to the south is limited, reduced by the lack of opportunities to cross Ben Lomond Road.

Residential land uses to the west are located beyond the 800 metre catchment of the station. There is evidence that the paths are regularly used by pedestrians however the access requires crossing Ben Lomond Road at roundabout intersections. There is a formalised crossing at the intersection of Ben Lomond Road and Campbelltown Road on the southern leg of the intersection.

The only railway crossings in Minto are provided at the station and one side of Ben Lomond Road.

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Minto Station are shown on **Figure 4-7** and the existing footpaths are shown on **Figure 4-8**.



#### Figure 4-7 Minto Station walking catchments

Source: Cox Architects



#### Figure 4-8 Existing footpaths at Minto



## 4.1.5 Leumeah

Cardno

Leumeah Station is located adjacent to a small retail precinct and the region's main sporting precinct. Two pedestrian railway crossings are provided in the station vicinity. These include at the station and to the north-east between the commuter and sports precinct car park. Further away there are two additional railway crossings, located at Campbelltown Road 840 metres to the south-west and Ross Payten Drive 520 metres to the north-east.

Pedestrian networks are provided on both the eastern and western sides of the station. There are large blocks of car parks around the station which provide additional permeability, however there is no advantage due to the vicinities road network block size.

On the western side the only pedestrian approach is via Plough Inn Road. This can be used to access residential areas in excess of 800 metres walking distance to the north-west. Pedestrian refuges are provided on the two roundabouts close to the station on Plough Inn Road.

On the eastern side pedestrians can access the station via O'Sullivan Road or Old Leumeah Road. On the eastern side, the roundabout intersection of O'Sullivan Road and Old Leumeah Road has a zebra crossing on the southern arm and a pedestrian refuge on the northern arm. Many residential land uses in the precinct are located on the opposite side of Pembroke Road. A roundabout intersection is located at O'Sullivan Road and there are refuges on all legs. A signalised intersection at Old Leumeah Road and signalised crossing points are located on the north-west and north-east legs.

A nature walk is provided along Smiths Creek Reserve to the south east and this increases the shorter distance walking catchment to some residential land uses to the east.

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Leumeah Station are shown on **Figure 4-9** and the existing footpath network is shown on **Figure 4-10**.



#### Figure 4-9 Leumeah Station walking catchments

Source: Cox Architects



#### Figure 4-10 Existing footpaths at Leumeah



#### 4.1.6 <u>Campbelltown</u>

Cardno

Pedestrians can access Campbelltown Interchange from both the eastern and western sides but there is limited permeability from the western side due to the undeveloped land, including Bow Bowing Creek and Fishers Ghost Creek reserve. A shared path is provided north of the interchange adjacent to Farrow Road linking to residential land uses approximately 750 metres from the interchange. There is a zebra crossing on Farrow Road adjacent to the interchange. This provides a formal crossing point access to the bus stop on the western side. It is not aligned with the pedestrian desire line between the interchange entrance and the large commuter car park.

Campbelltown has the largest business activity centre in the study corridor, located to the east of Campbelltown Interchange. As a result it has a well-developed pedestrian network to the south of the interchange which passes many activated frontages. Block sizes are larger surrounding the interchange due to large scale car parks, however footpaths are provided to guide pedestrians around these.

From the east the key desire line between the centre of the activity area and the Interchange is via Hurley Street and Patrick Street. There is a signalised midblock crossing on Hurley Street close to Patrick Street. Railway Street, parallel to Patrick Street is well aligned for access to the south of the interchange, however there are no at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities at the intersection of Railway Street and Hurley Street. An underpass beneath Hurley Street is located close to the intersection with Railway Parade but it presents some personal security perception issues.

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Campbelltown Interchange are shown in **Figure 4-11**.and the existing footpath network is shown on **Figure 4-12**.



#### Figure 4-11 Campbelltown Station walking catchments



### Figure 4-12 Existing footpath at Campbelltown





#### 4.1.7 <u>Macarthur</u>

Macarthur is the newest developing area in the study corridor. Due to the undeveloped nature of land use adjacent to the north of Macarthur Station, the footpath network is limited to a single path that provides access to the various educational land uses via the University Basin Reserve. The University Basin Reserve on the northern side only has one access point to the station.

The commuter car parks, shopping centre and retail blocks on the southern side reduce the path choice for pedestrian access to the station. Station access to the south is provided alongside Menangle Road and there is a pedestrian bridge that links directly to Macarthur Square shopping centre. Menangle Road has relatively wide pedestrian paths on both sides of the carriageway to the west, however crossing opportunities are limited and a central median has been installed to prevent errant crossings. The pedestrian footpath does not extend beyond the bus interchange on the north side of the carriageway to east.

Newly developed residential land uses close to the station generally do not have footpaths and convenient link opportunities appear to have been omitted.

The five minute and ten minute walking catchments to Macarthur Station are shown in **Figure 4-13** and the existing footpath network is shown on **Figure 4-14**.



Figure 4-13 Macarthur precinct walking catchments

Source: Cox Architects



#### Figure 4-14 Existing footpaths in Macarthur





Cardno

The existing bicycle network in the study corridor is currently highly fragmented. All stations are surrounded by low density residential precincts with local access roads. With the prevailing low volume and speeds, these roads are generally suitable for mixed traffic facilities. For users willing to ride on the road, the facilities are direct and convenient, however less confident riders may not find the network conducive to encouraging regular riding.

Every station in the corridor provides some form of bicycle parking facility, in most cases both bicycle racks and lockers. The use of the bicycle lockers is unknown, however bicycle racks are generally used at all stations in addition to informal parking, usually with bicycle locks attached to fences.

#### 4.2.1 Cycling routes

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor provides both regional cycling links and local cycling routes. These cycling facilities provide some level of support for cycling as a mode of transport, however the network is coarse and incomplete for cycling to be considered for many trips within the corridor. While it is difficult to establish the true network as mapping from different sources indicate different extents, reference in the following sections has been made to the online RMS Cycleway Finder which is continually updated.

#### Regional cycling routes

Regional cycling links are provided from the south to north via the Hume Motorway, which is classified as high difficulty, on a 2.5 metre shoulder lane. This facility is considered to have a low safety and amenity for people riding, the speed limit in the adjacent lane is 110 kilometres per hour.

The Eastern Road Corridor is comprised of a series of state roads that run along the eastern side of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor. These roads include Glenfield Road, Canterbury Road, Harold Street, Collins Promenade, Minto Road, Pembroke Road, Rudd Road and Queen Street. A regional cycleway travels along most of the length of this corridor and provides a more local connection north-south, compared to the Hume Motorway. However, this road is still considered to be moderately difficult by RMS.

The Parkway and Narellan Road provide an east-west regional cycleway connection.

#### Local cycling routes

Local cycling routes provide an easy way to get to the local shops, school, public transport or main activity centre. They are generally not intended as regional connectors, although at times they do serve a dual purpose. Local designated routes are sparse throughout the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.

Campbelltown has the most extensive network of local connections; made up of local roads, shared paths and bicycle paths. On-street facilities generally consist of shoulder lanes, which provide minimal protection and comfort for people riding. Shoulder lanes place cyclists between moving traffic and the door opening zone of parked cars. This presents serious safety implications and these generally end just before intersections and can reappear on the opposite side.

Off-road facilities represent approximately 50% of the local network in Campbelltown, which provide an easy way to get around in comfort and safety for short trips. However, these facilities would not support medium or longer length cycling commutes for less confident cyclists due to the network fragmentation. The existing key regional cycling routes are shown in **Figure 4-15**, and characteristics of each precincts' cycle infrastructure in the following sections.



#### Figure 4-15 Existing cycling routes



#### Data source: RMS



## 4.2.2 <u>Glenfield</u>

Cycling in the Glenfield local area was observed to be low.

The cycle network is provided through a mix of facilities in the precinct. An off-road separated cycle path is provided on the north-west side of the station linking to the north. Adjacent to the south-east side of the station are on-road shoulder lanes for short lengths along Railway Parade. Many of the local streets provide an ideal mixed-traffic riding environment, however the core collector street network (Railway Parade, Belmont Road and Canterbury Road) would be uncomfortable for many cyclists to use due to prevailing traffic speeds, traffic volumes and the lack of any supporting infrastructure particularly at intersections.

Bicycle parking racks are provided on both sides of Glenfield Station and some usage was observed. Bicycle lockers are also provided on the north-west side of the station.

#### 4.2.3 Macquarie Fields

Site observations indicated that minimal cycling was occurring and a few visible bicycles were parked within close proximity to the Macquarie Fields Station.

The cycle network is provided through a range of facilities in the precinct. Railway Parade, generally has a low volume of traffic as a result of not having through access to the north-east from the station and the low catchment of the road network. The parking lane on Saywell Road has bicycle stencils and a bicycle route sign observed to be indicating the direction towards Macquarie Fields shopping centre. Typically the parking lane was utilised by vehicles in the vicinity of the station.

Macquarie Fields has some bicycle parking racks and bicycle lockers for hire. A bike was observed to be chained to one rack and another bike was chained to a fence. The chains securing each bicycle appeared to be of greater strength than would normally be used, indicating a high concern of theft.

As per all modes, access is limited by the road network to the north-east of the station. The RMS Cycleway Finder identifies Saywell Road as a moderate difficulty on-road route.

#### 4.2.4 Ingleburn

Ingleburn has a shorter spaced street network than other precincts in the study area. Specific cycling infrastructure was not observed, however there are wide roads near to the station which are relatively wide and could facilitate comfortable bicycle movements. Oxford Road in the activity centres has been designated as a 10 km/h shared zone which is suitable for mixed traffic cycling. Further south-east of the activity centre there are shoulder lanes between the parking and traffic lanes.

The street network is highly permeable on the south-east side of the station, however collector and arterial roads including Macquarie Street, Cumberland Road and Chester Road may not be comfortable for many cyclists due to traffic speeds, traffic volumes and lack of separation.

To the north-west of the station the land uses will generally result in a notable amount of larger vehicle movements. The road network layout results in a lower catchment of through movements providing more amenable mixed traffic conditions for cyclists. The exception to this is Lancaster Street which would have higher volumes.

Site observations indicated that minimal cycling was occurring, however several bicycles were parked within close proximity of the station and on temporary bicycle racks at the station. It should be noted that construction works were being undertaken during the site visit and as such bicycle parking demand may be higher outside of construction periods.

## 4.2.5 <u>Minto</u>

Site observations indicated that minimal cycling was occurring with one bicycle seen using the station facilities.

The street network is a mix of residential to the north-east and industrial for the remainder of the precinct. As a result street blocks are often large and a higher than average percentage of heavy vehicles are present. To the west is a drainage channel that limits access from the west to the precinct.



Shoulder lanes are provided on Redfern Road and shared paths are provided through Coronation Park. Local roads surrounding the station are generally suitable for mixed traffic given the width of carriageways and low vehicle volumes. Ben Lomond Road and Pembroke Road are unlikely to be favoured by cyclists due to these being road environments with higher speed and volume.

Bicycle parking facilities are provided, and were observed to be used at Minto Station.

### 4.2.6 Leumeah

Site observations indicated a low amount of cycling was occurring, with few bicycles parked within close proximity to the Leumeah Station.

No specific bicycle network infrastructure was identified in the immediate vicinity of the station. The street network within the immediate vicinity of Leumeah Station is surrounded by industrial and sports entertainment, which has large blocks and limits cycle permeability within the inner station precinct. Campbelltown Road is a significant arterial road and creates a barrier in some areas for access east-west.

The main arterial roads are separated from the station which creates streets that carry low volumes of traffic. Many cyclists would feel comfortable cycling in this type of environment. Arterial roads including Pembroke Road/ Rudd Road and Campbelltown Road are unlikely to be popular for cyclists to access the station. As such, bicycle network constraints are located away from the stations inner precinct.

Bicycle parking facilities are provided at Leumeah Station, pedestrian barrier fencing was a more convenient option for one bike rider on the day of inspection.

#### 4.2.7 <u>Campbelltown</u>

Site observations indicated that a moderate amount cycling was occurring, with the highest demand for bicycle parking observed in the corridor within close proximity of Campbelltown Station.

The street network in Campbelltown is a mix of retail, commercial, industrial and residential. The layout varies from low speed environments within the town centre to wider streets in the industrial area. The street blocks within the town centre are considered medium to large, however there are opportunities to link through blocks connecting retail land uses. Hurley Street is a major road that runs parallel to the railway line on the southern side, this road carries large amounts of traffic and has limited crossing opportunities. As a result it presents a barrier to access to/from the station to the town centre.

No notable bicycle network infrastructure was observed on the south side of the station, as such the increased bicycle parking demand is likely to be proportional with the use of Campbelltown Station along the corridor. A wide shared path is provided adjacent to Farrow Road which provides a relatively high standard of facility on the north side of the station.

#### 4.2.8 <u>Macarthur</u>

Site observations indicated that minimal cycling is occurring and no bicycles were seen parked within close proximity to the Macarthur Station.

With the relatively recent construction and upgrade of surrounding roads, cycling facilities are reasonably catered for on the adjacent road network. This includes on-road cycle lanes not adjacent to car parking provided on Menangle Road and shoulder lanes provided on Gilchrist Drive. While parking is generally permitted along Gilchrist Drive, its traffic utilisation is lower which provides a safer riding environment.

Given the significant educational land uses in the precinct there is significant potential for increased cycling and the University of Western Sydney Campbelltown Campus is currently undergoing major redevelopment.

Overall the location of the shopping centre with its car dominated access provisions means that the street network has been designed to accommodate relatively high volumes of vehicles, reducing the attractiveness of cycling.

The current realignment and construction of Goldsmith Avenue on the northern side of the station is expected to result in improved cycle network facilities.



## 4.3 Rail

#### 4.3.1 <u>Train lines and services</u>

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor includes three lines on the Sydney Trains suburban network (the T2 South Line, the T5 Cumberland Line and the South West Rail Link) and one line on the intercity network (the Southern Highlands Line). It also facilitates regional and interstate rail services.

The SSFL is located adjacent to the Sydney Trains network. Freight train services operate on both the Sydney Trains network and ARTC's SSFL through the corridor. The SSFL is discussed in **Section 4.6.1**.

The corridor in relation to the wider Sydney Trains network is shown on **Figure 4-16**. A short description of each of the lines is presented including which of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor precincts are serviced by each line.



Figure 4-16 Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor in Sydney Trains suburban network context

Source: Sydney Trains

## T2 Airport, Inner West and South Line

The T2 line runs services between the city and either Macarthur (via the Airport or Sydenham) or Campbelltown (via the Inner West and Granville). T2 trains via the Airport or Sydenham generally service all Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor stations but some Airport services skip Macquarie Fields and some services begin and terminate at Campbelltown instead of Macarthur.

Only specific peak period services operate via Sydenham to the CBD, with inbound services during the AM peak and outbound during the PM peak.

The T2 line via Granville starts and ends at Campbelltown except for three city-bound services and one outbound service per day which extends to Macarthur. These services stop at all other stations in the corridor.



#### T5 Cumberland Line

The T5 Cumberland Line provides a north-south train connection through Sydney's western regions, between Campbelltown and Schofields via Parramatta, Blacktown and Liverpool.

The Cumberland Line only runs on weekdays. If weekend track work affects the T1 Western and T2 South lines, the Cumberland Line may run on these occasions. The Cumberland Line significantly increased the number of services in October 2013, from five per weekday to 45 per weekday in both directions, running every 30 minutes.

#### South West Rail Link

The South West Rail Link (SWRL) is Sydney's newest train line which opened on 8 February 2015. The line provides a link service between new stations at Leppington and Edmondson Park in the South West Growth Centre (SWGC), and terminates at Liverpool. Passengers on the SWRL can interchange with T2 South Line and T5 Cumberland Line services at Glenfield or Liverpool and also the T3 Bankstown Line at Liverpool.

The SWRL runs two services per hour between 5:15am and 12:04am at Glenfield Station.

It is expected the SWRL will be better integrated into the future metropolitan rail network in the future with single services to Sydney CBD.

#### Southern Highlands Line and Main South Line

The Southern Highlands Line operates between Campbelltown and Goulburn. The majority of Southern Highlands Lines services commence/terminate at Moss Vale, only five services a day commence at Goulburn. Passengers can interchange at Campbelltown for services on the suburban network and connections to Sydney.

Regional and interstate services also operate on the main south line that commence at Sydney (Central Station) and service several locations including Canberra, Griffith and Melbourne. Along the study corridor, these services only stop at Campbelltown.

#### Summary of passenger rail services

A summary of train services along each line that service the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is provided in **Table 4-1**. The table provides the total number of daily services as well as services per hour during peak and off peak times.

| Table 4-1         Gienfield to Macarthur Corridor train services per nour |                           |                |                              |                              |                              |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Line  | Direction                 | Daily services | AM Peak (/hr)<br>06:00-09:30 | Daytime (/hr)<br>09:30-16:00 | PM Peak (/hr)<br>15:00-18:30 |
| T2 via Airport<br>Line  | To city                   | 66             | 4                            | 2                            | 4                            |
|   | From city                 | 66             | 4                            | 3                            | 4                            |
| T2 via<br>Sydenham Line   | To city                   | 6              | 2                            | 0                            | 0                            |
|   | From city                 | 9              | 0                            | 0                            | 2                            |
| T2 via Granville  | To city                   | 71             | 5                            | 3                            | 4                            |
|   | From city                 | 70             | 4                            | 3                            | 4                            |
| T5 Cumberland<br>Line   | To Schofields             | 23             | 2                            | 2                            | 2                            |
|   | From Schofields           | 22             | 2                            | 2                            | 2                            |
| South West Rail<br>Link   | To Liverpool              | 38             | 2                            | 2                            | 2                            |
|   | From Liverpool            | 38             | 2                            | 2                            | 2                            |
| Southern<br>Highlands   | To<br>city/Campbelltown   | 22             | 2                            | 1                            | 1                            |
|   | From<br>city/Campbelltown | 27             | 2                            | 1                            | 2                            |

#### Table 4-1Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor train services per hour



Source: http://www.nswtrainlink.info viewed May 2015

## 4.4 Station interchanges

There are seven stations in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor. These are shown in **Figure 4-17** and described in the following sections.



#### Figure 4-17 Glenfield to Macarthur corridor rail train lines

Cardno<sup>®</sup>





Cardno

The features of each train station in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor are described in the following sections and the interchange facilities are summarised in **Section 4.5.8**.

#### 4.5.1 <u>Glenfield station interchange precinct</u>

Glenfield Station is situated on the western border of Glenfield's residential area. The station was upgraded as part of the SWRL project. The station has two entrances, one located on the eastern side of the railway line at the intersection of Railway Parade and Hosking Crescent and another located on the western side on Glenfield Road. The station has four platforms on two islands, accessed by stairs or lifts. The interchange facilities consist of bus zones, Kiss & Ride, Park & Ride, taxi zone, bike racks and lockers. These features are shown in **Figure 4-18**.



#### Figure 4-18 Glenfield Station interchange features



## 4.5.2 Macquarie Fields station interchange precinct

Macquarie Fields Station is situated on the far western border of the suburb's core residential area. The only entrance to Macquarie Fields Station is on Railway Parade on the eastern side of the station, there is no access to the station from the west. To the west of the station is a golf course and the gated Macquarie Links residential community. The station has two side platforms, connected by a pedestrian bridge with the train line running between them. The station is not currently DDA compliant, with only the eastern platform providing ramp access. The interchange features of the station include bus stops, Kiss & Ride, cycle parking, and Park & Ride which are shown in **Figure 4-19**.




# 4.5.3 Ingleburn station interchange precinct

Cardno

Ingleburn Station is located adjacent to the Ingleburn town centre on the east of the station and industrial lands on the west. There are two entrances to Ingleburn Station, on the western side the entry is at the intersection on Memorial Avenue and Stanley Road and on the eastern side the entry is at the intersection of Oxford Road and Ingleburn Road. Ingleburn Station consists of an island with two platforms which can be accessed from a pedestrian bridge by stairs or a ramp (gradient 1:9). The interchange features consist of bus zones, Kiss & Ride, taxi zones, bike parking, and Park & Ride which are shown in **Figure 4-20**.





# 4.5.4 Minto station interchange precinct

Cardno

Minto Station sits adjacent to the Minto village centre which is located on the eastern side of the railway line. The station has two entrances, on the east off Minto Road and on the west off Somerset Road. There are two platforms at Minto, one a side platform on the eastern side of the railway line and the other on the eastern side of an island platform. Minto is accessible with lifts and ramps provided for the mobility impaired. The island platform is accessed via stairs or the lift from a pedestrian bridge while the side platform is accessed via a ramp. The interchange features of the station consist of Kiss & Ride, taxi zone, bike parking, and Park & Ride which are shown in **Figure 4-21**.

#### Figure 4-21 Minto interchange features







# 4.5.5 Leumeah station interchange precinct

Cardno

Leumeah Station is located amidst a number of large blocks of commercial and retail land uses and commuter car parks. Accessed from both sides of the railway line, the station entrance on the eastern side is located on O'Sullivan Road and on the western side located off Plough Inn Road. The station has two platforms, a side platform off O'Sullivan Road on the eastern side and an island with a platform facing the east. The side platform is accessed via stairs and a ramp and the island is accessed via a pedestrian bridge, stairs and lift. The station provides cross corridor connections across the railway line for pedestrian movements. There is an additional pedestrian cross corridor connection 185 metres to the north, however to the south there are no other pedestrian cross corridor connections for 850 metres. Interchange features of Leumeah Station include bus zone, Kiss & Ride, taxi zone, bike parking and Park & Ride which are shown in **Figure 4-22**.



Figure 4-22 Leumeah interchange features



Cardno

Campbelltown Station is located to the north-west of Campbelltown's retail and commercial centre. On the eastern side of the railway line the station is adjacent to Campbelltown Council and Court House. On the western side the station is close to a large at-grade commuter car park and an auction centre. The station's eastern entry is on Hurley Street and on the west on Farrow Road. The railway line between Campbelltown Road and Narellan Road has stabling facilities.

Interchange features of Campbelltown Station include bus zones, Kiss & Ride, taxi zones, bike parking and Park & Ride facilities which are shown in **Figure 4-23**.

Campbelltown Station has three platforms; one side platform on the eastern side and two platforms on an island, accessed by stairs and a lift from a pedestrian bridge.



Figure 4-23 Campbelltown interchange features

# 4.5.7 <u>Macarthur station interchange precinct</u>

Cardno

Macarthur Station is located to the north of Macarthur's retail hub and south of the University of Western Sydney and Campbelltown TAFE. The station has three entrances, two on the southern side and one to the north. The southern side entrances include one onto Menangle Road and the other is a pedestrian bridge link into the Macarthur Square shopping centre. The northern entrance is adjacent to the University Basin Reserve and a pedestrian path provides access from the station to the education institutions.

Macarthur Station has three platforms; a side platform on the southern side of the station and an island with two platforms. All platforms are accessed from both sides via a pedestrian bridge with lifts and stairs. Macarthur's interchange facilities consist of bus zones, Kiss & Ride, taxi zones, bike parking and commuter parking to the west. The large shopping centre car park does not open until 10am which prevents it being used by commuters. The station and supporting facilities are shown in **Figure 4-24**.



#### Figure 4-24 Macarthur interchange features



# 4.5.8 Summary of station interchange facilities

| Station<br>precinct | Pedestrian access   | Bicycle<br>storage                     | No of bus routes  | Kiss & Ride spaces   | Taxi spaces  | CCP<br>spaces |
|---------------------|---|--|---|--|--|---------------|
| Glenfield           | Two access points. Northern<br>access via footpaths. Southern<br>access via signalised crossing.  | 20 bike<br>racks<br>12 bike<br>lockers | 6<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered.  | 10 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>Two Kiss & Ride spaces, 100m north<br>and south of the station entry on<br>Railway Parade.<br>Western side:<br>Eight spaces on Glenfield Road.<br>All Kiss & Ride waiting areas are<br>weather protected | 2 spaces<br>There are two allocated taxi zones,<br>one located on Glenfield Road and<br>the other on Railway Parade.   | 961           |
| Macquarie<br>Fields | Access only from eastern side via footpaths.  | 12 bike<br>racks<br>6 bike<br>lockers  | 4<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered.  | 4 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>The bus waiting area is shared with a<br>Kiss & Ride bay.   | No spaces<br>There is no taxi rank nearby.   | 159           |
| Ingleburn           | Two access points. Southern<br>access via footpaths and<br>pedestrian crossings and<br>northern access via footpath<br>and pedestrian crossing. | 10 bike<br>racks<br>4 bike<br>lockers  | 5<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered.  | 5 spaces<br>Kiss & Ride facilities are provided on<br>both sides of the station.   | 12 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>A taxi rank is provided on Ingleburn<br>Road opposite the station entrance.  | 317           |
| Minto               | Two access points. Western<br>access via footpaths or<br>pedestrian crossing and<br>eastern access via footpaths<br>only.                       | 5 bike<br>racks<br>10 bike<br>lockers  | 8<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered.  | 4 spaces<br>Western side:<br>A 'No Parking' section of Somerset<br>Street allows Kiss & Ride to occur<br>close to the station entrance.  | 9 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>Minto Road has a taxi zone to the<br>north of the station entrance.   | 636           |
| Leumeah             | Two access points. Northern<br>access via footpaths and<br>southern access via footpaths<br>or pedestrian crossing.                             | 5 bike<br>racks<br>4 bike<br>lockers   | 6<br>Bus stops on the<br>east side are<br>sheltered, the west<br>side has no<br>weather protection. | 5 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>A combined taxi and Kiss & Ride<br>zone is provided on O'Sullivan Road<br>adjacent to the station. There is no<br>weather protection or seating<br>provided here but the bus stop shelter<br>is nearby.   | 5 spaces<br>Eastern side:<br>A combined taxi and Kiss & Ride<br>zone is provided on O'Sullivan Road<br>adjacent to the station. There is no<br>weather protection or seating<br>provided here but the bus stop shelter<br>is nearby. | 1404          |

# Cardno \_\_\_\_

| Station<br>precinct | Pedestrian access   | Bicycle<br>storage                    | No of bus routes                      | Kiss & Ride spaces   | Taxi spaces   | CCP<br>spaces |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------|
| Campbelltown        | Two access points. Northern<br>access via footpath or<br>pedestrian crossing and<br>southern access via footpath,<br>pedestrian crossing or<br>signalised crossing.           | 9 bike<br>racks<br>12 bike<br>lockers | 22<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered. | <ul><li>13 spaces (approximately)</li><li>Eastern side:</li><li>An extensive Kiss &amp; Ride zone is provided on Hurley Street to the east of the bus and taxi interchange. The Kiss &amp; Ride zone includes some seating and weather protection.</li></ul> | <ul><li>11 spaces (approximately)</li><li>Eastern side: A taxi zone is provided within the bus interchange.</li><li>Western side: There is a taxi zone on Farrow Road adjacent to the station entrance, with space for one taxi</li></ul> | 1144          |
| Macarthur           | Two access points. Northern<br>access via footpath from<br>education precinct and<br>southern access via pedestrian<br>overpass, through Macarthur<br>Square Shopping Centre. | 12 bike<br>racks                      | 17<br>All bus stops are<br>sheltered. | 11 spaces<br>Southern side:<br>Kiss & Ride is provided along the<br>northern side of Menangle Road<br>adjacent to the station, to the west of<br>the bus interchange zone. Shelter<br>and seating are provided.  | 5 spaces<br>Southern side:<br>Taxi zones are provided along the<br>northern side of Menangle Road<br>adjacent to the station, to the east of<br>the station entrance. Shelter and<br>seating are provided.                                | 550           |



Cardno

# 4.6 Freight

The Glenfield to Macarthur corridor forms part of the national freight network. It is a key corridor for freight movement between regional NSW, ACT, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia. Freight rail movements between Victoria and Queensland are facilitated through the corridor. The rail corridor is a key link between Port Botany and south-west regional NSW.

The NSW Freight and Ports Strategy identifies a freight activity precinct through the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor. Freight activity precincts are key nodes that are serviced by the freight network. They allow the colocation of supporting infrastructure to efficiently meet the needs of freight generators and operators. The freight precinct through the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor commences south of Minto and extends through to Liverpool. It generally sits west of the railway line and extends west of the Hume Motorway.

# 4.6.1 Southern Sydney Freight Line

The Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) is a 36 kilometre freight line connection between Sefton and Macarthur. The line consists of a third track through the rail corridor that is dedicated for freight services, allowing passenger services to operate separate to freight. The SSFL opened in early 2013.

There is no curfew on the freight line and services can operate 24 hours a day.

Future corridor widening may be required to increase capacity on this freight line through the addition of an extra freight track. This must be considered in future land use planning in terms of retaining an easement for expansion and the noise impacts of more regular freight train services.

# 4.6.2 <u>Minto intermodal shipping terminal</u>

Qube Logistics NSW currently operates the Macarthur Intermodal Shipping Terminal (MIST) in Minto. MIST is located south of Minto Station on the eastern side of the railway corridor. MIST is a key freight network node in metropolitan Sydney, operating a Port Botany shuttle for imports and export containers. It has two rail sidings, each about 580 metres long. Container repair, fumigation and locomotive repairs also occur at the site.

MIST also receives freight from regional NSW, for example to the neighbouring malting works. The industrial location is compatible with the 24/7 nature of rail operations.

#### 4.6.3 <u>Hume Motorway</u>

The Hume Motorway forms part of the national road network is the primary road freight link between Sydney to Canberra, Melbourne, Adelaide and beyond. It also links to the M7 orbital motorway, providing a bypass route away from the Sydney CBD.

#### 4.6.4 Local freight roads

The RMS have delegated Restricted Access Vehicle routes for B-double trucks and high vehicles. These routes support the industrial precincts in the corridor, most notably at Ingleburn and Minto. All routes link to the Hume Motorway

#### 4.6.5 Other major freight generators

The major freight generators for the region include:

- > Patricks Autocare vehicle storage facility.
- > Barbeques Galore distribution centre.
- > Metro Ice Cream Distribution Pty Ltd.
- > Repco Ingleburn distribution centre.

The key freight generation areas of the study corridor are generally located to the west of the railway line in Ingleburn, Minto and Campbelltown.

Key freight roads throughout the study corridor are shown in Figure 4-25.



#### Figure 4-25 Restricted Access Vehicle Roads and Areas





# 4.7 Bus

The bus network servicing the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor includes a number of different types of routes. These routes include local shopping and residential loops, routes that traverse the length of the corridor providing connectivity to sections east of the railway line and regional routes that provide connections to centres in other regions such as Camden, Wollongong and Liverpool.

# 4.7.1 Bus route hierarchy

Cardno

The precincts have differing levels of bus coverage; the coverage ranges from Macquarie Fields local shopping routes to Campbelltown's large bus interchange. The bus routes in the corridor are shown in **Figure 4-26** and have been categorised as follows:

- > Regional routes longer distance routes.
- > Eastern corridor routes intercity buses between Campbelltown and Liverpool to the east of the rail corridor.
- > Local routes routes connecting different precincts within and external to the corridor.
- > Precinct loop routes local loop services connecting the stations to their precincts.

Due to the road network and land use development, many of the bus routes are indirect and circulate around curvilinear street networks in order to provide the largest possible catchment.

There are a large number of routes, many are derivatives of other routes, this reduces the legibility of the network and the frequencies along each route that could be reasonably provided with the existing resources. With all local routes mapped together, it is difficult to understand the network and its operation. It is apparent that the network has prioritised catchment coverage over route directness.

# 4.7.2 Interchanges and connection with rail services

All identified bus routes in the region have a stop at or near at least one station. Campbelltown is effectively the main regional centre in the precinct and transport hub. Many bus routes originate/ terminate at the station. Many CBD train services also originate and terminate at Campbelltown and the bus services provide connections to nearby regions outside of the railway catchment as well providing a transport network to support Campbelltown's own economy. Macarthur Station also supports a number of terminating bus services.

While the bus network supports the rail corridor, there is generally a high quantity of commuter car parking at each station which provides train users with a more convenient option than the bus. The level of service of some routes would not support commuters from the Sydney CBD to areas outside of the immediate walking catchment. Longer distance commuters are less likely to accept the delay from low frequency and indirect services within the study corridor.

It is anticipated that the bus network provides less use to station users in the catchment and more use for single public transport mode journeys along each respective bus route.

#### 4.7.3 Bus services

There are 34 separate bus routes that operate approximately 1,344 services per weekday in the study corridor. These services are described in Table 4-2 and their existing operational details are outlined in

**Table 4-3**. Service spans are typically lower than the rail network.



#### Figure 4-26 Existing bus routes in the study area





# Table 4-2 Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor bus route description

| Route<br>No. | Route                                      | Route Description  | Significant connections<br>not in close proximity to<br>study corridor stations |
|--------------|--|--|---|
| 850          | Narellan to Minto                          | This route follows the spine of Camden Valley Way and Raby Road with branches to Oran Park and Gregory Hills and a loop of Catherine Field   |   |
| 864          | Carnes Hill to Glenfield<br>(weekday only) | A relatively direct bus route providing a link from Glenfield Station to the north west of the study corridor.<br>This route passes through the suburbs of West Hoxton, and along the border of Horningsea Park,<br>Edmondson Park, Prestons and through the south-west corner of Casula. The route falls short of<br>providing a connection to Carnes Hill Marketplace. | Crossroads Homemaker<br>Centre  |
| 867          | Prestons to Glenfield<br>(weekday only)    | A local service providing a link between the residential areas of Prestons, to the north west of the study corridor to Glenfield Interchange.  | Prestons Shops  |
| 869          | Ingleburn to Liverpool                     | This services a western catchment of the Hume and South Western Motorway.  |   |
| 870          | Campbelltown to Liverpool                  | A parallel route to the railway line between Campbelltown and Liverpool. It operates on the east side of the railway line between Campbelltown and Glenfield and the western side north of Glenfield to Liverpool. While similar to routes 871 and 872, this route services the eastern precincts of Glenfield.  | Glenquarie Shopping Centre  |
| 871          | Campbelltown to Liverpool                  | Similar to Route 870 and 872. This route has a deviation in Casula (outside of the study) corridor to service additional residential area.   | Glenquarie Shopping<br>Centre, Minto Marketplace,<br>Campbelltown Hospital      |
| 872          | Campbelltown to Liverpool                  | Common to Route 870 and 871, this route deviates at Leumeah, Ingleburn and Macquarie Fields to offer<br>a different catchment. The Macquarie Fields diversion is extensive, servicing the outer eastern precincts<br>of the suburb   | Glenquarie Shopping<br>Centre, Minto Marketplace,<br>Campbelltown Hospital      |
| 873          | Ingleburn to Minto                         | A local circuitous service on the south-east side of the railway line between these two neighbouring suburbs   | Ingleburn RSL, Lagonda<br>Drive Shops   |
| 874          | Raby to Minto                              | A local loop service between Minto and residential precincts in the suburbs to the west of the Hume Motorway including Eagle Vale, Kearns, Raby, Varroville and St Andrews. Some services deviate to service the western employment district of Minto near the Railway Interchange.  | Raby Shops, Minto<br>Marketplace  |
| 875          | St Andrews to Minto                        | A circuitous local route providing a link between Minto Railway Interchange and residential areas of St Andrews and Bow Bowing to the west of the Hume Motorway.   | Minto Marketplace, St<br>Andrews Shopping Centre                                |



| Route<br>No. | Route                                   | Route Description   | Significant connections<br>not in close proximity to<br>study corridor stations |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| 876          | Macquarie Fields Loop<br>(weekday only) | A local loop service capturing the south eastern residential area of Macquarie Fields. The service runs clockwise in the AM and anti-clockwise in the PM period.  | Guise Public School   |
| 878          | Campbelltown to Eschol<br>Park          | A Campbelltown feeder services including the suburbs of Kearns, Raby, St Andrews to the west of the study corridor and the employment areas to the west of the railway line in Campbelltown and Leumeah.  | Raby Sports Complex   |
| 879          | Campbelltown to Leumeah                 | A loop service servicing the suburbs of Macarthur, Blair Athol, Blairmount and Woodbine. The majority of this service operates between the railway and Hume Motorway corridor.  |   |
| 880          | Campbelltown to Minto                   | A larger loop servicing the western suburbs of the railway. Suburbs along the route include Macarthur,<br>Blair Athol, Blairmount, Claymore, Eagle Vale, Eschol Park, Kearns, Raby and St Andrews. Some<br>services extend to Minto Mall, however regular services commence/ terminate on the west side of Minto<br>Railway Interchange |   |
| 881          | Campbelltown to Leumeah<br>North        | A local route providing a feeder service to Campbelltown and Leumeah Railway Interchanges. The service loops around Leumeah North   |   |
| 882          | Campbelltown to Leumeah<br>South        | A Campbelltown feeder service that loops around Campbelltown and Leumeah South to the south-east of the railway corridor  |   |
| 883          | Campbelltown to Ruse                    | A Campbelltown feeder service that loops around Ruse to the east of Campbelltown. The 883K also services Kentlyn.   | Ruse Village Shopping<br>Centre   |
| 884          | Campbelltown to Airds                   | A Campbelltown feeder service that loops around Airds south of Campbelltown. The 884W forms a spur that also services St Helens Park and Wedderburn further south.  |   |
| 885          | Campbelltown to, Bradbury               | A Campbelltown feeder service that loops around Bradbury, south of Campbelltown   |   |
| 886          | Campbelltown to<br>Ambarvale            | A Campbelltown and Macarthur feeder service that loops around Glen Alpine, south of Macarthur. The route also has a stop in Rosemeadow.   |   |
| 887          | Campbelltown to<br>Wollongong           | A suburban service connecting the two localities. The service passes through the suburbs of Bradbury, Rosemeadow, Appin, and North Wollongong to the south of the study corridor.   | University of Wollongong  |
| 888          | Campbelltown to St Helens<br>Park loop  | A high frequency feeder service that loops around St Helens Park to the south of Campbelltown.  |   |
| 889          | Campbelltown to Menangle                | Servicing towns south of Campbelltown along the railway line including Macarthur, Menangle Park. This is a very low frequency service.  |   |



| Route<br>No. | Route   | Route Description  | Significant connections<br>not in close proximity to<br>study corridor stations             |
|--------------|---|--|---|
| 890          | Harrington Park to<br>Campbelltown                      | This links the study corridor to localities to the west of Campbelltown. It loops around Harrington Park. Suburbs along the route include Macarthur, Mount Annan, Narellan Vale and Narellan   |   |
| 890C         | Campbelltown to Camden                                  | This route operates on Narellan Road and Camden Valley Way. It has a minor diversion to Macarthur and a major diversion through Narellan Vale significantly reducing the directness of the service.  |   |
| 891          | Mt Annan South to<br>Campbelltown                       | Services to the west of Campbelltown with service to Mt Annan South and Currans Hill. Some services continue to Narellan.  | Mt Annan Leisure Centre,<br>Macarthur Square  |
| 892          | Campbelltown Road to<br>Mount Annan                     | A Campbelltown feeder service that loops around Mt Annan to the west.  | Mt Annan Marketplace, Mt<br>Annan Leisure Centre,   |
| 893          | Campbelltown to Narellan                                | Service operates via Mt Annan, Narellan Vale, Elderslie to the west. This service loops around to provide greater coverage.  | Mt Annan Marketplace, Mt<br>Annan Leisure Centre,<br>Narellan Town Centre                   |
| 894          | Campbelltown to<br>Bridgewater Estate<br>(Camden South) | A relatively direct bus route between each end. The route is configured as an arc to the south east of Campbelltown. It uses the key arterials of Narellan Road, Camden Valley Way and Old Hume Motorway. This service passes through Narellan and Camden town centre. It deviates of the principal arterial through Elderslie and Camden. | University of Western<br>Sydney Macarthur, Mt<br>Annan Marketplace,<br>Narellan Town Centre |
| 895          | Campbelltown to Camden South                            | A circuitous version of the 894, this route services additional catchments in Macarthur, Smeaton Grange, Narellan, Elderslie, Camden and Camden South.   | Mt Annan Marketplace,<br>Narellan Town Centre   |
| 896          | Campbelltown to Oran Park                               | Configured as a T at the Oran Park/ Gregory Hills end. The route separates at Narellan depending on the direction of travel. The route is quite direct until the end T-point at Camden Valley Way/ Gregory Hills Drive/ Oran Park Drive  | Mt Annan Marketplace,<br>Narellan Town Centre, Oran<br>Park Town Centre                     |
| 898          | Campbelltown to<br>Harrington Park                      | This service loops around Harrington Park with a termination, commencement spur at Gledswood Hills to the north west of Campbelltown.  | Harrington Plaza  |
| 900          | Campbelltown to Picton                                  | A regional service that generally runs along regional arterial roads. It deviates to service the Narellan Town Centre and Camden Town Centre.  | Narellan Town Centre,<br>Camden CBD.  |
| S9           | Glenfield Loop  | A local loop and Glenfield Interchange feeder service that also services Macquarie Fields to the south east of the railway line.   | Glenquarie Shopping Centre  |



# Table 4-3Bus route operations

| 850       Narellan to<br>Minto       Narellan       6:58am - 6:18pm       2       2       1       18       9       8         864       Carnes Hill to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Carnes Hill       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons to<br>Glenfield       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         869       Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool       Ingleburn       6:52am - 7:01am       4       0       0       6       0       0       •         870       Campbelltown to       Campbelltown       5:30am - 10:15pm       2       2       1       18       9       •       •  | Precincts Serviced |         |              |           |  |  |  |
|---|--------------------|---------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Minto       Minto       6:40am - 5:20pm       2       1       1       17       8       8         864       Carnes Hill to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Carnes Hill       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         869       Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool       Ingleburn       6:52am - 8:39pm       2       2       2       27       13       13       •         870       Campbelltown to       Campbelltown       5:30am - 10:15pm       2       2       1       26       18       9       •       •   | Ingleburn<br>Minto | Leumeah | Campbelltown | Macarthur |  |  |  |
| Minto       6:40am - 5:20pm       2       1       1       17       8       8         864       Carnes Hill to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Carnes Hill       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         868       Benfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         869       Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool       Ingleburn       6:52am - 8:39pm       2       2       2       27       13       13       •         870       Campbelltown to       Campbelltown       5:30am - 10:15pm       2       2       1       26       18       9       •       • | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Glenfield       5:02am - 7:07am       2       0       2       6       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         867       Prestons to<br>Glenfield<br>(weekday only)       Prestons       4:10pm - 6:42pm       0       3       2       7       0       0       •         869       Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool       Ingleburn       6:52am - 8:39pm       2       2       2       27       13       13       •         870       Campbelltown to       Campbelltown       5:30am - 10:15pm       2       2       1       26       18       9       •       •  | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |                    |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Glenfield<br>(weekday only)         Glenfield         5:06am - 7:01am         4         0         0         6         0         0         •           869         Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool         Ingleburn         6:52am - 8:39pm         2         2         2         27         13         13         •           870         Campbelltown to         Campbelltown         5:30am - 10:15pm         2         2         1         26         18         9         •         •  |                    |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| (weekday only)       Glenfield       5:06am - 7:01am       4       0       0       6       0       0       •         869       Ingleburn to<br>Liverpool       Ingleburn       6:52am - 8:39pm       2       2       2       27       13       13       •         870       Campbelltown to       Campbelltown       5:30am - 10:15pm       2       2       1       26       18       9       •       •   |                    |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Liverpool         Liverpool         5:47am - 7:32pm         2         2         2         27         15         13         •           870         Campbelltown to         Campbelltown         5:30am - 10:15pm         2         2         1         26         18         9         •         •  |                    |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| 870         Campbelltown to         Campbelltown         5:30am - 10:15pm         2         2         2         2         2         13         •  | 1                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
|   |                    |         |              |           |  |  |  |
|   | •                  | •       | ٠            | •         |  |  |  |
| Liverpool 6:03am - 10:50pm 2 2 1 26 18 9 • • •  | •                  | •       | •            | •         |  |  |  |
| 871         Campbelltown to         Campbelltown         8:45am - 7:35pm         <1         1         8         11         6         •         •  | •                  | ٠       | •            | •         |  |  |  |
| Liverpool Liverpool 5:35am - 1:15pm <1 0 1 6 11 6 • • •   | •                  | ٠       | •            | •         |  |  |  |
| 872         Campbelltown to         Campbelltown         5:16am - 10:00pm         2         2         32         32         19         •         •         •  | •                  | ٠       | •            | •         |  |  |  |
| Liverpool Liverpool 5:24am - 10:30pm 2 2 2 36 32 19 • • •   | •                  | ٠       | •            | •         |  |  |  |
| 873         Ingleburn to         Ingleburn         5:22am - 7:48pm         2         2         2         29         13         9         •  | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Minto         5:33am - 8:10pm         2         2         30         12         10  | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| 874         Raby to Minto         Raby         5:32am - 8:30pm         2         2         2         31         13         12   | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Minto         5:14am - 8:39pm         2         2         2         31         13         12  | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| 875         St Andrews to         St Andrews         5:37am - 9:00pm         2         2         2         31         12         11   | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |
| Minto         5:13am - 8:08pm         2         2         30         12         11  | •                  |         |              |           |  |  |  |

# Cardno'\_

| Route<br>No. | Route                             | То                               | Service span     | Bus fro<br>hour |         |          | Numb    | er of Sei | vices  | Precir    | Precincts Serviced  |           |       |         |              |           |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-------|---------|--------------|-----------|
|              |                                   |                                  |                  | AM Peak         | PM Peak | Off-peak | Weekday | Saturday  | Sunday | Glenfield | Macquarie<br>Fields | Ingleburn | Minto | Leumeah | Campbelltown | Macarthur |
| 876          | Macquarie                         | via Parliament Rd                | 5:07am - 7:33am  | 3               | 0       | 0        | 7       | 0         | 0      |           | •                   |           |       |         |              |           |
|              | Fields Loop<br>(weekday only)     | via Saywell Rd                   | 3:45pm - 6:20pm  | 0               | 2       | 2        | 7       | 0         | 0      |           | •                   |           |       |         |              |           |
| 878          | Campbelltown to<br>Eschol Park &  | Eschol Park & Kearns             | 9:45am - 2:36pm  | 0               | 0       | 1        | 6       | 15        | 0      |           |                     |           |       | •       | ٠            | •         |
|              | Kearns                            | Campbelltown                     | 9:34am - 2:24pm  | 0               | 0       | 1        | 6       | 15        | 0      |           |                     |           |       | •       | •            | •         |
| 879          | Campbelltown to                   | Leumeah                          | 5:46am - 8:31pm  | 2               | 2       | 1        | 23      | 15        | 12     |           |                     |           |       | •       | •            | •         |
|              | Leumeah                           | Campbelltown                     | 6:12am - 8:57pm  | 2               | 2       | 1        | 24      | 15        | 12     |           |                     |           |       | •       | •            | •         |
| 880          | Campbelltown to                   | Minto                            | 4:44am - 10:53pm | 3               | 4       | 2        | 44      | 31        | 15     |           |                     |           | •     |         | •            | •         |
|              | Minto                             | Campbelltown                     | 4:45am - 9:23pm  | 4               | 3       | 2        | 41      | 30        | 16     |           |                     |           | •     |         | •            | •         |
| 881          | Campbelltown to<br>Leumeah Loop   | Campbelltown via<br>Macquarie St | 5:12am - 6:07pm  | 1               | 2       | 1        | 14      | 3         | 0      |           |                     |           |       | •       | •            |           |
| 882          | Campbelltown to Leumeah Loop      | Campbelltown via<br>Waminda Ave  | 5:39am - 11:32pm | 2               | 2       | 2        | 35      | 27        | 15     |           |                     |           |       | •       | •            |           |
| 883          | Campbelltown to<br>Ruse Loop      | Campbelltown via<br>Waminda Ave  | 4:53am - 11:32pm | 3               | 2       | 2        | 42      | 27        | 15     |           |                     |           |       |         | ٠            |           |
| 884          | Campbelltown to<br>Airds Loop     | Campbelltown via St<br>Johns Rd  | 3:59am - 12:02am | 4               | 3       | 2        | 46      | 29        | 11     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
| 884W         | Campbelltown to                   | Wedderburn                       | 12:06pm - 5:40pm | 0               | <1      | 0.5      | 4       | 0         | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
|              | Wedderburn                        | Campbelltown                     | 7:01am - 4:48pm  | 1               | 0       | 0.5      | 5       | 0         | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
| 885          | Campbelltown to<br>Bradbury Loop  | via Jacaranda Ave                | 4:34am - 12:02am | 2               | 2       | 2        | 37      | 28        | 16     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
| 886          | Campbelltown to<br>Ambarvale Loop | via Macarthur Square             | 4:27am - 10:01pm | 2               | 2       | 1        | 30      | 15        | 13     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 887          |                                   | Wollongong                       | 6:33am - 6:35pm  | 1               | 1       | 1        | 12      | 3         | 2      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |

\_\_\_\_\_

# Cardno'\_

| Route<br>No. | Route                                      | То                   | Service span     | Bus fro<br>hour |         |          | Precin  | Precincts Serviced |        |           |                     |           |       |         |              |           |
|--------------|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-------|---------|--------------|-----------|
|              |  |                      |                  | AM Peak         | PM Peak | Off-peak | Weekday | Saturday           | Sunday | Glenfield | Macquarie<br>Fields | Ingleburn | Minto | Leumeah | Campbelltown | Macarthur |
|              | Campbelltown to<br>Appin and<br>Wollongong | Campbelltown         | 6:42am - 6:23pm  | 1               | 1       | 0.5      | 11      | 3                  | 2      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 888          | Campbelltown to<br>St Helens Park<br>loop  | via Macarthur Square | 3:57am - 11:32pm | 4               | 4       | 2        | 69      | 52                 | 27     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 889          | Campbelltown to                            | Campbelltown         | 6:11am - 6:08pm  | 2               | 1       | <1       | 7       | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
|              | Menangle                                   | Menangle             |                  | 1               | 1       | <1       | 6       | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
| 890          | Harrington Park                            | Harrington Park      | 5:46am - 11:02pm | 1               | 1       | 2        | 31      | 23                 | 17     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | to Campbelltown                            | Campbelltown         | 5:13am - 9:38pm  | 3               | 3       | 1        | 32      | 23                 | 16     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 890C         | Campbelltown to<br>Camden                  | Campbelltown         | 7:49am - 4:21pm  | 2               | 0       | 1        | 10      | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | Camden to<br>Campbelltown                  | Camden               | 7:07am - 3:00pm  | 0               | 0       | 1        | 7       | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 891          | Harrington Park                            | Harrington Park      | 5:02am -10:32pm  | 2               | 2       | 2        | 33      | 30                 | 26     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | to Campbelltown                            | Campbelltown         | 5:21am - 9:38pm  | 1               | 2       | 2        | 31      | 29                 | 27     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 892          | Mount Annan to                             | Mount Annan          | 5:46am - 8:01pm  | 1               | 2       | 1        | 21      | 13                 | 3      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | Campbelltown                               | Campbelltown         | 6:13am - 8:05pm  | 1               | 2       | 1        | 21      | 13                 | 3      |           |                     |           |       |         | ٠            | •         |
| 893          | Narellan to                                | Narellan             | 6:14am - 8:31pm  | 2               | 2       | 2        | 29      | 9                  | 12     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | Campbelltown                               | Campbelltown         | 5:33am - 7:05pm  | 2               | 2       | 2        | 29      | 9                  | 12     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 894          | Bridgewater                                | Bridgewater Estate   | 6:49am - 7:05pm  | 3               | 2       | 0        | 14      | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | Estate to<br>Campbelltown                  | Campbelltown         | 5:39am - 5:43pm  | 3               | 2       | 0        | 12      | 0                  | 0      |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 895          | Camden South                               | Camden South         | 5:21am - 11:39pm | 4               | 4       | 2        | 46      | 18                 | 16     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | to Campbelltown                            | Campbelltown         | 4:28am - 11:08pm | 4               | 4       | 2        | 53      | 19                 | 15     |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |

# Cardno<sup>®</sup>\_

| Route<br>No. | Route           | То                   | Service span Bus frequency per N<br>hour |         | Numb    | Number of Services |         |          | Precincts Serviced |           |                     |           |       |         |              |           |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|---------|---------|--------------------|---------|----------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|-------|---------|--------------|-----------|
|              |                 |                      |  | AM Peak | PM Peak | Off-peak           | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday             | Glenfield | Macquarie<br>Fields | Ingleburn | Minto | Leumeah | Campbelltown | Macarthur |
| 896          | Oran Park to    | Oran Park            | 5:37am - 8:56pm                          | 2       | 2       | 1                  | 24      | 14       | 11                 |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | Campbelltown    | Campbelltown         | 6:19am - 9:27pm                          | 2       | 2       | 1                  | 23      | 14       | 11                 |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 898          | Harrington Park | Harrington Park      | 5:08pm - 6:23pm                          | 0       | 4       | 0                  | 6       | 0        | 0                  |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
|              | to Campbelltown | Campbelltown         | 6:22am - 5:30pm                          | 4       | <1      | 0                  | 7       | 0        | 0                  |           |                     |           |       |         | •            | •         |
| 900          | Campbelltown to | Campbelltown         | 7:25am - 4:05pm                          | 1       | 1       | 0                  | 2       | 0        | 0                  |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
|              | Picton          | Picton               | 8:25am - 5:25pm                          | 1       | 1       | 0                  | 2       | 0        | 0                  |           |                     |           |       |         | •            |           |
| S9           | Glenfield Loop  | via Glenquarie Shops | 9:10am - 2:08pm                          | 0       | 0       | 0.5                | 4       | 0        | 0                  | •         |                     |           |       |         |              |           |



# 4.8 Road

The existing network is generally sufficient to accommodate existing demands, however during peak periods anecdotal evidence and site observations indicate there is significant congestion, particularly around Campbelltown and most notably on Narellan Road.

The key roads within the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor are presented on **Figure 4-27** and discussed in the following section, as either major north-south or east-west connections.

#### 4.8.1 North-south connections

#### Hume Motorway

The Hume Motorway is a state road, also known as both the Hume Freeway and Hume Highway in various sections, and is one of Australia's major inter-city highways between Sydney and Melbourne. The Hume Motorway begins north of Glenfield, from where it is linked to the M5 and M7 motorways. The M5 and M7 motorways form part of Sydney's orbital motorway network. The Hume Motorway is the south western connection into Sydney's orbital motorway network. It provides access from the Southern Highlands, Goulburn and Canberra into Sydney.

The Motorway is located to the west of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor, forming the boundaries of the Macarthur, Campbelltown, Ingleburn and Glenfield areas. The Motorway runs parallel to the study area rail corridor.

The Hume Motorway is four lanes in each direction between Glenfield and Minto, changing to three lanes in each direction between Minto and Campbelltown and two lanes in each direction south of Campbelltown to Macarthur and beyond. The posted speed limits along this motorway are 100km/hr between the M5/M7 and Glenfield, and 110km/hr to the south of the Glenfield area.

The major exits that affect the local traffic network in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor are:

- > Brooks Road, Ingleburn: northbound entry only and southbound exit;
- > Campbelltown Road, Ingleburn: northbound exit and southbound entry only;
- > Campbelltown/Raby Road, Campbelltown: northbound entry only and southbound exit only; and
- > Narellan Road: All movements allowed.

These exit roads are all state funded regional roads.

#### Campbelltown Road

Campbelltown Road is a state road that links Campbelltown to Casula and provides regional north-south access to the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor. This road is an alternate to the Hume Motorway.

The road is predominantly one lane in each direction, except at larger intersections and a section between Camden Valley Way and Beech Road where the road varies between two and three lanes in each direction. Most of the intersections along this road are roundabouts with a few signalised intersections. The speed limit along this road varies from 70 to 80km/h. As discussed in the Hume Motorway section, there are two entry and exit points to the Hume Motorway from Campbelltown Road. On-street parking is generally not permitted.

In June 2014, the RMS announced plans for upgrade works of Campbelltown Road between Camden Valley Way and Brooks Road. The upgrade works are proposed to involve widening of the road from two lanes undivided in each direction to four lanes divided in each direction, new traffic signals and shared paths on the western side of Campbelltown Road. The objective of the proposed works is to provide a main road transport corridor to access the South West Growth Centre.

#### Moore Street/ Oxley Street

Moore and Oxley Streets are state roads that are a continuation of Campbelltown Road to the south. These streets are mainly three lanes southbound and two lanes northbound and have a speed limit of 60km/hr. No parking is allowed on either side of these roads.



#### Figure 4-27 Glenfield to Macarthur road hierarchy





#### Eastern Road Corridor

The Eastern Road Corridor is a series of state roads that run along the eastern side of the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor. These roads include Glenfield Road, Canterbury Road, Harold Street, Collins Promenade, Minto Road, Pembroke Road, Rudd Road and Queen Street.

These roads run in a north-south direction from Campbelltown Road in the north to Campbelltown Road/Moore Street in the south between Leumeah Station and Campbelltown Station. These corridors vary between one and two lanes in each direction. The road is two lanes in each direction along Canterbury Road and Harold Street between Glenfield Road and Evelyn Street, with the exception of the section between Harrow Road and Victoria Road (Bunbury Curran Park) where there is one lane in each direction. The corridor is also two lanes in each direction along Pembroke Road between Durham Street and Ben Lomond Road, and outside Campbelltown Sports Stadium. The rest of this corridor is one lane in each direction.

The speed limit along the length of this corridor is 60km/hr. This corridor has limited on-street parking which predominantly occurs in the two lane sections of road.

#### Appin Road

Appin Road is a state road that connects Narellan Road in Macarthur to the Princes Highway in Bulli, in a generally north-south direction. It is a key road for freight and motorists travelling from south western Sydney to the South Coast. The road is mainly single lane in each direction, except for a section of road through Macarthur which is two lanes in each direction. The road varies between speed limits in this section of road from 60km/hr for a 300m northern section of Appin Road and is 80km/h thereafter.

On-street parking is generally not permitted along this road.

#### Menangle Road

Menangle Road is a state road which is predominantly one lane in each direction and connects Macarthur to Picton Road. The speed limit in the Macarthur section of Menangle Road is 60km/hr. Outside Macarthur Station, the road is expanded to two lanes in each direction. On-street parking is permitted north of the station on both sides of the road. In addition, there are some small sections outside Macarthur Station that allow vehicles to stop for Kiss & Ride.

#### Blaxland Road/ Gilchrist Drive

Blaxland Road is continued by Gilchrist Drive to the south. Blaxland Road and Gilchrist Drive are regional roads which are two lanes in each direction between Campbelltown Road and Narellan Road. The road consists of mainly signalised and roundabout intersections. No parking is allowed along this stretch of road. Speed limits along this road are 60km/hr in both directions.

#### Cumberland Road, Macquarie Road, Fields Road, Atchison Road and Railway Parade

Cumberland Road is a regional road that runs parallel to the Eastern Road Corridor between Minto Road and Henderson Road. The road is predominately one lane in each direction, with a median turning lane in the middle. Parking is permitted kerbside along the stretch of the road, and the speed limit is 60km/hr along the length. This road continues to the north with similar characteristics until it reaches Glenfield Station.

#### 4.8.2 <u>East west connections</u>

#### Narellan Road

Narellan Road is a state road that travels in an east-west direction and provides a link to the Northern Road at Camden Valley Way and to Appin Road at Oxley Street. This road has two lanes in each direction between Appin Road and the Hume Motorway intersection with a posted speed limit of 80km/h to the west and 60km/hr to the east of the intersection with Blaxland Road. On-street parking is generally not permitted along this road.

This road currently reaches capacity during peak periods and upgrades are proposed which are discussed in **Section 5.6.1**.



#### **Glenfield Road**

Glenfield Road is a state road that provides an east-west connection between Campbelltown Road and the railway line. The road generally has a single lane in each direction, with a posted speed limit of 60km/hr. This road is the main bus corridor for services arriving at or departing from Glenfield Station. On-street parking is permitted kerbside.

#### Raby Road

Raby Road is a regional road that provides an east-west link between Campbelltown Road and Camden Valley Way. This 6 kilometre stretch of road has a speed limit of 60km/hr between Campbelltown Road and Thunderbolt Drive, and is mainly two lanes in each direction. Further to the west, the speed limit increases to 80 kilometres per hour and only has one lane in each direction. This intersects with Campbelltown Road at a two lane roundabout intersection. A northbound on-ramp and off-ramp is also provided for the Hume Motorway from Raby Road.

#### **Badgally Road**

Badgally Road is a regional road that connects Campbelltown Station to Eagle Vale Drive. This road is predominantly one lane in each direction, except for the section between Blaxland Road and Johnson Road which is two lanes in each direction. The speed limit along this road is 60km/hr, with a time restricted school zone limit also in place.

#### Ben Lomond Road

Ben Lomond Road is a regional road that that connects Campbelltown Road to Pembroke Road. This route is two lanes in each direction and has a speed limit of 60km/hr. Intersections are predominantly controlled by roundabouts. No on-street parking is permitted along this road.

#### **Broughton Street**

Broughton Street is a regional road that provides a connection from the Campbelltown Station to Junction Road. Within the study area, the road is two lanes in each direction, with a speed limit of 60km/hr. Intersections are usually controlled by traffic signals along this road. Timed parking is permitted along this road.

#### Williamson Road/ Henderson Road

Williamson Road and Henderson Road are regional roads, which travel north east, and provide a connection from Campbelltown Road to Harold Street. Henderson and Williamson Roads are two lanes in each direction with a speed limit of 70km/hr. These roads do not permit any on-street parking. The intersections are controlled predominately by roundabouts.

# 4.9 Parking

Parking is a key transport facility that can support access to the public transport network in key strategic locations. Conversely, an excessive supply of parking is not economically efficient, can impact the viability of public transport, contributes to congestion and improves the attractiveness of driving. Large parking areas occupy land that could be better utilised for other purposes.

This section details the existing on and off street parking for each precinct's train station and the controls that affect parking supply for new developments.

#### 4.9.1 On-street and Park & Ride facilities

The study area has a mix of on and off street parking to support public transport and local business. **Table 4-4** indicates the facilities at each interchange for parking, this includes dedicated off-street facilities. Onstreet spaces for commuters were assumed to be spaces adjacent to the railway corridor. Given the time of demand for these spaces and their convenience, it is reasonable to assume that almost all of these spaces are used by commuters. Leumeah has the highest number of commuter car parking spaces available. The station's co-location with the sports stadium allow commuters complementary use of large car parking areas for commuters and stadium visitors. Campbelltown, Macarthur and Glenfield also have large commuter carpark facilities.

# Table 4-4Parking facilities at interchanges

| Station             | On-street | Off-street | Park & Ride (on and off street spaces) |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|--|
| Glenfield           | 28        | 933        | 961                                    |
| Macquarie<br>Fields | 44        | 115        | 159                                    |
| Ingleburn           | 161       | 156        | 317                                    |
| Minto               | 0         | 636        | 636                                    |
| Leumeah             | 28        | 1,376      | 1404                                   |
| Campbelltown        | 17        | 1,127      | 1144                                   |
| Macarthur           | 0         | 550        | 550                                    |
| Total               | 278       | 4893       | 5,171                                  |

Overall, all commuter parking facilities were observed to be highly utilised, indicating a high reliance on private vehicles access to stations.

#### 4.9.2 Campbelltown Development Control Plan (CDCP) parking controls

Off-street parking in the study area is generally controlled by CDCP, the objective of the CDCP for parking and access is to:

*Provide adequate on-site car parking for residents and visitors that is convenient, secure and safe having regard to the traffic generated by the development.* 

CDCP outlines parking requirements based on the type of land use (e.g. retail) and the density of the land use The combination of these two attributes results in the determination of the minimum amount of parking to be provided on-site by a development. The CDCP uses minimum parking controls, which result in a development requiring a set amount of parking spaces as a minimum. In areas of higher density in Sydney, parking rates are often set as maximums to reduce trips by private vehicles and to encourage more people to walk, cycle and catch public transport. This occurs in Parramatta and for comparative purposes, key land uses for Parramatta City Council parking rates (for the wider local government area) are shown alongside the CDCP rates in **Table 4-5** where applicable.

It should be noted that Parramatta City Council also have city centre and main town centres parking rates that are more restrictive than the rates provided below.

| Development Type                               | Campbelltown Council rates  | Parramatta City Council rates   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Residential                                    |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Dwelling houses,                               | A dwelling house shall be provided with a   | Outside city centre   |  |  |  |  |
| domestic outbuildings,<br>swimming pools/ spas | minimum of one undercover car parking space   | 1 space for dwellings less than or equal to 125 m <sup>2</sup>            |  |  |  |  |
| and secondary dwellings                        |   | 2 spaces for dwellings equal to or greater than or 125 $\ensuremath{m^2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary dwellings                            | -   | Outside city centre   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | No additional parking is required for a secondary dwelling                |  |  |  |  |
| Narrow lot dwellings                           | A narrow lot dwelling shall be provided with one covered car parking space.                     | -   |  |  |  |  |
| Multi dwellings                                | One (1) external additional visitor car parking   | Outside city centre   |  |  |  |  |
|  | space shall be provided for every two (2) units   | 0.6 spaces per studio apartment   |  |  |  |  |
|  | (or part thereof), unless all dwellings within the development have direct frontage to a public | 1 space per 1 bedroom unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  | street.   | 1.25 spaces per 2 bedroom unit  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | 1.5 spaces per 3 bedroom unit   |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | 2 spaces per 4 bedroom unit   |  |  |  |  |

#### Table 4-5 Campbelltown and Parramatta City Council parking control comparison



| Development Type  | Campbelltown Council rates  | Parramatta City Council rates   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | Plus 0.25 space per dwelling for visitor parking  |
|   |   | A car wash bay which may also be a visitor space  |
| Multi-dwelling close to   | -   | Outside city centre   |
| public transport  |   | 1 space per 1 or 2 bedroom unit   |
| The public transport<br>connections must be within  |   | 1.2 spaces per 3 bedroom unit   |
| 400 metres walking distance<br>of a transit way bus stop with                               |   | 2 spaces per 4 bedroom unit   |
| a service frequency of an average of 10 minutes or less                                     |   | Plus 0.25 space per dwelling for visitor<br>parking   |
| during the morning peak hour<br>(7am-9am) in either direction,<br>or of a railway station). |   | A car wash bay which may also be a visitor space  |
| Residential subdivision   | All required visitors car parking spaces within<br>a Strata Title subdivision shall be within<br>common property.                         | -   |
| Resident apartments   | Each dwelling shall be provided with a  | Outside city centre   |
|   | minimum of one car parking space, and:  | 0.6 spaces per studio apartment   |
|   | an additional car parking space for every 4   | 1 space per 1 bedroom unit  |
|   | dwellings (or part thereof); and<br>an additional visitor car parking space for   | 1.25 spaces per 2 bedroom unit  |
|   | every 10 dwellings (or part thereof).   | 1.5 spaces per 3 bedroom unit   |
|   | Each development shall make provision for   | 2 spaces per 4 bedroom unit   |
|   | bicycle storage at a rate of 1 space per 5 dwellings within common property.  | Plus 0.25 space per dwelling for visitor<br>parking   |
|   |   | A car wash bay which may also be a visitor space  |
| Resident apartments   | -   | Outside city centre   |
| close to public<br>transport  |   | Same as multi-dwelling close to public<br>transport   |
| The public transport  |   | In Parramatta City Centre:  |
| connections must be within 400 metres walking distance                                      |   | Studio: 0.5 spaces  |
| of a transit way bus stop with a service frequency of an                                    |   | 1 bedroom: 0.75 spaces  |
| average of 10 minutes or less   |   | 2 bedroom: 1 spaces   |
| during the morning peak hour (7am-9am) in either direction,                                 |   | 3 or more bedroom: 1.5 spaces   |
| or of a railway station).   |   | ·   |
| Mixed use development   | In addition to residential car parking rates the development shall provide one (1) car parking space per 25sqm of leasable floor space at | Outside city centre<br>The residential component of mixed use   |
|   | ground level and one (1) car parking space per  | development   |
|   | 35sqm of floor space at upper levels for all  | 0.6 spaces per studio apartment   |
|   | commercial/retail parts of the building.  | 1 space per 1 bedroom unit<br>1.25 spaces per 2 bedroom unit  |
|   | The development shall provide adequate space for the on-site parking, loading and   | 1.5 spaces per 3 bedroom unit   |
|   | unloading of all delivery/service vehicles as   | 2 spaces per 4 bedroom unit   |
|   | detailed in Part 6.4.2 of this Plan.  | Plus 0.25 space per dwelling for visitor  |
|   |   | parking   |
|   |   | A car wash bay which may also be a visitor space  |
| Commercial  |   |   |
| Retail Premises   | Ground level - 1 space per 25m <sup>2</sup> GFA   | Outside city centre   |
|   | Upper level(s)- 1 space per 35m <sup>2</sup> GFA  | 1 space per 30 m <sup>2</sup> of gross floor area 1<br>loading bay per 400 m <sup>2</sup> of gross floor area |
|   |   | In Parramatta City Centre:  |



| Development Type    | Campbelltown Council rates   | Parramatta City Council rates   |
|---------------------|--|---|
|                     |  | Minimum of 1 space per 60m <sup>2</sup> of gross<br>floor area, maximum of 1 space per 30m <sup>2</sup><br>of gross floor area  |
| Commercial Premises | Ground level - 1 space per 25m <sup>2</sup> GFA<br>Upper level(s)- 1 space per 35m <sup>2</sup> GFA                                      | Outside city centre<br>1 space per 50 m <sup>2</sup> of gross floor area plus<br>1 loading bay per 400 m <sup>2</sup> of gross floor<br>area<br>In Parramatta City Centre<br>Minimum of 1 space per 70m <sup>2</sup> of gross<br>floor area, maximum of 1 space per 50m <sup>2</sup><br>of gross floor area   |
| Medical Facilities  | <ul> <li>&gt; Ground level - 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>&gt; Upper level(s)- 1 space per 35m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> </ul>    | <ul> <li>In Parramatta City Centre</li> <li>Minimum of 1 space per 70m<sup>2</sup> of<br/>gross floor area, maximum of 1<br/>space per 50m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area</li> </ul>   |
| Shopping Centres    | <ul> <li>&gt; Ground level - 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>&gt; Upper level(s)- 1 space per 35m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> </ul>    | -   |
| Restaurants         | > 1.5 spaces per 10m <sup>2</sup> GFA  | <ul> <li>&gt; Outside city centre         <ul> <li>First 100m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>1 space per 30 m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area Available on-street parking cannot be included in the calculation (Section 3.6.2 C.30 'Business and Retail Premises' does not apply to the first 100 m<sup>2</sup> of floor space)</li> <li>Additional floor space over the first 100 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Whichever is greater - 15 spaces per 100 m<sup>2</sup> or 1 space per 3 seats</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| Cafes               | > 1.5 spaces per 10m <sup>2</sup> GFA  | <ul> <li>In Parramatta City Centre:</li> <li>Minimum of 1 space per 60m<sup>2</sup> of<br/>gross floor area, maximum of 1<br/>space per 30m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area</li> </ul>  |
| Clubs               | <ul> <li>&gt; 1.5 spaces per 10m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>&gt; 1.5 spaces per 10m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> </ul>                             | -   |
| Function Centres    | <ul> <li>&gt; 1.5 spaces per 10m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>&gt; 1.5 spaces per 10m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> </ul>                             | -   |
| Hotels              | · · ·  | -   |
| Convenience stores  | <ul> <li>&gt; 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>Plus</li> <li>5 spaces per work bay (for vehicle servicing facilities)</li> </ul> | -   |
| Service Stations    | <ul> <li>&gt; 1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> <li>Plus</li> <li>5 spaces per work bay (for vehicle servicing facilities)</li> </ul> | -   |



| Development Type            | Campbelltown Council rates  | Parramatta City Council rates   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Bulky Goods/ Industrial     | > 1 space per 60m <sup>2</sup> GFA  | > Outside city centre   |
|                             |   | <ul> <li>1 space per 70 m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor<br/>area plus 1 loading bay per 800 m<sup>2</sup><br/>of gross floor area</li> </ul> |
| Car Sales                   | <ul> <li>&gt; 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup> site area plus 5 spaces<br/>per work bay (for vehicle servicing<br/>facilities)</li> </ul>   | -   |
| Motor Showrooms             | <ul> <li>&gt; 1 space per 100m<sup>2</sup> site area plus 5 spaces<br/>per work bay (for vehicle servicing<br/>facilities)</li> </ul>   | -   |
| Squash Courts               | > 3 spaces per court  | -   |
| Tennis Courts               | > 3 spaces per court  | -   |
| Bowling Alley               | > 3 spaces per alley  | -   |
| Gymnasiums                  | > for indoor facilities:  |   |
|                             | <ul> <li>1 space per 25m<sup>2</sup> GFA</li> </ul>   |   |
|                             | > for outdoor facilities:   |   |
|                             | <ul> <li>1 space per 50m<sup>2</sup> of site area</li> </ul>  |   |
| Recreational Facilities     | > As per gymnasium rates  | -   |
| Sport Facilities            | > As per gymnasium rates  | -   |
| Cinemas                     | > As per gymnasium rates  | -   |
| Motels                      | > 1 space for each unit   | -   |
|                             | Plus  |   |
|                             | 1 space per 2 employees   |   |
| Plant Nurseries             | > 15 spaces;  | -   |
|                             | Plus  |   |
|                             | 0.5 spaces per 100 m <sup>2</sup> of site area.   |   |
|                             | Childcare Centre  |   |
| Childcare Centre            | > A minimum of one (1) on site car parking  | > Outside city centre   |
|                             | space shall be provided for every four (4) children approved to attend the child care centre.   | <ul> <li>1 space for every 4 children in<br/>attendances</li> </ul>   |
| Religious Establishments    |   |   |
| Religious<br>Establishments | > A minimum of one (1) car parking space<br>shall be provided for every 3.5 site users.   | -   |
| Separate Development DCP    |   |   |
| One Minto DCP               | > A separate off-street car parking space<br>shall be provided for the occupants of the<br>studio apartment in addition to the car<br>parking requirements for the main dwelling. | -   |



| Development Type                | Campbelltown Council rates  | Parramatta City Council rates |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Glenfield Urban<br>Release Area | <ul> <li>Accommodation on-site for 2 cars provided<br/>for single detached dwelling-houses.</li> </ul>  | -                             |
|                                 | > Number of bedrooms/ dwelling and rate:  |                               |
|                                 | <ul> <li>Bedsitter of 1 bedroom – car parking<br/>spaces/ dwelling = 0.75</li> </ul>  |                               |
|                                 | <ul> <li>2 bedroom – car parking spaces/<br/>dwelling = 1</li> </ul>  |                               |
|                                 | <ul> <li>3 or more bedroom – car parking<br/>spaces/ dwelling = 1.5</li> </ul>  |                               |
|                                 | <ul> <li>Visitor spaces – car parking spaces/<br/>dwelling = 0.2</li> </ul>   |                               |
| UWS DCP 2008                    | > Minimum 1 space per dwelling plus:  | -                             |
|                                 | <ul> <li>an additional space for every 4<br/>dwellings (or part thereof)</li> </ul>   |                               |
|                                 | <ul> <li>an additional visitor space for every 10<br/>dwellings (or part thereof)</li> </ul>  |                               |
|                                 | > Where development greater than 3 storeys<br>all car parking is to be at basement level<br>Parking at ground level shall be screened<br>from view. |                               |
|                                 | > All residential apartment buildings to<br>provide bicycle storage at a rate of 1 space<br>per 5 dwellings within common property.                 |                               |

Overall, the Campbelltown car parking rates are either slightly higher than Parramatta City Council rates or consistent. This is also reflective of the evolution of each region with regards to the amount of development and area density.

# 4.9.3 <u>Precincts</u>

Parking conditions for each precinct is discussed further in the following sections.

#### Glenfield

The Glenfield precinct has three primary demands for parking; these are residential, educational and commuter. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

Residential demands are accommodated on each respective property. Residential visitor demand is generally accommodated for on-street through a mix of unrestricted and restricted parking controls to manage a variety of demands simultaneously. The majority of on-street parking is restricted within 400 metres of the Glenfield Station. In the outer area controls are generally 3P and longer, closer to the Station controls are generally 2P or less to cater for the main street demand. The on-street parking controls have inconsistent times of operation in the precinct.

The off-street parking supply is provided via commuter, retail and sporting ground car parking. The largest facility is the commuter car park with approximately 750 spaces, which is located to the north of the station. The sporting ground provides 180 spaces and is located to the south of the station. The retail parking is a local facility that provides additional parking for people visiting the main street. Overall it is considered that Glenfield provides off-street parking for a much larger catchment area. This indicates that Glenfield provides Park & Ride facilities for people living outside the precinct.

There is existing Kiss & Ride facility located on the north-west side of the station. The provision of one Kiss & Ride facility is considered to be inadequate for the scale of the station and demand.

The on-street and off-street parking needs for the local area appeared suitably catered for within this precinct.



### Macquarie Fields

The Macquarie Fields precinct has two primary demands for parking; residential and commuter. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The residential demand is currently catered for on-street through a mix of unrestricted and restricted parking controls to manage a variety of demands simultaneously. The majority of on-street parking is unrestricted, with No Parking restrictions closer to the station to discourage commuter parking on-street. The use of No Parking as a restriction to manage commuter parking on-street has the potential to also impact on residential demand. For example, residents may have a visitor during these times or park their vehicle on-street. While an effective tool to manage commuter parking, consideration should be given to implementing timed parking restrictions to provide some flexibility for residents.

The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter car park. The facility provides approximately 115 spaces, which is located to the south of the station. The parking was observed to be well utilised, with some vehicles parked informally on the grassed area adjacent to the formal commuter car park. The demand in this area is primarily from commuters, as there are no other significant demands within the area. Consideration should be given the formalising and integrating the adjacent grassed area with the existing commuter car park.

The current Kiss & Ride facility is located on the south-east side of the station. The provision of one Kiss & Ride facility is considered to be adequate for the scale of the station, and its demand and available access points.

The on-street and off-street parking needs for the local area appeared to be sufficient to cater for demand in the precinct.

#### Ingleburn

The Ingleburn precinct has three primary demands for parking; residential, retail/commercial and commuter. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The residential demand is currently catered for on-street through a mix of unrestricted and restricted parking controls to manage a variety of demands simultaneously. The majority of on-street parking is unrestricted on the north-west side of the station and restricted on the south-east side of the station. This reflects the differing land uses of industrial, retail and commercial respectively. The north-west side of the station is largely unrestricted and provides overflow parking for employees of the industrial land uses in this area. The south-east side of the station has a higher demand for vehicle access and as a result parking. The retail and commercial nature of this area results in moderate-significant demand for parking, which has resulted in parking controls of 2P or less for the majority of the day Monday-Saturday.

The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter and town centre car park. The largest facility is the town centre car park that collectively provides approximately 600 spaces. These spaces are located in two locations; north and south of the town centre. The commuter car park provides approximately 200 spaces, which are located within close walking distance of the station.

There is currently no Kiss & Ride facility located at the station. The provision of a Kiss & Ride facility on each side of the station is recommended to improve safety for these movements.

#### Minto

The Minto precinct has three primary demands for parking; industrial, residential, commuter and retail. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The industrial land use is located on the north-west and south of the station, which occupies approximately three quarters of the area surrounding the station. The low density nature of the industrial land use does not generate significant on-street demand for parking, most parking is provided on-site. Parking in the industrial areas is unrestricted. The residential area also generates low demand for parking and has unrestricted on-street parking. The station is the largest generator of parking demand within the Minto precinct. This has resulted in a combination of parking restrictions along the main street, ranging from 15min15min to 2P operating during general business hours and on Saturday morning.



The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter and town centre car park. The largest facility is the commuter car park that collectively provides approximately 600 spaces. These spaces are located in two locations; south and west of the town centre. The commuter car park is comprised of a combination of off-street and on-street parking, with 80 spaces on-street and 520 off-street.

There is currently no Kiss & Ride facility located at the station. The provision of a Kiss & Ride facility on the eastern side of the station is recommended to provide a formal location and prevent vehicle conflicts.

#### Leumeah

The Leumeah precinct has four primary demands for parking; these are commuter, entertainment, large scale retail/industrial and residential. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The commuter demand is currently not for catered for on-street, although some unrestricted parking is provided within walking distance of the station. There are some 2P parking restrictions on the south side of the station, adjacent to retail uses. The majority of parking for the precinct is provided via off-street facilities.

The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter and town centre car park. The largest facility is the commuter car park that collectively provides approximately 1,300 spaces. These spaces are located in three locations; south-west, east and north-east of the station. The remaining parking that is located off-street is on private property, which amounts to approximately 1,400 spaces.

There are currently two Kiss & Ride facilities located on the north and south side of the station. The Kiss & Ride on the south side is timed between 9:00pm - 6:00am to cater for evening and late night demand.

The on-street and off-street parking needs for the local area are currently considered adequate for this precinct.

#### Campbelltown

The Campbelltown precinct has three primary demands for parking; these are retail, commercial, commuter and industrial. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The parking demand is currently catered for on-street through a mix of unrestricted and restricted parking controls to manage a variety of demands simultaneously. The majority of on-street parking is restricted on the south-east side of the station and unrestricted on the north-west side of the station. This reflects the differing land uses of retail/commercial and industrial respectively. The south-east side of the station has a higher demand for access and as a result on-street parking. The retail and commercial nature of this area results in moderate-significant demand for parking, which has resulted in parking controls of 2P or less, with the majority being 1P during business hours Monday-Saturday.

The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter and town centre car parking. The commuter car parking collectively provides approximately 1,050 spaces. These spaces are located in three locations all north-west of the station. The town centre car parking provides approximately 1,800 spaces, which are located on the south side of the station and distributed throughout the town centre.

There is currently one Kiss & Ride facility located on the north side of the station. The provision of a Kiss & Ride facility on the southern side of the station is not required as there is a 15min parking zone to cater for Kiss & Ride.

The on-street and off-street parking needs for the local area are currently considered adequate for this precinct.

#### Macarthur

The Macarthur precinct has three primary demands for parking; these are retail, educational and commuter. These demands are currently catered for through on-street and off-street facilities.

The parking demand is currently catered for on-street through a mix of unrestricted and restricted parking controls to manage a variety of demands simultaneously. The majority of on-street parking is unrestricted on the south side of the station with no current on-street parking on the north side of the station. This reflects the differing land uses of retail and educational respectively.

The off-street parking supply is provided via a commuter, town centre and educational car parking. The largest facility is the town centre car parking that collectively provides approximately 2,900 spaces. These spaces are located in a number of locations around the town centre. The commuter car park provides approximately 500 spaces, which are located within close walking distance to the station.

There is currently one Kiss & Ride facility located on the south side of the station. The provision of a Kiss & Ride facility on the north side of the Station should be investigated as part of the university and TAFE development. At present, there is no need for a Kiss & Ride at this location.

The on-street and off-street parking needs for the local area are currently considered adequate for this precinct.

#### 4.9.4 <u>Precinct parking considerations</u>

Cardno

Parking management strategies should be investigated to develop clear and consistent parking restrictions for on-street facilities and Opal card technology used to maximise the use of off-street commuter facilities for public transport customers.

Each precinct would benefit from an area wide parking study to determine complementary uses that could utilise parking at different times of the day. In addition travel demand management strategies, such as carpooling and public transport fare inclusion in ticket prices, should be investigated to develop an integrated parking management framework for the precinct.

# 4.10 Key considerations

Cardno

The existing transport network in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor provides an insight into how the corridor functions and raises a number of transport considerations for the development of the precinct structure plans. Key considerations for the study area include:

#### Walking

> The walking network in the study area varies from precinct to precinct in quality, connectivity and safety. Where provided, these are generally to minimum standards away from key activity precincts.

There are some significant barriers to access some stations, including:

- Large land parcels with limited public access;
- Natural features, such as creeks and waterways;
- Main roads with high traffic volumes and limited safe crossing opportunities;
- Sporting facilities; and
- Shopping centres.
- > The highest priority is establishing a clear and legible walking network around each station to provide basic access. Improved connectivity and maximising the walking catchment is also a high priority to increase the potential customer base.

#### Cycling

- > The cycling network is incomplete and does not connect key destinations within each precinct or regionally. In most cases the station is within close proximity to the precinct's main area for goods and services, which is an opportunity to provide cycling facilities that connect multiple key destinations. The high amount of private vehicle use within the study area is likely to require facilities that are of a high safety standard to encourage more people to cycle.
- > The result is that the cycling facilities and network is underutilised and cycling mode split is under represented.

#### Rail (Passenger)

- > The rail network within the study area serves freight and passengers. There are three train lines that service the study are, T2 South Line, T5 Cumberland Line and the South West Rail Link. The study area facilitates a large amount of industrial uses and as a region it is the gateway to and from the Southern Highlands, South Western Sydney and Canberra. In this context, rail provides a significant role in supporting the local economy and intermodal facilities. Future proofing for both freight and passengers is a key challenge for this rail corridor.
- > Within the study area there are seven rail stations, each with specific challenges, which include:
  - Access and walking: maximising walking catchments will increase the amount of people who have access between the station and their residence and employment. This will increase the likelihood of achieving mode shift to sustainable modes of transport;
  - Integration with other modes: Ensuring integration with other modes of transport maximises the customer experience and increases the likelihood that people will walk, cycle and catch the bus to/from the rail station;
  - Parking: balancing the supply and restrictions of parking to support the use of public transport however not encourage private vehicle use for all trips; and
  - Land use: providing a mix of land uses within close proximity of the station to encourage multi-purpose trips and maximise local access to local business.

#### Freight (Rail and Road)

Cardno

- > The key rail and road freight networks have national significance and as a result the corridor has optimal access to the national and international freight network.
- > Consideration is required to reserve space to increase freight network capacity in the future.
- > The study area supports a large amount of industrial uses and as a result, freight within the study area and wider region is significant. Access to the railway lines and motorways is a key driver for industrial uses and maintaining and improving these access points will continue to support the local and regional industrial uses.

#### Bus

- > The study area has good coverage for bus routes, however service levels have a high variance of frequency depending on origin, destination and route in between.
- > There are routes that connect to Wollongong and Warragamba, which also connect to Appin and Oran Park. These services are infrequent with one service each in the AM and PM peak period.
- > Local routes cover the study area well and generally are all day services, not peak demand services. This means that there is a steady frequency throughout the day to support all day use.
- > While coverage is considered to be good, directness is affected and as a result journey times can be lengthy. A balance of coverage and directness with the services for the study area is a consideration for future networks.
- > The prevailing residential land use density through the corridor is low and there are a large number of bus routes in the region. As such it is difficult to justify higher frequency services.

#### Road and parking

- > The road network is largely local with some significant regional and cross corridor connections.
- > The road network provides good local connections and a limited number of connections to the arterial road network, in particular the Hume Motorway. The limited connections to the Motorway is considered to be typical for this type of infrastructure.
- > There are limited opportunities to cross the railway line for the local network, this is considered a barrier to all transport modes and consideration for increasing the amount of crossing opportunities should be investigated further.
- > Parking throughout the study area is provided through a mix of on and off-street parking. Parking policy and restrictions require careful consideration to balance the competing needs of local residents, commuters, businesses and visitors. A combination of time-based restricted and unrestricted parking currently exists in most precincts aiming to achieve this balance. Strategies developed to aid in the management of parking should consider these needs and seek to support a higher sustainable mode share for the future.

#### Summary

The assessment of the existing transport network has been undertaken to identify improvements and opportunities. These key considerations will be used to develop objectives and measures to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use while seeking to support the corridor's key employment uses, freight activity and strategic role within Metropolitan Sydney.



# 5 Planned transport network improvements

This section provides a review of the known proposed transport network improvements in the region prior to the development of this strategy. These have been identified through background research and consultation with TfNSW.

# 5.1 Walking

#### 5.1.1 <u>Green Grid</u>

The Green Grid is a NSW government initiative to ensure that Sydney continues to be one of the most distinctive and liveable cities in the world. The Sydney Green Grid project is outlined as Action 3.2.1 of A Plan for Growing Sydney, 2014. Initially, a pilot program will be undertaken in Parramatta City Council LGA. If this is successful, it is expected to be rolled out across metropolitan Sydney.

The initiative aims to provide and promote a network of green spaces such as national parks, wetlands and rivers that are connected via high quality walking and cycling connections which is called the Green Grid. The Green Grid will improve urban landscapes while ensuring that sustainable infrastructure is part of developments in Sydney's future.

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is in close proximity to some major water bodies and national parks, such as the Nepean and Georges Rivers, Warragamba Dam, Western Sydney Parklands and Mount Annan Botanic Gardens.

The 'Green Grid' for Glenfield to Macarthur area seeks to maximise the use of open and green space for recreational and active uses. This initiative has the potential to activate spaces that feel unsafe and also reduce maintenance costs associated with open space.

It should be noted that the Green Grid may provide some key transport links, however the primary purpose of the network is to maximise the connection between green spaces.

# 5.2 Cycling

Campbelltown-Macarthur is identified in the plan as a Major Centre which will have a bicycle network plan developed, in collaboration with the relevant councils, for a five kilometre catchment as part of the Connecting Centres Program outlined in Sydney's Cycling Future. The initiative supports local councils to develop bicycle plans and fund infrastructure. The five kilometre catchment will be expanded to cycling links within a ten kilometre catchment in the long term.

Specific improvements for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor:

- > Priority cycleway routes proposed for between Liverpool and Glenfield.
- > Installation of secure bicycle facilities at Campbelltown Station.

In relation to these programs, no timeframes are specified and these will require collaboration with state and local governments.

# 5.3 Rail

# 5.3.1 <u>Railway corridor</u>

The railway line will remain a key transport corridor in the region and as part of the national network. As the needs of the both the freight and passenger network increase, so too will the need to provide additional capacity on the corridor. Major expansions can be expected in the longer term, however medium term improvements would likely include additional passing loops on the freight line and a review of passenger services and operations to utilise existing spare capacity on the network.

Long term expansion requirements are likely to include additional tracks, stabling and other supporting facilities along the corridor, however the extent of these facilities are not know at this stage and this has not been committed to.

### 5.3.2 Ingleburn station precinct accessibility upgrade

Cardno

Ingleburn Station has been included as part of the Transport Access Program (TAP) and at the time of writing was being upgraded. The TAP is an initiative by Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) to provide a better experience for public transport customers by delivering accessible, modern, secure and integrated transport infrastructure where it is needed most. The aim of the program is to provide:

- Interchange precincts that are accessible to people with a mobility impairments, the elderly and people with prams, that is step free access;
- > Inclusive buildings and facilities for all modes that meet the needs of a growing population;
- > Modern interchanges that support an integrated network and allow seamless transfers between all modes for all customers;
- > Safety improvements including extra lighting, help points, fences and security measures for car parks and interchanges, including bus stops and wharves;
- > Signage improvements so customers can more easily use public transport and transfer between modes at interchanges; and
- > Other improvements and maintenance such as painting, new fencing and roof replacements.

The proposed improvements for Ingleburn include:

- > Three new lifts;
- > Covered walkways from the lifts to the platforms;
- > Reconfiguration of the existing commuter parking to provide four accessible parking spaces;
- > The installation of new bicycle racks;
- > Reconfigured station entries;
- > New customer amenities;
- > Improvements to the bus stop and canopy, taxi zone, bicycle storage and accessible parking; and
- > Formalised kiss and ride facilities.

It is expected the improvements will support the use of public transport in the corridor and beyond.

#### 5.3.3 Campbelltown station commuter car park expansion

The Minister for Transport announced an additional 450 commuter car parking spaces for Campbelltown Station, as an election commitment on 20 March 2015. TfNSW will work with Campbelltown Council to deliver the additional spaces near the Campbelltown Station Interchange precinct.

#### 5.4 Freight

#### 5.4.1 <u>Road</u>

The RMS is responsible for key road freight routes and they will monitor the road network and identify the needs so as to efficiently accommodate future demands.

#### 5.4.2 <u>Moorebank Intermodal Terminal</u>

The proposed Moorebank Intermodal (freight) Terminal proposes to create a strategically located terminal to improve freight interchange for the south west Sydney region. It is to be located approximately 2.3 kilometres north-east of Glenfield Station adjacent to the national freight rail connection, specifically the Southern Sydney Freight Line and Hume Motorway. This includes a rail connection to Port Botany, where shipping containers will be transferred from ship to rail. This will allow the movement of freight to the western suburbs from the Port of Botany off the road network.

It will comprise of a freight rail yard, trucking terminal and warehousing. There will be two distinct components of the facility, these being:

> An import-export terminal to manage up to 1.2 million shipping containers per annum; and



> An interstate terminal linked to the national freight network with a proposed capacity of 500,000 shipping containers per annum.

The key advantage of the terminal will be to take freight traffic from inner Sydney roads and transfer movements to rail, thus releasing road capacity, increasing reliability and efficiency.

The proposal was in Step 6 of an 8 step planning process at the time of writing. Additional up to date information is available at <u>http://simta.com.au/</u> and <u>http://www.micl.com.au/</u>.

The road and rail network implications from the freight growth stimulated by the Moorebank Intermodal Precinct are being investigated.

The proposed location of the facility is shown in Figure 5-1

#### Figure 5-1 Proposed Moorebank intermodal terminal location



Source: http://www.micl.com.au/the-terminal/terminal-location-map.aspx, viewed 06/03/2015



### 5.5 Bus

Transport for NSW undertakes continual reviews of bus services and strategic planning to determine requirements to accommodate future needs. The following considerations and concepts were inferred from consultation and are indicative of TfNSW's developing bus strategy for the region. These are in addition to the strategies and proposals set out in Sydney's Bus Future.

It must be noted that and a wider network review is required before any significant changes are made to any services.

#### **Existing constraints:**

- > Cross regional links to the east are restricted by the Georges River and the Holsworthy Military Reserve.
- > Narellan Road experiences significant traffic congestion and increasing numbers of buses are also using the road to access Campbelltown.
- > Road congestion through Campbelltown reduces service reliability, particularly Narellan Road.
- > Macquarie Fields Railway Station has limited road access.

#### Considerations for the future bus network include:

- > Streamlining Campbelltown to Liverpool services, these longer distance routes are patronised greater than local routes.
- > The road and bus network should be integrated in the planning phase to ensure the requirements of the bus network are taken into account when changes are made to the road network.
- > Frequency increases are required to support the use of rail.
- > Bus services will need to integrate with the SWGC bus strategy.
- > Bus services between Wollongong and Campbelltown could be improved.
- > Providing more services along Narellan Road and Badgally Road.

#### Concept routes and infrastructure improvements

The following pre-feasibility study concepts are potential solutions to accommodate the needs of an increasing population:

- > Proposed development in Macarthur South could impact bus routes, new routes or alterations to existing routes could be considered as part of a wider network review to service the area.
- > New transit roads could be provided for bus services only to bypass constrained roads around Campbelltown and Macarthur. These include:
  - Menangle Road to Camden Road link under Narellan Road.
  - Badgally Road and Broughton Street link/ railway crossing.
- > A potential new route between Ingleburn and Edmondson Park.
- > A new route between Catherine Fields and Minto is also being considered.

The concept future bus network routes are outlined in **Figure 5-2** as follows:


#### Figure 5-2 Planned future bus routes





Cardno

## 5.6 Road

Regional road improvements will be largely driven by the development of the South West Growth Centre, Western Sydney Airport and the Western Sydney Employment lands. Increases to the number of railway crossing points would be driven by interconnectivity requires brought about by these neighbouring regional developments. Structure plans of the South West Growth Centre indicate key road corridors and their links with existing roads in the study corridor.

Key freight and transit corridors, including potential railway crossing points will need to be protected for future expansion of the road network.

#### 5.6.1 Narellan Road Upgrade

In June 2014, the RMS published plans to increase the capacity of Narellan Road, between Camden Valley Way and Blaxland Road. The Narellan Road Upgrade plans to provide road capacity for the growing population of South West Sydney. The 7.7 kilometre road upgrade is a key road in connecting the Hume Highway to regional centres of Camden and Campbelltown for motorists, commuters, cyclists and freight.

Stages of the upgrade include:

- > Stage 1: Three lanes for both directions on Narellan Road between Mount Annan Drive and Hume Highway interchange;
- Stage 2: Three lanes eastbound between the Hume Highway and Blaxland Road and three westbound lanes between the UWS/TAFE access road and the Hume Highway interchange;
- > Stage 3: Increase to two right turn lanes on Narellan Road at the Blaxland Road/ Gilchrist Drive intersection;
- > Stage 4: Three lanes in both directions between Waterworth Drive and Mount Annan Drive; and
- > Stage 5: Bridge widening at the Hume Highway.

The upgrade also proposes to build a shared path running parallel to the road along the southern side. Stage 1 is currently under construction and expected to be complete by mid-2016 and Stage 2 to be complete by 2018, with subsequent stages yet to be finalised for completion. A map of the proposed upgrade is provided in **Figure 5-3**.



#### Figure 5-3 Narellan road upgrade



Source: http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/documents/projects/sydney-west/campbelltown-narellan-road/narellan-road-community-update-nov-12.pdf

#### 5.6.2 <u>Glenfield Road</u>

The RMS propose to widen Glenfield Road between Campbelltown Road and Brampton Avenue as part of the Pinch Point Program. The work will seek to improve traffic flow and pedestrian facilities. Construction on this project is expected to begin in 2015.

#### 5.6.3 <u>Cambridge Avenue</u>

Investigations would be undertaken as part of the proposed Moorebank Intermodal Terminal to determine any requirements to upgrade Cambridge Avenue. This would be part of the Higher Productivity Vehicle route from the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Precinct to the Hume Motorway, and to the M7.

#### 5.6.4 Western Sydney Airport

A new airport is proposed at Badgerys Creek in Western Sydney. The new airport would be a major driver of growth in south west Sydney and is expected to be operational in the mid 2020's. It would provide links between the region and the rest of Australia and international locations. Infrastructure planning is underway to provide the necessary facilities to support the function and access to the airport.

Plans for these upgrades include:

- The upgrade of Bringelly Road to a minimum of four lanes from Camden Valley Way to The Northern Road;
- Werrington Arterial Stage 1 upgrade of Gibbs Street to a four lane dual carriageway linking the Great Western Highway and M4 with east facing ramps on the M4 motorway;
- > The upgrade of The Northern Road to a minimum of four lanes from Narellan to the M4 Motorway;



- > Construction of a new four lane motorway between the M7 Motorway and The Northern Road; and
- > A \$200 million package for local roads upgrades.

Cardno

The NSW and Australian Governments will also reserve a rail corridor that would link between the new South West Rail Link and St Mary's via the new airport.



## 6 Data review

Various data sources from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census Data and the Bureau of Transport Statistics (BTS) have been assessed to establish the transport network demand indicators and relationships to then assess the future function of the transport network. The data types assessed include:

- > Population;
- > Employment;
- > Dwellings and structure type;
- > Household income;
- > Vehicle ownership;
- > Journey to Work (JTW);
- > Household travel survey;
- > Rail demand; and
- > Bus demand.

## 6.1 Population and employment

This section provides a summary of existing and projected population, workforce and jobs for each of the Precincts and for the study area. These have a direct relationship with trip generation.

Residential population for the corridor is summarised in **Table 6-1**. The Ingleburn precinct has the highest residential population, followed by Campbelltown and Glenfield. Minto accounts for only 4% of the precinct corridor's population.

| Precinct         | 2011   | %    |
|------------------|--------|------|
| Glenfield        | 7,814  | 15%  |
| Macquarie Fields | 6,891  | 13%  |
| Ingleburn        | 14,442 | 27%  |
| Minto            | 2,129  | 4%   |
| Leumeah          | 7,882  | 15%  |
| Campbelltown     | 9,607  | 18%  |
| Macarthur        | 4,790  | 9%   |
| Study Area Total | 53,555 | 100% |

### Table 6-1 Estimated population (ERP)

Note: ERP – estimated resident population

Source: BTS 2014 series small-area population projections

**Table 6-2** summarises estimates of the residential workforce (workforce participants who live in the corridor) irrespective of where they work, in each of the precincts and within the overall corridor. The Ingleburn precinct has the most number of workforce participants, followed by Campbelltown, Glenfield and Leumeah. Minto has only 929 people participating in the workforce. Minto also has the smallest proportion the total population participating in the workforce at 44% and Glenfield has the highest at 54%.



#### Table 6-2 Estimated resident workforce

| Precinct         | 2011   | Percentage of study<br>area | Proportion of total resident population |
|------------------|--------|-----------------------------|---|
| Glenfield        | 4,195  | 16%                         | 54%                                     |
| Macquarie Fields | 3,241  | 12%                         | 47%                                     |
| Ingleburn        | 7,315  | 27%                         | 51%                                     |
| Minto            | 929    | 3%                          | 44%                                     |
| Leumeah          | 4,153  | 15%                         | 53%                                     |
| Campbelltown     | 4,615  | 17%                         | 48%                                     |
| Macarthur        | 2,488  | 9%                          | 52%                                     |
| Total            | 26,936 | 100%                        |   |

Source: BTS 2014 series small-area workforce projections

Employment within the study area is summarised in **Table 6-3**. Across the precincts Ingleburn and Campbelltown provides the most employment opportunities, accounting for 27% and 26% of all jobs through the corridor. When Campbelltown and Macarthur employment is combined they account for 44% of all jobs.

| Table 6-3 Estimated existing en | nployment |      |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|
| Precinct                        | 2011      | %    |
| Glenfield                       | 1,495     | 4%   |
| Macquarie Fields                | 1,557     | 4%   |
| Ingleburn                       | 10,781    | 27%  |
| Minto                           | 3,536     | 9%   |
| Leumeah                         | 5,196     | 13%  |
| Campbelltown                    | 10,414    | 26%  |
| Macarthur                       | 7,010     | 18%  |
| Study Area                      | 39,989    | 100% |

Source: BTS 2014 series small-area employment projections

## 6.2 Dwellings and structure type

Different dwelling structures tend to be associated with varying levels of vehicle ownership and trip generation. RMS trip generation data indicates that lower density residential developments tend to have higher vehicle trip generation rates than higher density residential developments. This also translates into lower rates of active and public transport usage for lower density residential. This relationship is also likely born located in proximity to other land uses and transport access. Transit stops and stations have finite catchments and many low density residential developments are located away from good public transport services.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census records this information and categorises dwelling structure variables. For this analysis the ten Census structure types were coded to four:

- > Separate dwelling these are generally lower density;
- > Semi includes townhouses and row or terrace houses, these are generally medium density;
- > Flats, units and apartments (FUA) includes flats, units and apartments of various heights, these are generally medium to higher density; and
- > Other includes caravan cabin and houseboat, as well as improvised tents and sleepers out.

**Table 6-4** provides a summary of aggregate dwelling structure distribution in each of the precincts. The precincts are defined in terms of ABS's statistical area 1 (SA1) geography.

#### Table 6-4 Aggregate dwelling structure distribution by precinct (count) 2011

| Precinct         | Separate | Semi       | FUA            | Other           | NA  | NS | Total  |
|------------------|----------|------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|----|--------|
| Glenfield        | 1,747    | 928        | 132            | 0               | 7   | 0  | 2,814  |
| Macquarie Fields | 1,357    | 885        | 0              | 0               | 0   | 0  | 2,242  |
| Minto            | 398      | 158        | 82             | 0               | 0   | 0  | 638    |
| Ingleburn        | 2,205    | 1,210      | 56             | 0               | 0   | 0  | 3,471  |
| Leumeah          | 1,728    | 467        | 247            | 0               | 5   | 0  | 2,447  |
| Campbelltown     | 1,864    | 426        | 408            | 5               | 5   | 0  | 2,708  |
| Macarthur        | 141      | 287        | 356            | 0               | 14  | 0  | 798    |
| Combined         | 9,440    | 4,361      | 1,281          | 5               | 31  | 0  | 15,118 |
|                  |          | Note: NA – | not applicable | ; NS – not stat | ed. |    |        |

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder

The above analysis indicates that the precincts vary considerably in the number of dwellings within their boundary. A summary of the distribution of dwelling types is provided in Table 6-5.

| able 6-5 Aggregate dwelling structure distribution by precinct (%) 2011 |          |      |     |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|----------|------|-----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Precinct  | Separate | Semi | FUA | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Glenfield   | 62%      | 33%  | 5%  | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields  | 61%      | 39%  | 0%  | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minto   | 62%      | 25%  | 13% | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ingleburn   | 64%      | 35%  | 2%  | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leumeah   | 71%      | 19%  | 10% | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campbelltown  | 69%      | 16%  | 15% | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macarthur   | 18%      | 37%  | 45% | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined  | 63%      | 29%  | 8%  | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sydney Outer SW SA4   | 84%      | 12%  | 4%  | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GMA   | 63%      | 12%  | 24% | 0%    |  |  |  |  |  |  |

T-1-1- 0 F . . . . .

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder, analysis by TMA

Apart from Macarthur, the precincts generally have low proportions of concentrated FUAs, with separate housing making up just under two-thirds of the dwelling stock. The combined precinct's dwelling distribution is quite different when compared with the Sydney Outer South West area which has a substantially higher proportion of separate dwellings. The Sydney Outer South West area is dominated by new greenfield development. The Glenfield to Macarthur corridor has a more balanced mix of dwelling types. When compared with the GMA's distribution, the combined precinct's distribution has the same proportion of separated dwellings, but a higher proportion of semi dwellings and a lower proportion of FUAs. Higher density dwellings support public and active transport modes more than lower density dwellings.

#### 6.3 Household income

Household income is a key indicator for transport usage. On average transport costs account for over 15% of total income spend for households. As income rises or falls the transport portion of total income reduces or increases. Also, transport choices are made economically by people; people on lower incomes tend to be more reliant on public transport. Further, reduced expenditure on transport allows that saved amount to contribute to the economy in other ways. For lower income household, sensitivities to changes in the price of goods and services impacts the amount of any disposable income or financial stress, where lifestyle adjustments are required.

By providing a large variety of land uses together with high quality and accessible public transport, walking and bicycle networks allows people access to reduce the cost spent on transport. As a result it is important to understand context within the study area to ensure social equity and resilience in the transport network for financial stress.

The data is presented between families and overall averages. It should be noted that single parent households, in addition to single people are not included as families, hence this partially explains why the median weekly household income is notably less than family household incomes.

Each precinct has been assessed with ABS Census 2011 data as shown in Table 6-6.

|                               | a meome companson                 |                           |                        |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
|                               | Median weekly<br>household income | Families without children | Families with children |
| Glenfield                     | \$1,394                           | \$2,106                   | \$2,253                |
| Macquarie Fields              | \$989                             | \$1,845                   | \$1,935                |
| Ingleburn                     | \$1,210                           | \$1,927                   | \$2,214                |
| Minto                         | \$1,152                           | \$1,866                   | \$1,968                |
| Leumeah                       | \$1,144                           | \$1,926                   | \$2,188                |
| Campbelltown – Macarthur      | \$993                             | \$1,904                   | \$2,098                |
| Unweighted Study area average | \$1,133                           | \$1,918                   | \$2,100                |
| Greater Sydney                | \$1,490                           | \$2,333                   | \$2,586                |

#### Table 6-6 Household income comparison

Cardno

Source: http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/quickstats, viewed 25/05/2015

The median household income review indicates that overall people residing in the study area have lower incomes than the Sydney average. Overall, residents in Glenfield have higher incomes, while residents in Macquarie Fields have lower incomes. The study area median household weekly income is 31.5% less than the Greater Sydney average.

Factors contributing to lower median incomes in additional to people with lower paid employment include retirees and potentially student households in the Campbelltown/ Macarthur close to the major education precinct. Household income could be linked with vehicle ownership and lower income households may be more dependent on public transport.

## 6.4 Vehicle ownership

Vehicle ownership is a key indicator for mode share. The portion of ownership or non-ownership indicates the feasibility of relying on other transport modes. Vehicle ownership is also linked with household income. **Table 6-7** provides a summary of the vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles per dwelling in each of the precincts. It also provides similar information for Sydney Outer South West SA4 and for the GMA.

| Precinct               | 0<br>veh | 1<br>veh | 2<br>veh | 3<br>veh | 4<br>veh+ | Dwellings | Total vehicles | Average veh/<br>dwelling |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Glenfield              | 9%       | 44%      | 33%      | 9%       | 4%        | 2,490     | 3,885          | 1.56                     |
| Macquarie Fields       | 12%      | 48%      | 29%      | 9%       | 3%        | 2,021     | 2,889          | 1.43                     |
| Minto                  | 15%      | 48%      | 27%      | 7%       | 3%        | 545       | 732            | 1.34                     |
| Ingleburn              | 13%      | 47%      | 28%      | 8%       | 4%        | 3,104     | 4,403          | 1.42                     |
| Leumeah                | 10%      | 47%      | 32%      | 8%       | 3%        | 2,169     | 3,187          | 1.47                     |
| Campbelltown           | 16%      | 38%      | 31%      | 11%      | 4%        | 2,371     | 3,480          | 1.47                     |
| Macarthur              | 15%      | 56%      | 23%      | 4%       | 1%        | 693       | 843            | 1.22                     |
| Combined               | 12%      | 46%      | 30%      | 9%       | 3%        | 13,393    | 19,419         | 1.45                     |
| Sydney Outer SW<br>SA4 | 7%       | 33%      | 39%      | 13%      | 7%        | 73,940    | 132,855        | 1.80                     |
| GMA Total              | 12%      | 39%      | 34%      | 10%      | 5%        | 1.9m      | 2.9m           | 1.56                     |

#### Table 6-7 Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, all dwelling structures 2011

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder, analysis by TMA

The average vehicles per dwelling varies across the precincts, with the two lowest, Macarthur and Minto, also having the highest proportion of FUAs (refer to **Table 6-5**). This association of lower rates of vehicle ownership with higher proportions of FUAs is a consistent attribute within the greater Sydney area. Of note is that 12% of dwellings in the combined precincts have zero vehicle ownership. Overall, the combined precincts have the same proportion of zero vehicle ownership as the GMA but higher than the Sydney Outer South West area at 7%. The Sydney Outer South West area has considerably higher vehicle ownership than the combined precincts. This corresponds with the high proportion of separate dwellings throughout the area.

Table 6-8 provides a similar analysis, but for separate dwellings only.

Cardno

| Table 6-8 Vehic        | le owne  | ership   | distribu | ution ar | nd avera  | ge vehicles, se | parate dwelling | structure 2011           |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Precinct               | 0<br>veh | 1<br>veh | 2<br>veh | 3<br>veh | 4<br>veh+ | Dwellings       | Total vehicles  | Average veh/<br>dwelling |
| Glenfield              | 6%       | 34%      | 39%      | 13%      | 7%        | 1,605           | 2,885           | 1.80                     |
| Macquarie Fields       | 8%       | 41%      | 34%      | 12%      | 5%        | 1,229           | 2,017           | 1.64                     |
| Minto                  | 11%      | 44%      | 30%      | 11%      | 4%        | 355             | 548             | 1.54                     |
| Ingleburn              | 9%       | 41%      | 33%      | 12%      | 5%        | 2,009           | 3,294           | 1.64                     |
| Leumeah                | 7%       | 41%      | 38%      | 10%      | 4%        | 1,570           | 2,577           | 1.64                     |
| Campbelltown           | 8%       | 35%      | 38%      | 14%      | 5%        | 1,671           | 2,865           | 1.71                     |
| Macarthur              | 11%      | 51%      | 33%      | 2%       | 2%        | 127             | 170             | 1.34                     |
| Combined               | 8%       | 39%      | 36%      | 12%      | 5%        | 8,566           | 14,356          | 1.68                     |
| Sydney Outer SW<br>SA4 | 5%       | 30%      | 42%      | 15%      | 8%        | 63,066          | 120,744         | 1.91                     |
| GMA                    | 6%       | 32%      | 42%      | 14%      | 6%        | ~1,200,000      | ~2,200,000      | 1.82                     |

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder, analysis by TMA

This analysis indicates that average vehicle ownership in each of the precincts for separate dwellings is higher than the average for all dwelling types (see **Table 6-7**). The combined precincts average vehicle ownership for separated dwellings is markedly lower than Sydney Outer South West SA4; and is lower than the GMA. The precincts have a higher percentage of single vehicle dwellings than the entire south west statistical area and GMA.

An analysis for vehicle ownership in semi dwellings is presented below in Table 6-9.

# Cardno'\_

| Precinct               | 0<br>veh | 1<br>veh | 2<br>veh | 3<br>veh | 4<br>veh+ | Dwellings | Total vehicles | Average veh/<br>dwelling |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Glenfield              | 13%      | 62%      | 23%      | 2%       | 0%        | 784       | 896            | 1.14                     |
| Macquarie Fields       | 17%      | 60%      | 19%      | 4%       | 0%        | 792       | 872            | 1.10                     |
| Minto                  | 23%      | 53%      | 24%      | 0%       | 0%        | 132       | 134            | 1.02                     |
| Ingleburn              | 21%      | 58%      | 19%      | 1%       | 1%        | 1,050     | 1,068          | 1.02                     |
| Leumeah                | 21%      | 59%      | 17%      | 3%       | 1%        | 412       | 425            | 1.03                     |
| Campbelltown           | 29%      | 48%      | 19%      | 4%       | 0%        | 360       | 356            | 0.99                     |
| Macarthur              | 6%       | 47%      | 36%      | 9%       | 3%        | 264       | 410            | 1.55                     |
| Combined               | 18%      | 58%      | 21%      | 3%       | 0%        | 3, 794    | 4,161          | 1.10                     |
| Sydney Outer SW<br>SA4 | 19%      | 54%      | 22%      | 4%       | 1%        | 8,382     | 9,569          | 1.14                     |
| GMA                    | 15%      | 49%      | 29%      | 5%       | 2%        | 220,368   | 282,847        | 1.28                     |

#### Table 6-9 Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, semi dwelling structure

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder, analysis by TMA

Semis have lower average vehicle ownership than the all dwellings average in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor, an average of 1.1 vehicles per dwelling compared with 1.45 vehicles per dwelling. They also have a higher proportion of zero vehicle dwellings than the all dwelling estimate.

Vehicle ownership distributions for FUAs are shown below in Table 6-10.

#### Table 6-10 Vehicle ownership distribution and average vehicles, FUA dwelling structure

| Precinct               | 0<br>veh | 1<br>veh | 2<br>veh | 3<br>veh  | 4<br>veh+    | Dwellings | Total vehicles | Average<br>veh/dwelling |  |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Glenfield              | 20%      | 57%      | 23%      | 0%        | 0%           | 101       | 104            | 1.03                    |  |
| Macquarie Fields       | na       | na       | na       | na        | na           | na        | na             | na                      |  |
| Minto                  | 28%      | 59%      | 14%      | 0%        | 0%           | 58        | 50             | 0.86                    |  |
| Ingleburn              | 18%      | 73%      | 9%       | 0%        | 0%           | 45        | 41             | 0.91                    |  |
| Leumeah                | 16%      | 70%      | 14%      | 0%        | 0%           | 187       | 185            | 0.99                    |  |
| Campbelltown           | 42%      | 46%      | 9%       | 1%        | 2%           | 340       | 259            | 0.76                    |  |
| Macarthur              | 24%      | 67%      | 8%       | 1%        | 0%           | 302       | 263            | 0.87                    |  |
| Combined               | 28%      | 59%      | 11%      | 1%        | 1%           | 1,033     | 902            | 0.87                    |  |
| Sydney Outer SW<br>SA4 | 27%      | 53%      | 15%      | 4%        | 2%           | 2,289     | 2,308          | 1.01                    |  |
| GMA                    | 26%      | 53%      | 18%      | 2%        | 1%           | 418,797   | 410,937        | 0.98                    |  |
|                        |          |          | No       | ote: na - | - not applie | cable.    |                |                         |  |

Source: ABS Census of Population and Housing 2011, extracted using Tablebuilder, analysis by TMA

FUAs have a lower average vehicle ownership than the all-dwelling type average, which is expected given the housing typology. Just under a third of FUAs are zero vehicle dwellings. FUAs in Sydney Outer South West have similar levels and distribution of vehicle ownership as the GMA.

Overall, the dwelling structure and vehicle ownership for the area indicate a direct relationship between higher density housing and vehicle ownership. In this regard, it is desirable to encourage higher density housing in locations close to town centres and transport hubs to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use.

## 6.5 Journey to work

Cardno

#### 6.5.1 Outline of approach

Journey to work (JTW) information is collected as part of ABS's Census of Population and Housing. This dataset provides detailed information about inferred travel between home and work, including the modes of travel used as part of the journey. This section provides JTW information for several different geographies, based on BTS's travel zones (TZ 2011) and includes:

- > Seven individual precincts which are the subject of this study.
- > Several comparison areas using aggregations of travel zones:
  - Campbelltown SA3 which is a slightly larger than the study area
  - Sydney Outer South West SA4 which covers Campbelltown SA3, Wollondilly SA3 and Camden SA3
  - GMA the Greater Metropolitan Area.

The precincts and overall study area are defined in terms of BTS travel zones. It is noted that the precincts do not directly concord with travel zones.

The summary information presented in the following sections includes:

- > JTW trip numbers by mode from (origins) the precincts and study area.
- > JTW mode shares from (origins) the precincts, study area and comparison areas.
- > JTW trip numbers by mode to (destinations) the precincts and study area.
- > JTW mode shares to (destinations) the precincts, study area and comparison areas.
- > Destinations of workers resident within the precincts and the study area.
- > Origin of workers employed within the precincts and the study area.
- > Live and work analysis examining the corridor's degree of self-containment.

#### 6.5.2 JTW trips from the corridor

Transport modes used by trips to and from the corridor were assessed with modifications to permit separate identification of bicycle trips. Mode shares for these commuter trips are summarised in **Table 6-11**. The study area's rail mode share is above that of Sydney Outer South West (SA4) and above the Sydney-wide average. Vehicle use is similar in the study area to the overall GMA average. Bus use is well below the GMA average (1% versus 6%). Minto has the highest rail mode share of 34% which is well above both the Sydney Outer SW (13%) and GMA (14%) averages.

# Cardno'\_

|                          | 10 10 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                |                   | •••••           |         | •              |               |       |
|--------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| Mode split               | Train | Bus                                   | Ferry/<br>Tram | Vehicle<br>driver | Vehicle<br>pass | Bicycle | Walked<br>only | Other<br>mode | Total |
| Glenfield                | 32%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 60%               | 5%              | 0%      | 2%             | 0%            | 100%  |
| Macquarie Fields         | 26%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 64%               | 6%              | 0%      | 1%             | 1%            | 100%  |
| Ingleburn                | 26%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 65%               | 5%              | 0%      | 2%             | 1%            | 100%  |
| Minto                    | 34%   | 0%                                    | 0%             | 55%               | 5%              | 0%      | 4%             | 2%            | 100%  |
| Leumeah                  | 19%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 71%               | 7%              | 0%      | 1%             | 0%            | 100%  |
| Macarthur                | 25%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 64%               | 6%              | 1%      | 3%             | 0%            | 100%  |
| Campbelltown             | 17%   | 2%                                    | 0%             | 69%               | 7%              | 0%      | 4%             | 1%            | 100%  |
| Corridor                 | 25%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 65%               | 6%              | 0%      | 2%             | 1%            | 100%  |
|                          |       |                                       | Comp           | oarison Are       | as              |         |                |               |       |
| Campbelltown SA3         | 18%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 72%               | 7%              | 0%      | 2%             | 1%            | 100%  |
| Sydney Outer SW<br>(SA4) | 13%   | 1%                                    | 0%             | 77%               | 6%              | 0%      | 2%             | 0%            | 100%  |
| GMA                      | 14%   | 6%                                    | 0%             | 68%               | 6%              | 1%      | 4%             | 1%            | 100%  |

#### Table 6-11 Journey to Work origin mode shares with comparison areas

Source: BTS 2011 JTW tables 13 v1.3 & 14 v1.4 (for bicycles)

Bus use within the precincts is low, which may indicate that rail and private vehicle travel times are much more competitive as well as other service level, time and cost factors. This is also likely to be a result of parking policy and expectation in the region.

Vehicle driver and passenger make up 71% of the mode share for the precincts, which is slightly lower than the GMA, Sydney Outer SW and Campbelltown SA3. Comparatively the precincts use of private vehicles is lower than the surrounding area, however generally in line the GMA average.

Bicycle use for the precincts is low, with less than 1% cycling to work. This is below the GMA of 1% and in line with Campbelltown SA3 and Sydney Outer SW. Walking to work represents 2% of journeys, which is in line with Sydney Outer SW and Campbelltown SA3, however half the GMA average of 4%.

Areas of interest include Minto, with a below average private vehicle usage of 70% and corresponding higher usage of rail at 34%. Similarly Glenfield has a below average use of private vehicle with 65% and corresponding higher use of rail and bus representing 33%.

#### 6.5.3 JTW trips to the corridor

**Table 6-12** outlines JTW for employment within the precincts i.e. for people who travel to the study area precincts to work.



| Table 6-12 Journey to work destination mode shares with comparison areas |       |     |             |                   |                      |                    |         |             |            |       |
|--|-------|-----|-------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|-------|
| Mode split   | Train | Bus | Ferry/ Tram | Vehicle<br>driver | Vehicle<br>passenger | Vehicle<br>(Total) | Bicycle | Walked only | Other mode | Total |
| Glenfield  | 4%    | 1%  | 0%          | 82%               | 7%                   | 89%                | 1%      | 5%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| Macquarie Fields   | 2%    | 3%  | 0%          | 82%               | 8%                   | 90%                | 1%      | 3%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| Ingleburn  | 5%    | 1%  | 0%          | 84%               | 7%                   | 91%                | 0%      | 2%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| Minto  | 4%    | 1%  | 0%          | 85%               | 8%                   | 93%                | 0%      | 2%          | 0%         | 100%  |
| Leumeah  | 5%    | 1%  | 0%          | 84%               | 9%                   | 93%                | 0%      | 1%          | 0%         | 100%  |
| Campbelltown   | 4%    | 3%  | 0%          | 83%               | 8%                   | 91%                | 0%      | 2%          | 0%         | 100%  |
| Macarthur  | 5%    | 3%  | 0%          | 81%               | 8%                   | 89%                | 0%      | 2%          | 0%         | 100%  |
| Corridor   | 4%    | 2%  | 0%          | 83%               | 8%                   | 91%                | 0%      | 2%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| Campbelltown (SA3)   | 4%    | 2%  | 0%          | 83%               | 8%                   | 91%                | 0%      | 2%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| Sydney Outer SW (SA4)  | 3%    | 1%  | 0%          | 85%               | 8%                   | 93%                | 0%      | 2%          | 1%         | 100%  |
| GMA  | 14%   | 6%  | 0%          | 68%               | 6%                   | 74%                | 1%      | 5%          | 1%         | 100%  |
|  |       |     |             |                   |                      |                    |         |             |            |       |

#### Table 6-12 Journey to work destination mode shares with comparison areas

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table5v1.3

Vehicle use to travel to work within the corridor is very high, with 91% of trips made by driving or being a passenger. This is significantly higher than the GMA with 74%, the same as Campbelltown SA3 with 91% and lower than Sydney Outer SW with 93%.

#### 6.5.4 JTW destinations of the study area's resident workers

Table 6-13 identifies the top twenty destinations for JTW travel originating in the study area. The entire study area has been assessed to determine the potential rail customer base for those travelling to areas served by rail.

|      | Top twenty destinations of corridor s resident workers |        |      |
|------|--|--------|------|
| Rank | Destination SA3  | Trips  | %    |
| 1    | Campbelltown (NSW)                                     | 7,455  | 32%  |
| 2    | Sydney Inner City                                      | 3,219  | 14%  |
| 3    | Liverpool  | 2,276  | 10%  |
| 4    | Bankstown  | 1,188  | 5%   |
| 5    | No fixed work address (GMA)                            | 819    | 4%   |
| 6    | Camden   | 814    | 3%   |
| 7    | Fairfield  | 701    | 3%   |
| 8    | Parramatta   | 676    | 3%   |
| 9    | Merrylands - Guildford                                 | 668    | 3%   |
| 10   | Botany   | 654    | 3%   |
| 11   | Auburn   | 547    | 2%   |
| 12   | Strathfield - Burwood - Ashfield                       | 388    | 2%   |
| 13   | Bringelly - Green Valley                               | 359    | 2%   |
| 14   | North Sydney - Mosman                                  | 282    | 1%   |
| 15   | Mount Druitt   | 276    | 1%   |
| 16   | Canterbury   | 256    | 1%   |
| 17   | Hurstville   | 211    | 1%   |
| 18   | Ryde - Hunters Hill                                    | 210    | 1%   |
| 19   | Blacktown  | 206    | 1%   |
| 20   | Chatswood – Lane Cove                                  | 188    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top twenty                                   | 21,392 | 92%  |
|      | Total  | 23,326 | 100% |

| Table 6-13 | Top twenty destinations of corridor's resident workers |
|------------|--|
|------------|--|

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

Close to a third of the study areas resident workforce are employed in Campbelltown

#### 6.5.5 JTW origins of workers in the study area

The top 20 origins of people who work within the study area is shown in **Table 6-14**.



| Rank | Origin SA3                       | Trips  | %    |
|------|----------------------------------|--------|------|
| 1    | Campbelltown (NSW)               | 17,244 | 49%  |
| 2    | Camden                           | 4,269  | 12%  |
| 3    | Wollondilly                      | 2,047  | 6%   |
| 4    | Liverpool                        | 1,793  | 5%   |
| 5    | Bringelly - Green Valley         | 1,273  | 4%   |
| 6    | Fairfield                        | 1,266  | 4%   |
| 7    | Wollongong                       | 614    | 2%   |
| 8    | Bankstown                        | 597    | 2%   |
| 9    | Penrith                          | 419    | 1%   |
| 10   | Southern Highlands               | 416    | 1%   |
| 11   | Sutherland - Menai - Heathcote   | 414    | 1%   |
| 12   | Merrylands - Guildford           | 395    | 1%   |
| 13   | Hurstville                       | 353    | 1%   |
| 14   | Parramatta                       | 259    | 1%   |
| 15   | Canterbury                       | 257    | 1%   |
| 16   | Cronulla - Miranda - Caringbah   | 231    | 1%   |
| 17   | Strathfield - Burwood - Ashfield | 225    | 1%   |
| 18   | Kogarah - Rockdale               | 219    | 1%   |
| 19   | Mount Druitt                     | 218    | 1%   |
| 20   | Blacktown                        | 216    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top twenty             | 32,722 | 93%  |
|      | Total                            | 35,318 | 100% |

| Table 6-14 | Top twenty origins of workers within study area |
|------------|---|
|------------|---|

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

Of the all the people that work in the study area, close to half live in Campbelltown and the majority living in the south west 'wedge' of the broader Sydney area.

#### 6.5.6 JTW employment self-containment

A detailed analysis of the people that live and work along the corridor has been undertaken to determine the influence of a transport corridor on this relationship as shown in **Table 6-15**.

| Table 6-15 Proportion of corridor's resident workers who also work in the corridor |
|--|
|--|

| Precinct         | Total employed population per precinct | Number of employed population who also work along the corridor | Proportion of employed<br>people who live and work<br>along corridor |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Glenfield        | 3,492                                  | 708  | 20%  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields | 2,983                                  | 776  | 26%  |  |  |
| Ingleburn        | 6,419                                  | 1,907  | 30%  |  |  |
| Minto            | 731                                    | 245  | 34%  |  |  |
| Leumeah          | 3,532                                  | 1,273  | 36%  |  |  |
| Campbelltown     | 3,948                                  | 1,451  | 37%  |  |  |
| Macarthur        | 2,221                                  | 675  | 30%  |  |  |
| Study area       | 23,326                                 | 7,035  | 30%  |  |  |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

The study area has a reasonable level of self-containment, with 30% of workers also living in the study area. This represents an opportunity to increase sustainable modes of travel usage as the distance to work is likely to be relatively short, given the corridor length of approximately 16 kilometres.

Comparison of mode shares for all of the study area's workers and those who live and work in the corridor is presented in below in **Table 6-16**.

Corridor's workers' mode shares for JTW – all origins and origins of those who live

|                     | and work in t     |                       | res for 5 f w – all origin     | is and origins of   |                    |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Precinct            | Car mode<br>share | Transit mode<br>share | Total mechanised<br>mode share | Other mode<br>share | Walk mode<br>share |
|                     |                   | All                   | JTW Origins                    |                     |                    |
| Glenfield           | 66%               | 32%                   | 97%                            | 1%                  | 2%                 |
| Macquarie<br>Fields | 71%               | 27%                   | 97%                            | 1%                  | 2%                 |
| Ingleburn           | 70%               | 27%                   | 97%                            | 1%                  | 2%                 |
| Minto               | 60%               | 33%                   | 93%                            | 2%                  | 5%                 |
| Leumeah             | 78%               | 20%                   | 98%                            | 1%                  | 1%                 |
| Campbelltown        | 76%               | 19%                   | 95%                            | 1%                  | 4%                 |
| Macarthur           | 70%               | 26%                   | 96%                            | 0%                  | 3%                 |
| Corridor            | 70%               | 25%                   | 95%                            | 1%                  | 2%                 |
|                     |                   | JT                    | W live & work                  |                     |                    |
| Glenfield           | 82%               | 8%                    | 90%                            | 3%                  | 7%                 |
| Macquarie<br>Fields | 84%               | 8%                    | 93%                            | 2%                  | 6%                 |
| Ingleburn           | 83%               | 7%                    | 90%                            | 2%                  | 8%                 |
| Minto               | 76%               | 6%                    | 82%                            | 2%                  | 16%                |
| Leumeah             | 89%               | 7%                    | 96%                            | 1%                  | 3%                 |
| Campbelltown        | 82%               | 9%                    | 90%                            | 2%                  | 8%                 |
| Macarthur           | 86%               | 5%                    | 91%                            | 1%                  | 9%                 |
| Corridor            | 84%               | 7%                    | 91%                            | 2%                  | 7%                 |

Note: car mode share includes car driver and car passenger; transit is train, bus, tram, ferry; mechanised is car and transit; mode shares are compared with a base of those that travelled on census day and provide a mode (i.e. excludes worked at home, did not go to work and mode not stated)

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

**Table 6-16** indicates that residents who work in the corridor have much lower transit mode share and higher walk share than all workers in the study area.

## 6.6 Household travel survey

Cardno

Table 6-16

The BTS Household Travel Survey provides information on travel undertaken by residents of the Sydney Greater Metropolitan Area. The following tables provide background information for the study. This data is more general for the corridor, not just the station precincts.

 Table 6-17 indicates the sample size of the HTS by direction of travel and purpose.



| To/from         | Go to work | Work related<br>business | Education/<br>childcare/<br>Personal<br>business | Shopping | Social/<br>recreation | Serve<br>passenger | Go home | Other | Total   |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|--|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|---------|
| To Study Area   | 156        | 111                      | 198  | 273      | 267                   | 339                | 648     | 50    | 2,042   |
| From Study Area | 152        | 117                      | 178  | 229      | 244                   | 312                | 761     | 49    | 2,042   |
| Within GMA      | 8,117      | 6,744                    | 10,074   | 12,193   | 16,757                | 14,565             | 38,203  | 2,872 | 109,525 |

#### Table 6-17 HTS sample by purpose to, from study area and within GMA

Source: BTS Request 14818; HTS five years pooled linked trip data from 08/09 to 12/13

Table 6-18 summarises weighted estimates of travel (trips) from the HTS.

#### Table 6-18 HTS weighted trip estimates by purpose to, from study area and within GMA

| To/from            | Go to work | Work related<br>business | Education/ch<br>ildcare/Perso<br>nal business | Shopping  | Social/recrea<br>tion | Serve<br>passenger | Go home   | Other   | Total      |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|---|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|------------|
| To Study Area      | 30,010     | 20,649                   | 38,342  | 54,608    | 49,158                | 63,216             | 124,048   | 9,411   | 389,441    |
| From Study<br>Area | 29,083     | 22,450                   | 34,337  | 45,240    | 47,635                | 58,317             | 143,487   | 9,015   | 389,564    |
| Within GMA         | 1,546,494  | 1,288,732                | 1,819,846                                     | 2,313,039 | 3,139,665             | 2,675,855          | 7,078,193 | 564,673 | 20,426,496 |

Source: BTS Request 14818; HTS five years pooled linked trip data from 08/09 to 12/13, weighted to estimated resident population 30 June 2012

The purpose shares of travel in the study area are reported below and compared with the Sydney-wide average. This comparison indicates similar purpose characteristics of travel for Sydney and the study area. A higher proportion of trips to and from the study area are for the purpose of ferrying passengers (16% and 15%) than in the GMA (13%).

## Table 6-19 Household travel survey weighted proportions by purpose to, from study area and within the GMA

| To/from         | Go to work | Work related<br>business | Education/ch<br>ildcare/Perso<br>nal business | Shopping | Social/recrea<br>tion | Serve<br>passenger | Go home | Other | Total |
|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|---|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|-------|
| To Study Area   | 8%         | 5%                       | 10%   | 14%      | 13%                   | 16%                | 32%     | 2%    | 100%  |
| From Study Area | 7%         | 6%                       | 9%  | 12%      | 12%                   | 15%                | 37%     | 2%    | 100%  |
| Within GMA      | 8%         | 6%                       | 9%  | 11%      | 15%                   | 13%                | 35%     | 3%    | 100%  |

Source: BTS Request 14818; HTS five years pooled linked trip data from 08/09 to 12/13, weighted to estimated resident population 30 June 2012

## 6.7 Rail demand

The following tables summarise station use within the study area for weekday 24 hour ins and outs (combined) and AM peak ins and outs<sup>1</sup>. A change index series, based on 2004, provides an indication of proportional changes for these stations as well as for stations across the rail system.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> AM peak – 0600 to 0930

| Station                                   | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Glenfield                                 | 7,720  | 9,500  | 10,440 | 10,860 | 11,600 | 12,260 | 9,780  | 9,180  | 9,520  | 9,480  |
| Macquarie Fields                          | 2,720  | 2,680  | 2,580  | 2,180  | 2,260  | 2,240  | 2,080  | 2,140  | 2,280  | 2,580  |
| Minto                                     | 7,280  | 7,280  | 7,020  | 7,860  | 7,700  | 7,540  | 7,260  | 7,340  | 7,360  | 5,700  |
| Ingleburn                                 | 8,520  | 7,920  | 7,780  | 7,880  | 8,120  | 8,180  | 7,640  | 7,640  | 7,940  | 7,740  |
| Leumeah                                   | 6,700  | 6,780  | 6,800  | 6,980  | 7,180  | 7,340  | 6,020  | 6,200  | 6,060  | 4,900  |
| Campbelltown                              | 13,940 | 13,980 | 13,700 | 12,560 | 12,520 | 12,060 | 11,260 | 11,440 | 12,740 | 12,120 |
| Macarthur                                 | 3,420  | 2,140  | 2,400  | 3,800  | 4,600  | 5,240  | 5,240  | 6,140  | 4,540  | 4,600  |
| Total                                     | 50,300 | 50,280 | 50,720 | 52,120 | 53,980 | 54,860 | 49,280 | 50,080 | 50,440 | 47,120 |
| Index (2004 = 1.00)<br>– total            | 1.00   | 1.00   | 1.01   | 1.04   | 1.07   | 1.09   | 0.98   | 1.00   | 1.00   | 0.94   |
| Index (2004 = 1.00)<br>- rail system-wide | 1.00   | 0.98   | 1.00   | 1.04   | 1.09   | 1.10   | 1.11   | 1.15   | 1.16   | 1.18   |

## Table 6-20 Historic station barrier counts, 24 hours total ins and outs on weekdays

Source: Analysis of BTS Rail station barrier counts 2004-13

**Table 6-20** indicates an overall increase from 2004 to 2009, followed by a decline through to 2013, to a level about 4 to 5% lower than the 2004 levels. The data indicates rail usage volumes have been largely static over the previous 10 year period. Overall, Campbelltown is the busiest station by passenger volumes within the corridor and the 44<sup>th</sup> busiest station on the metropolitan network.

An analysis for the AM peak barrier counts of station entries (ins) is presented in Table 6-21.

#### Table 6-21 Station barrier counts, AM peaks 'ins' on weekdays

| Index (2004 =<br>1.00) – total | 1.00   | 0.99   | 0.99   | 1.02   | 1.05   | 1.06   | 1.01   | 1.04   | 1.09   | 0.99   |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Total                          | 13,590 | 13,410 | 13,460 | 13,880 | 14,320 | 14,400 | 13,730 | 14,080 | 14,810 | 13,440 |
| Macarthur                      | 670    | 400    | 460    | 730    | 890    | 980    | 980    | 1,150  | 1,010  | 1,030  |
| Campbelltown                   | 3,620  | 3,630  | 3,560  | 3,260  | 3,240  | 3,120  | 2,920  | 2,970  | 3,660  | 3,180  |
| Leumeah                        | 1,980  | 2,020  | 2,030  | 2,090  | 2,170  | 2,210  | 2,050  | 2,040  | 2,000  | 1,580  |
| Ingleburn                      | 2,090  | 1,810  | 1,780  | 1,800  | 1,860  | 1,870  | 2,060  | 2,060  | 2,100  | 2,050  |
| Minto                          | 2,270  | 2,270  | 2,190  | 2,520  | 2,470  | 2,420  | 2,330  | 2,250  | 2,260  | 1,680  |
| Macquarie Fields               | 810    | 800    | 780    | 710    | 730    | 720    | 670    | 680    | 730    | 770    |
| Glenfield                      | 2,150  | 2,480  | 2,660  | 2,770  | 2,960  | 3,080  | 2,720  | 2,930  | 3,050  | 3,150  |
| Station                        | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   | 2011   | 2012   | 2013   |

Source: Analysis of BTS Rail station barrier counts 2004-13

Review of the AM peak ins in **Table 6-21** indicates station volumes have been largely static over the last available 10 year period whereas the overall network AM peak volumes increased by 15%.

| Station                        | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  | 2011  | 2012  | 2013  |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Glenfield                      | 530   | 900   | 1,080 | 1,100 | 1,140 | 1,230 | 1,010 | 790   | 800   | 830   |
| Macquarie Fields               | 120   | 120   | 120   | 50    | 50    | 50    | 50    | 60    | 70    | 120   |
| Minto                          | 340   | 340   | 330   | 290   | 280   | 280   | 270   | 250   | 250   | 420   |
| Ingleburn                      | 830   | 760   | 740   | 750   | 770   | 770   | 580   | 580   | 620   | 610   |
| Leumeah                        | 300   | 640   | 640   | 640   | 640   | 650   | 150   | 190   | 180   | 130   |
| Campbelltown                   | 1,010 | 1,010 | 1,000 | 860   | 860   | 840   | 900   | 910   | 770   | 890   |
| Macarthur                      | 220   | 270   | 280   | 440   | 530   | 570   | 570   | 670   | 410   | 420   |
| Total                          | 3,350 | 4,040 | 4,190 | 4,130 | 4,270 | 4,390 | 3,530 | 3,450 | 3,100 | 3,420 |
| Index (2004 = 1.00)<br>– total | 1.00  | 1.21  | 1.25  | 1.23  | 1.27  | 1.31  | 1.05  | 1.03  | 0.93  | 1.02  |

#### Table 6-22 Station barrier counts, AM peak 'outs' on weekdays

Source: Analysis of BTS Rail station barrier counts 2004-13

Review of the AM peak station outs in **Figure 6-1** shows a similar overall level of station in movements during the AM peak period.

The directional balance of barrier counts during the AM peak can provide an indication of the type of demand supported by a particular station. In movements suggest that the station is supporting an outflow of patrons from an area (typically a residential catchment and/or park and ride); Out movements indicate that the station is probably serving a catchment with substantive employment and education uses. The following charts shows the directional balance of barrier counts for the study area stations in 2013.

#### Figure 6-1 Analysis of directional split of AM peak barrier counts, Ins as % of total - 2013



Source: Analysis BTS Rail station barrier counts 2004-13

**Figure 6-1** shows that all stations in the corridor have a much higher (70% plus) proportion of in movements in the AM peak than out movements. Stations with an employment base, such as Campbelltown, Macarthur and Ingleburn tend to have slightly lower peak station ins as a percentage of total barrier counts.



#### 6.7.1 <u>Rail opal data</u>

Rail Opal data was analysed for station alightings, train trip containment, time of day tap on/off and day of week tap on. The data was for the month of February 2015. It should be noted that this is outside of university semester periods which would result in slightly lower demand.

#### **Rail destinations**

Opal data for train journeys from the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor to the rest of the Sydney Trains network was gathered for train trips in February 2015. The top five destinations for each of the stations within the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor was analysed.

The top five origins to destinations from the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor in February 2015 are provided in **Figure 6-2**. The highest proportion of Opal card trips occurred between Glenfield to Central with approximately 8000 trips, closely followed by Glenfield to Wynyard with just over 7,500 Opal card trips.



Figure 6-2 Top five rail origin to destination trips for the study area

The majority of train travel by Opal commuters is Sydney CBD bound, which include Central, Town Hall, Wynyard, St James and Museum Stations. The graphs for origin-destination from commuters within the study area are provided as follows.





#### Figure 6-3 Top six most common rail destinations from stations in the corridor

Note: The six destinations for rail trips from the corridor in the above chart cover the top five destinations for each of the individual precincts. Although the trips are provided from each precinct origin to all six destinations, one of the destinations will not be in the precincts top five. For example, Parramatta is not in Glenfield's top five destinations but it is in Leumeah's, Macquarie Fields, Minto and Campbelltown's top five.

Source: Opal data - February 2015

Cardno

Inner Sydney and Parramatta are significant employment areas and generate rail patronage from the residents of the corridor. It is likely a number of factors influence the decision to use public transport to these areas, including availability and cost of parking, ease of access, travel time length, reliability and cost.





#### Rail trip containment

Campbelltown Station was the key destination for Opal card passengers traveling from all stations in the corridor except Macarthur. Ingleburn and Macarthur are also popular intra-corridor destinations. There is a particularly high movement of passengers between Campbelltown and Ingleburn Stations. This shows that the rail network is used to make intra-corridor trips.

**Figure 6-4** shows the intra-corridor trips for commuters within the corridor. Each station has a small percentage of intra-corridor trips that begin and end at the same station. This is due to reverse tap-ons and commuters arriving at the station of origin within 1 hour of departure, which is counted as a transfer under the Opal system.





#### Station Opal card patronage

**Figure 6-5** shows the number of Opal card commuters that alighted from the train at the stations within the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor in February 2015. Campbelltown and Glenfield Stations had the highest patronage across the corridor. This could be attributed to the significant commuter car parking at both stations, the provision of the Campbelltown bus interchange adjacent to Campbelltown Station and employment opportunities in Campbelltown. Ingleburn, Minto, Leumeah and Macarthur all had similar volumes of Opal card alighting's over February 2015; between 30,000 and 40,000 each. Macquarie Fields Station was the least patronised station throughout February with only 12,500 Opal passengers alighting at this station.





#### Figure 6-5 Station alighting's in February

#### Time of day tap ons

The times of day that Opal passengers tapped on at the stations through the corridor in February 2015 are shown on **Figure 6-6**. Overall, most stations have a big influx during the morning peak, usually between 7:00 – 8:00am. The peak morning time at Campbelltown starts earlier and continues for two hours from 6:00 - 8:00am, compared with a one hour peak for the other stations within the corridor.

Significantly fewer Opal passengers tapped on at train stations throughout the corridor in the afternoon peak than the morning peak. This is because there is predominantly more residential, than educational and employment land uses in the corridor; people leave in the morning and arrive back to the corridor in the afternoon. The Ingleburn, Glenfield and Minto Stations' afternoon peak tap on for Opal users is earlier than that for Campbelltown and Macarthur. This could be due to the differing industries between the precincts; industrial employees and construction workers may finish work earlier than retail and office workers.



Figure 6-6 Time of day tap ons in February

Cardno

### Day of tap on

The days in which Opal card users access the train network are all relatively similar. Wednesday is typically the busiest day for stations in the corridor and Sunday the quietest. **Figure 6-7** presents the data for day of travel by Opal card users in February. Macarthur has the smallest percentage difference between weekday and weekend Opal passenger volumes.



Figure 6-7 Day of tap on in February 2015





#### 6.7.2 <u>Rail capacity</u>

No capacity constraints have been identified for train services when operating along the corridor. This is not unexpected given the location of the stops in relation to the rail network and its key attraction location, Sydney CBD. Capacity constraints on the rail network are evident when services are close to city stations and are busiest in the AM peak period. 2013 BTS rail passenger statistics indicate that at Green Square or Sydenham, during the AM peak hour 8:00am – 8:59am on average trains carried 114% of their seated capacity, however over the 3.5 hour morning peak 6:00am – 9:30am, on average 85% of seated capacity was observed to be utilised at these stations.

## 6.8 Bus demand

Bus use and demand data has been assessed through Opal data as this was the only data source that could be made available.

The tap on data for buses at all bus stops within the corridor were provided for Opal card users for a week in February 2015. The main interchanges and trip generator locations such as shopping centres, educational precincts, and sports precincts are summarised in this section.

The top 10 stops is shown in Table 6-23.

| Rank | Precinct Location | Location   | Weekly Customers | Average Weekday |
|------|-------------------|--|------------------|-----------------|
| 1    | Campbelltown      | Campbelltown Interchange                                     | 12,311           | 2,184           |
| 2    | Ingleburn         | Ingleburn Station -  | 4,311            | 736             |
| 3    | Glenfield         | Glenfield Station  | 3,343            | 602             |
| 4    | Macarthur         | Macarthur Square (stops not at station, along Menangle Road) | 2,960            | 463             |
| 5    | Minto             | Minto Station  | 2,487            | 463             |
| 6    | Leumeah           | Leumeah Station  | 1,762            | 302             |
| 7    | Minto             | Minto Mall   | 1,652            | 263             |
| 8    | Macquarie Fields  | Macquarie Fields TAFE  | 908              | 153             |
| 9    | Macarthur         | Campbelltown Hospital  | 616              | 105             |
| 10   | Macquarie Fields  | Macquarie Fields Station                                     | 263              | 53              |

 Table 6-23 Top 5 busiest locations by passenger volume bus stops

The data review indicates that bus services are mostly used to connect with stations, however two shopping centres, health and educational uses also feature. It is noted that Macarthur station had relatively low patronage of bus services. Given the 34 bus services operating approximately 1,344 services per weekday within the study corridor, the service usage appears to be moderate.

#### Glenfield

There are two main bus stops at the Glenfield Station interchange that are both located on the eastern side of the station, along Railway Parade. Both of these bus stops cater for the services 864, 867, 870, 871, 872, with buses departing from the bus stop on the western side of Railway Parade (Stop ID 216711) travelling towards Liverpool, and services from the eastern side of Railway Parade (Stop ID 216712) proceeding towards Campbelltown.

Opal card tap on data for a week in February 2015 shows 1,968 passengers travelling towards Campbelltown, while services to Liverpool carried 1,375 passengers. **Figure 6-8** shows the weekly and average weekday users of the main trip generating bus stops within the precinct.



#### Figure 6-8Glenfield precinct main bus stops





#### Macquarie Fields

Macquarie Fields Station caters for only one bus route; Route 876 that runs in a loop to connect the eastern parts of the suburb to the train station. The weekly Opal bus customers at the bus stop adjacent to the station (Stop ID 256491) was approximately 263.

In addition to the station, the South Western Sydney TAFE in the north eastern side of the Macquarie Fields precinct caters for the 870 and 872 bus routes towards Liverpool and Campbelltown. This bus route (Stop ID 256485) was used by 908 weekly users in February 2015. **Figure 6-9** shows the trip volumes for the Macquarie Fields Station bus stop and TAFE bus stops.









#### Ingleburn

Ingleburn Station has two bus stops, located on either side of Ingleburn Road, with services towards Liverpool and Campbelltown. The routes that service the station include 869, 870, 871, 872 and 873. Services departing from the eastern side (Stop ID 256518) travel towards Campbelltown. 1,698 Opal card passengers accessed this bus stop in one week during February 2015. For services to Liverpool (Stop ID 256564), 2,613 Opal card passengers accessed this bus stop during the one week period.

In addition to the train station, a bus stop is located at Ingleburn shops, another main trip generator within the precinct. This stop (Stop ID 256517) caters for bus services 870, 871 and 873 for services to Liverpool and Minto. 166 Opal card passengers used these services during the week in February. The station and Ingleburn shop bus stops are shown in **Figure 6-10**, along with their weekly and average weekday Opal passenger use.



#### Figure 6-10 Ingleburn Precinct main bus stops





#### Minto

Three bus stops are located at Minto Station, two on the eastern side and one on the western side. The western side bus stop (Stop ID 256628) service the areas towards Minto, Gregory Hill and Campbelltown and are services by routes 850,874,875 and 880. 763 Opal card passengers accessed the Minto Railway Station bus stop during a week in February 2015.

On the eastern side, bus stops located on Minto Road (Stop ID 2566233) and Redfern Road (256664). The Minto Road bus stop is located on the southern side of the road and caters for Route 873 towards Ingleburn. 460 Opal card customers used this bus stop during a week in February 2015. The Redfern Road bus stops services routes 873, 874 and 875 towards Minto and Raby. This bus stop had Opal card use of 1,264 during a week in February 2015.

In addition to the train station, Minto Marketplace presents a location where trip generation is expected to be high. Although just outside the precinct area, Minto Marketplace is likely to generate trips from customers within the precinct area. Altogether, 1,652 customers used the Minto Marketplace bus stops (Stop ID 256629/256666) in a week in February 2015. The bus routes that service the Marketplace are 850, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874 and 875, of which three also service Minto Station. The main Minto bus stops and weekly and average weekday use are shown in **Figure 6-11**.



#### Figure 6-11 Minto Precinct main bus stops





#### Leumeah

Three bus stops are located at Leumeah Station, two on the eastern side, and one on the western side. The western side bus stop (Stop ID 2560667) caters for Route 879 which travels to Campbelltown. Opal data from February 2015 shows a weekly use of this bus stop of 302 passengers. The service departs from the roundabout at the end of Plough Inn Road.

There were 1,460 Opal bus customers accessing the bus stop on the southern side of O'Sullivan Road (Stop ID 2560267) during the February 2015 week. The routes that service this bus stop are the 870, 871, 872 and 881. Opal data for bus stop 256085 was not available.

In addition to the station bus stop, the Sports Stadium is also a major trip generator during sports events. The Opal data that was received shows a weekly usage of 116 commuters over the week in February 2015. This number is likely to be higher during sporting events at the stadium. **Figure 6-12** shows the location and the recorded weekly and average daily commuters at each stop.



#### Figure 6-12 Leumeah Precinct main bus stops





#### Campbelltown

Campbelltown Station includes a major bus interchange on the southern side of the station, and two bus stops on the northern side of the station. The bus interchange consists of bus stops A to F. These bus stops provide services within the Campbelltown LGA, Picton, Wollongong, Camden and Narellan. Over the course of a week, 11,341 Opal card passengers accessed bus services at this interchange.

On the northern side of the station, 970 Opal card passengers used services from both these bus stops. Only the 880 service to Minto runs from this side of the station. Opal card usage for the key bus stops in the Campbelltown precinct for the week in February 2015 is shown in **Figure 6-13**.



#### Figure 6-13 Campbelltown Precinct main bus stops






#### Macarthur

The Macarthur precinct has various major trip generators which include the train station, Campbelltown TAFE, University of Western Sydney (UWS), Macarthur Square and Campbelltown Hospital.

Macarthur Station includes three bus stops in close vicinity to the station entrance. Together these bus stops had a total bus tap on of 302 commuters over a week in February 2015. Bus services from Macarthur Station connect to other destinations within the study corridor including Leumeah and Minto and suburbs west of the Hume Motorway that are without rail access such as Narellan, Mount Annan, Oran Park and Currans Hill. Bus services are also provided to suburbs south of Macarthur including Bradbury, Ambarvale and Airds.

The Campbelltown TAFE and UWS are the main educational trip generators in the precinct. No Opal data was available for UWS customers, while the Campbelltown TAFE bus stops together had a combined usage of 156 users over the week.

Campbelltown Hospital has a main bus stop inside the hospital precinct, and two other bus stops along Therry Road. The main bus stop inside the hospital precinct (Stop ID 2560334) had a weekly patronage of 443 Opal card users in February 2015. The bus stops along Therry Road had a combined total of 26 Opal card users.

The final main trip generator in the Macarthur Precinct is Macarthur Square, which is the main shopping complex in the precinct. This shopping complex consists of four main bus stops. There was a combined weekly total of 2,885 Opal card tap ons at Macarthur Square in February 2015.

**Figure 6-14** shows the weekly and average weekday Opal cards users at each of the main trip generators in the Macarthur Precinct.



#### Figure 6-14 Macarthur Precinct main bus stops



## 6.9 Key considerations

Cardno

The existing travel behaviour within the study area provides an insight into how the study area functions and consequently transport considerations. Key considerations for the study area are described below.

- > Dwelling structure within a precinct indicates the density, likely travel patterns and vehicle ownership. The dwelling structure in the study area is predominately 63%, low-density separate housing. This type of dwelling structure in a precinct is likely to lead to higher vehicle use for all trips. Semis (townhouses/ terraces/ row houses) represent 29% of all dwellings, this type of dwelling structure supports higher use of walking, cycling and public transport. Flats, units and apartments (FUA) represent 8% of dwellings, this form of dwelling supports and encourages sustainable modes of transport. FUAs provide the density for public transport and all day activity promotes a feeling of safety to walk and cycle throughout the day.
- > Vehicle ownership within the study area varies, with more single vehicle households compared to the GMA and less 2, 3 and 4+ vehicle households compared to the GMA which is presented in Table 6-24.

| Precinct                        | 0 veh | 1 veh | 2 veh | 3 veh | 4<br>veh+ | Dwellings  | Total<br>vehicles | Average veh/<br>dwelling |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Glenfield to Macarthur corridor | 12%   | 46%   | 30%   | 9%    | 3%        | 13,393     | 19,419            | 1.45                     |
| GMA Total                       | 12%   | 39%   | 34%   | 10%   | 5%        | ~1.900,000 | ~2.900,000        | 1.56                     |

#### Table 6-24 Vehicle ownership comparison

- > There are opportunities to capitalise on the lower proportion of 2+ vehicle dwellings to encourage the use of more sustainable transport modes.
- > Journey to work data for people who live in the study area indicates a high proportion of vehicle driver and passenger, 65% and 6% respectively with a total of 71% of all trips by vehicle. This is a little lower than the mode share splits for Greater Sydney, vehicle drivers and passengers at 68% and 6% respectively. This proportion of journey to work trips indicates a significant reliance on the private motor vehicle and is likely to result in short trips to work also being taken by private motor vehicle. This is an opportunity to increase walking, cycling and the use of public transport.
- > The journey to work mode shares for people working in the study area represent an even higher reliance on private motor vehicles with the proportion of vehicle drivers and passengers at 83% and 8% respectively, a total of 91% of all work trips to jobs located in the corridor. There is a significant difference between the trips to jobs located in the corridor and work trips in Greater Sydney. This may indicate the study area's workers live in parts of Sydney that have limited public transport regional coverage and frequency and so public transport travel times are not competitive with private vehicles. Key considerations are the facilities at the end destination, in this case parking is widely available throughout the corridor and is a key driver for the use of private vehicles. There are a number of opportunities to increase walking, cycling and public transport use within the study area. Parking supply and policy may also need to be addressed to decrease the attractiveness of driving.
- > The proportion of people who live and work in the study area is 32% (the proportion of journey to work trips that are self-contained within the corridor). This is a significant opportunity to increase walking, cycling and public transport for these self-contained trips.
- > The workplace location for residents who live in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor demonstrates a relatively local economy; the five top employment destinations for residents are Campbelltown, Sydney Inner City, Liverpool, Bankstown and Camden. The employment for residents is located locally (approximately 45 minute public transport trip). These shorter trips may be feasible by walking, cycling or public transport.
- > The top five locations where people who work in the study area live are Campbelltown, Camden, Wollondilly, Liverpool and Bringelly – Green Valley. This corresponds to the above data, where the majority of workers in the area live within the study area or close by.
- > The Household Travel Survey shows a higher trend of shopping trips (14%) and serving a passenger trips (16%) for the study area when compared to Greater Sydney (11% and 13% respectively). This is likely to



indicate the importance of the study area within the regional retail structure, the majority of large shopping centres in the South West are located within the corridor. The higher than average trip purpose of serving passengers is likely to indicate a higher proportion of people under the age of 17 (driving age) and the lack of public transport coverage, frequency, reliability and potentially personal security. This suggests there are opportunities to improve public transport connections to the study area to encourage people shopping and younger people to use more public transport.

These key considerations will be used to develop objectives and measures to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport use while seeking to support the study areas key employment uses and strategic role within Metropolitan Sydney.



## 7 Forecast conditions

The Department of Planning and Environment (DP&E) and TfNSW have identified urban activation and intensification opportunities along the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor to support population and economic growth. Each of the seven precincts has been considered for their ability to support additional residents and employees.

Resident population growth is generally proposed to be focused around the railway station precincts in higher density land use than exists currently. This utilisation of the existing rail provision will reduce the required investment in new transport infrastructure and services.

The proposed precinct changes are provided with population growth figures (**Section 7.1**) and indicated on precinct structure plans (**Section 7.2**) which demonstrate the new land uses and road connections needed to accommodate the growth. Full details of the structure plan changes are available in Cox Richardson's Structure Plan report.

To understand how the forecast populations targeted for each precinct differ from the growth that would have occurred through the corridor regardless of intensified land use, forecast population growth from BTS to 2036 has also been provided in **Section 7.1**.

## 7.1 Forecast population

Forecast resident and employment populations to 2036 are presented in the following sections by both the current Bureau of Transport Statistics (BTS) forecasts and also by the proposed precinct structure plans. A summary of the differences between each of the forecasts is also provided.

### 7.1.1 <u>Resident population growth</u>

### **BTS forecast**

\_ . . \_ .

This section provides a summary of projected population, workforce and jobs for each of the precincts and for the study area. Projections are drawn from the 2014 scenario of BTS's small-area population and employment land use series. The precinct-level estimates should be considered approximate as the travel zone boundaries and precinct boundaries do not concord.

Projected population for the corridor is summarised in **Table 7-1**. The combined centre of Campbelltown-Macarthur is expected to have the highest population by 2036, with Campbelltown having the highest population for a single precinct. Overall the study area's population is projected to increase by an additional 16% by 2036, with Macarthur having the highest growth rate within the precinct from 2011 onwards.

. .

.

.

...

...

.

| Table 7-1 Compariso | n of natural growth                     | and structure plan growth | of population | for 2036 |  |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------|----------|--|
| Precinct            | Background (BTS) Proposed Structure Pla |                           | Change        | % change |  |
| Glenfield           | 14,100                                  | 14,900                    | 800           | 6%       |  |
| Macquarie Fields    | 7,900                                   | 7,900                     | 0             | 1%       |  |
| Ingleburn           | 16,600                                  | 17,900                    | 1,300         | 8%       |  |
| Minto               | 2,600                                   | 3,100                     | 500           | 20%      |  |
| Leumeah             | 9,300                                   | 10,000                    | 700           | 8%       |  |
| Campbelltown        | 13,700                                  | 18,300                    | 4,600         | 33%      |  |
| Macarthur           | 10,900                                  | 15,200                    | 4,300         | 39%      |  |
| Total               | 75,100                                  | 87,300                    | 12,200        | 16%      |  |

#### Summary

The Structure Plans forecast 16% more resident population that the current BTS forecasts. In Glenfield and Leumeah precincts the forecasts are similar at 6% and 8% respectively, however in Macarthur there is a difference of 39%.

# Cardno'\_

## 7.2 Forecast employment

### BTS forecast

Projected employment within the study area is summarised in **Table 7-2** and shows employment concentrated in Ingleburn, Campbelltown and Macarthur. The structure plans show marginal increase in employment numbers in addition to the growth forecast by BTS. Glenfield employment is expected to increase by 7% under the structure plan, which is a moderate increase and it should also be noted that the base employment is low, while Campbelltown is forecast to have an 11% increase to further solidify the towns role as a centre within the region.

| Precinct         | Background<br>(BTS) | Proposed Structure Plan | Change | % change |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Glenfield        | 2,300               | 2,500                   | 200    | 7%       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields | 2,300               | 2,300                   | 0      | 1%       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ingleburn        | 15,000              | 14,800                  | -200   | -2%      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minto            | 5,300               | 5,400                   | 100    | 2%       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leumeah          | 7,100               | 7,100                   | -100   | -1%      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campbelltown     | 15,600              | 17,300                  | 1,700  | 11%      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macarthur        | 11,100              | 11,300                  | 200    | 2%       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study Area       | 58,700              | 60,700                  | 2,000  | 3%       |  |  |  |  |  |
|                  |                     |                         |        |          |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Summary

The structure plans propose to maintain a similar level of activity to population within the corridor, which will continue to support internal live and work and therefore reduce the requirement for regional trips within the transport network. This will also provide opportunities for people to walk, cycle and use public transport as a means to travel and from work.

### 7.3 Forecast road network operation

Traffic modelling was undertaken using the NSW Government's *Sydney Strategic Travel Model* to identify the likely transport implications of land use projections (both population and employment forecasts) and background network amendments within the corridor. The full traffic modelling report is provided in **Appendix B**.

The aim of the model is to provide a high level indication of transport demand changes that might be expected from future land use (population and employment) assumptions and future network assumptions. Two scenarios were assessed as part of the study, including:

- > 2036 Base Scenario: Analysis of the study area against future year transport projects and population and employment forecasts by the BTS. This scenario is business as usual for the corridor and takes into account natural growth in housing and employment. It is considered the base case for the year 2036 and is used as a benchmark against the proposed increase related to the structure plans.
- > 2036 Project Scenario: Analysis of the study area against future year transport projects and population and employment forecasts with amendments to the land use and potential transport upgrades. This outputs from this model were then assessed against the 2036 Base Scenario outputs to determine changes in transport demand and potential network challenges.

 Table 7-3 outlines the additional population for each precinct above the 2036 Base Scenario.

# Cardno'\_

| Precinct         | 2011 | 2016 | 2021  | 2026  | 2031  | 2036   |  |  |  |  |
|------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Glenfield        | N/A  | 60   | 42    | 448   | 1,083 | 1,601  |  |  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields | N/A  | -26  | -27   | -27   | -120  | -334   |  |  |  |  |
| Ingleburn        | N/A  | 1    | 37    | 252   | 299   | 534    |  |  |  |  |
| Minto            | N/A  | 20   | 80    | 145   | 192   | 278    |  |  |  |  |
| Leumeah          | N/A  | -70  | -201  | -102  | 199   | 647    |  |  |  |  |
| Campbelltown     | N/A  | 362  | 1,050 | 1,582 | 2,030 | 2,623  |  |  |  |  |
| Macarthur        | N/A  | 525  | 2,137 | 3,618 | 4,529 | 5,609  |  |  |  |  |
| Total            | N/A  | 872  | 3118  | 5,916 | 8,212 | 10,958 |  |  |  |  |
|                  |      |      |       |       |       |        |  |  |  |  |

### Table 7-3 2036 Project Scenario additional population

An important consideration when interpreting results from this model is that the public transport networks used in STM currently do not have capacity constraints. The outputs are strategic and indicative of demand and not specific to particular intersections.

A number of potential links over the railway line were investigated as part of the modelling task. These were:

- > Glenfield: connection from Glenfield Road to Campbelltown Road;
- > Macquarie Fields: connection from Victoria Road to Railway Parade;
- > Ingleburn: connection from Oxford Road to Memorial Avenue and Chester Road to Devon Road;
- > Minto: connection from Minto Road to Campbelltown Road; and
- > Campbelltown: connection from Broughton Street to Badgally Road.
- > Macarthur: transit link from Camden Road to Menangle Road.

The results from the modelling indicated that some of these links are likely to induce traffic and as a result may have negative impacts on town centres and the local economy. As a result, the following concept links are not recommended:

- > Ingleburn: connection from Oxford Road to Memorial Avenue; and
- > Minto: connection from Minto Road to Campbelltown Road.

Due to the limited nature of the STM, a more detailed analysis is required for local links that may have local benefit. This analysis should take into consideration strategic objectives within this strategy, induced traffic and local congestion as a result of the links. It is also recommended that alternate options are considered for these links, including walking, cycling and public transport only. The links recommended for further investigation are:

- > Glenfield: connection from Glenfield Road to Campbelltown Road;
- > Macquarie Fields: connection from Victoria Road to Railway Parade;
- > Ingleburn: Chester Road to Devon Road; and
- > Campbelltown: transit and active transport connection from Broughton Street to Badgally Road.

#### 7.3.1 <u>Glenfield</u>

In the 2036 Base Scenario, the Glenfield precinct is to gain approximately 1,800 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM peak, and 1,900 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years. The 2036 Project Scenario indicates that approximately 2,500 additional origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak period, and 2,600 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years.

Small scale changes are anticipated to the assigned traffic volumes in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036 with modest increases in demand along Glenfield Road to the west of the rail line, connecting to Campbelltown Road.

It was identified that an extension of Cambridge Avenue may alleviate issues identified in the wider transport study. The 2036 Project Scenario model was undertaken to determine the traffic and transport impacts with the extension of Cambridge Avenue.

The assessment indicated that despite no induced traffic demands above anticipated growth being generated into the Glenfield precinct as a result of construction of the extension. The Cambridge Avenue extension would likely redistribute some traffic from Glenfield Road (the parallel route being largely superseded by the extension of Cambridge Avenue). This would result in a minor re-orientation of trips to take advantage of the extension.

The 2036 structure plan scenario indicates that approximately 2,500 origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak, and 2,600 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years. This is an increase of 700 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour above the BTS growth scenario.

#### 7.3.2 Macquarie Fields

Cardno

In the year 2036 Base Scenario Macquarie Fields precinct trips are expected to generally increase in the AM peak period over 25 years, and decrease slightly in the PM peak period. The 2036 Project Scenario indicates that trips in the AM and PM peak periods are anticipated to have small increase and decrease margins over 25 years in comparison to the 2036 Base Scenario.

Modest changes in vehicle demand are anticipated in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036, with the maximum change in vehicle demand reaching approximately 200 vehicles per hour along a number of roads.

No major road infrastructure upgrades were modelled for the 2036 Project Scenario. The analysis indicated that the changes in vehicle assignment in comparison to the 2036 Base Scenario within the precinct are minor with the assignments between the two scenarios (in particular on Atchison Road) generally comparable.

The 2036 project scenario indicates that volumes would be consistent with BTS's existing forecast.

#### 7.3.3 Ingleburn

In the year 2036 Base Scenario the Ingleburn precinct is to gain approximately 900 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM peak, and 350 additional trips in the PM peak periods over 25 years. The 2036 Project Scenario indicates that approximately 1,300 additional origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak, and 700 additional trips in the PM peak periods over 25 years.

The traffic volumes in both directions across the rail line are anticipated to increase by approximately 200 vehicles per hour in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036. The traffic modelling results indicate that further detailed investigation is required to determine the performance of key intersections along the route (including the intersections of Henderson Road/Williamson Road, Henderson Road/Lancaster Road and Henderson Road and Macquarie Road).

The study team identified that an extension of Brooks Road to the east side of the rail line may alleviate issues identified in the wider transport study. A 2036 Project Scenario model was undertaken to determine the traffic and transport impacts with the extension of Brooks Road.

The assessment indicated that extension of Brooks Road to the east (coupled with modified land use) would lead to diverting traffic from the current rail crossing at Henderson Road. As a result of the aforementioned upgrades, eastbound traffic along Henderson Road is projected to reduce by just under 400 vehicles in two hours, whilst eastbound traffic on the Brooks Road extension is anticipated to increase by approximately 350 vehicles per hour. In addition, westbound traffic is anticipated to reduce by approximately 600 vehicles in two hours on Henderson Road and by 1,200 vehicles on Brooks Road.

The traffic modelling results indicate that additional traffic is unlikely to be generated to the Ingleburn precinct, minor reassignment of traffic is expected (subject to additional modelling and costs faced by drivers analysis) as well as noting other key benefits in the extension of Brooks Road to the east, including:

- > Providing additional capacity across the rail line and Bunbury Curan Creek,
- > Providing more direct access to the area immediately around the station; and
- > Reducing travel distances.



It is recommended that a southern alignment, a connection between Devon Road and Chester Road, is investigated in more detail. This would include detailed transport modelling, potential public transport and freight priority options and an assessment against the objectives within **Section 9**.

The 2036 structure plan scenario indicates that approximately 1,300 origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak, and 700 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years. This is an increase of 400 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour above BTS base growth scenario.

#### 7.3.4 <u>Minto</u>

Cardno

The year 2036 Base Scenario indicates that the Minto precinct is to gain approximately 750 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM peak and 650 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years.

The east-west traffic in the Minto precinct is anticipated to increase by approximately 250 to 350 vehicles per hour in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036 bi-directional via Ben Lomond Road and Pembroke Road, with associated movement to the north along Minto Road.

A connection between St Andrews Road and Minto Road was modelled that would facilitate direct east-west access between Minto Road and Campbelltown Road to the north of the Minto station precinct. The analysis indicated that a connection between St Andrews Road and Minto Road will likely result in a significant increase in traffic demand with the link likely to result in an increase of approximately 200 and 300 vehicles per hour in each direction over the 2036 Base Scenario.

Westbound traffic along Ben Lomond Road was expected to marginally fall as a result of the connection between St Andrews Road and Minto Road, however it is anticipated that traffic volumes will generally increase, in particular traffic crossing the rail line. The model indicates that the increase in traffic demand is likely to originate or continue onto Minto Road in the east. The modelling further outlined that the connection has the risk of introducing long distance segments to run through the precinct.

The 2036 structure plan scenario indicates that approximately 1,050 origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak, and 950 additional trips in the PM peak period over 25 years. This is an increase of 300 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour above the BTS base growth scenario.

#### 7.3.5 Leumeah

The 2036 Base Scenario indicates that the Leumeah precinct is to gain approximately 900 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM peak and approximately 1,000 in the PM peak period.

The traffic modelling indicated there is likely to be modest increases in traffic demand in the town centre in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036 with further analysis recommended to the intersections of Rose Payton Drive and Pembroke Parade (subject to existing intersection performance) as two approaches of the intersection are likely to attract an additional 150 to 200 vehicles per hour.

The analysis of the 2036 Project Scenario indicates that there is a projected decrease in vehicle demand using Campbelltown Road and the northbound on-ramp to the Hume Highway with an overall increase in northbound demand between Campbelltown Road across to Catherine Field. The increase in north to south road capacity is likely as a result of ongoing development west of the Hume Highway corridor, as well as development of the South West Growth Centre.

The 2036 Project Scenario indicates that an approximate 950 origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak and 1,050 in the PM peak periods over 25 years. This is an increase of 50 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour above the natural growth scenario.

#### 7.3.6 <u>Campbelltown</u>

The 2036 Base Scenario indicates that the Campbelltown precinct is to increase by approximately 1,750 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM peak and by 1,850 additional trips in the PM peak periods over 25 years.



The analysis indicates that traffic demand is likely to increase in both directions along Hurley Street and Lindesay Street by approximately 200 vehicles per hour one-way in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036. The modelling report indicates that further analysis would be required to determine if the increase in traffic demand would result in a vast increase in traffic delay at intersections. Further traffic demands are projected on eastbound traffic on Narellan Road (which currently experiences heavy use) and is subject to an upgrade project.

An extension of Badgally Road to Broughton Street was identified as a potential option to provide direct access from the west into Campbelltown town centre, creating an additional rail line crossing. A 2036 Project Scenario model was undertaken to determine the traffic and transport impacts of this option. The analysis indicates that the extension of Badgally Road to Broughton Street is projected to draw 2,000 vehicles per two hours east bound and 1,500 vehicles per two hours westbound in the AM peak period – reversed in the PM.

The addition of the link between Badgally Road and Broughton Street is anticipated to reduce eastbound demand on Narellan Road by around 300 vehicles in two hours and westbound traffic by around 500 vehicles in two hours. While the link would ease demand on Narellan Road, the vehicles using the link would travel directly to the Campbelltown town centre. This opposes many of the planning strategies summarised in **Section 2**, has the potential to create amenity issues and does not encourage sustainable transport use.

It is recommended that detailed investigations should be undertaken to develop integrated options to alleviate congestion on Narellan Road and the wider Campbelltown CBD. This could involve the construction of the Badgally Road to Broughton Street link at Campbelltown as a transit and active transport link only

The 2036 Project Scenario was tested with the Badgally Road and Broughton Street link available to private vehicles. The modelling indicated that approximately 3,300 additional origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM peak and 3,000 in the PM peak period over 25 years. This is an increase of 1,550 and 1,150 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour respectively above the natural growth scenario. This is further evidence of the need and opportunity to implement more sustainable transport options.

### 7.3.7 <u>Macarthur</u>

The 2036 Base Scenario indicates that the Macarthur precinct is to gain approximately 1,500 and 1,250 additional origin and destination trips per hour in the AM and PM peak periods respectively over 25 years.

The modelling indicated that there is increased traffic demand eastbound on Narellan Road by approximately 200 vehicles per hour west of Kellicar Road and over 300 vehicles per hour east of Kellicar Road in the Base Scenario between 2011 and 2036. Northbound traffic demands on Menangle Road show substantial increase (of approximately 500 vehicles per hour) into Macarthur which is likely to be driven by a combination of higher delays along Narellan Road and the introduction of Spring Farm Parkway to the south-east of Macarthur.

The analysis of the 2036 Project Scenario indicated that traffic demand is likely to be increased on Narellan Road. The extension of Badgally Road is likely to draw a minor amount of traffic from Narellan Road and therefore slightly increase capacity for traffic heading into Macarthur via Narellan Road. Furthermore, the model indicates that increased traffic is anticipated into Macarthur with the additional trip generation likely to create issues for access capacity and likely knock-on effects on other road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and buses. It is recommended that additional investigation and analysis is undertaken for access strategies for Macarthur and Campbelltown town centres (particularly from the west).

The 2036 Project Scenario anticipates that the additional pressure would be placed on key access routes of Narellan Road and Menangle Road given the relatively large land use increases within the centre. It is recommended that as major land use in Macarthur increases, further detailed analysis of their implications on access and circulation be undertaken.

The 2036 Project Scenario indicates that an approximate 4,750 and 5,000 origin and destination trips per hour are anticipated in the AM and PM peak periods respectively over 25 years. This is an increase of 3,250 and 3,750 vehicles in each AM and PM peak hour respectively above the already forecast growth scenario.



### 7.4 Draft precinct structure plans

The proposed structure plans for the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor are presented in the following sections. They indicate the proposed land uses and densities, the existing street network and the proposed new connections.

#### 7.4.1 Draft Glenfield Structure Plan

The draft Glenfield Structure Plan, shown in **Figure 7-1**, includes:

- > Increase of land use density around the station on the eastern side.
- > Increased permeability of street network.
- > Potential link from Glenfield Road to Campbelltown Road.
- > Maximisation of green corridors.

#### Figure 7-1 Draft Glenfield Structure Plan





#### 7.4.2 Draft Macquarie Fields Structure Plan

The draft Macquarie Fields Structure Plan, shown in Figure 7-2, includes:

- > Increasing land use density around the station on the eastern side.
- > More fine grained network with smaller block sizes.
- > Additional creek crossing and maximisation of green corridors.
- > Introduction of small amount of mixed retail/residential close to the station.

#### Figure 7-2Draft Macquarie Fields Structure Plan





#### 7.4.3 Draft Ingleburn Structure Plan

The draft Ingleburn Structure Plan, shown in **Figure 7-3**, includes:

- > Increasing land use density around the station.
- > Introduction of residential and business park land uses on the western side of the railway line.
- > Potential link from Williamson Road to Chester Road via Devon Road.
- > A finer grained road network, particularly in the far eastern part of the precinct and directly to the west of the station.

#### Figure 7-3 Draft Ingleburn Structure Plan





#### 7.4.4 Draft Minto Structure Plan

The draft Minto Structure Plan, shown in Figure 7-4, includes:

- > Increased residential density in the north-east of the precinct.
- > Finer grain road network in the north-east of the precinct.
- > Maintain key industrial land uses and freight connections to the west and south.

#### Figure 7-4 Draft Minto Structure Plan





#### 7.4.5 Draft Leumeah Structure Plan

The draft Leumeah Structure Plan, shown in **Figure 7-5**, includes:

- > Increased residential density to the east of the station.
- > Extension of the cultural and leisure land uses across to the western side of the railway line.
- > Mixed use residential and retail land uses to the south of the station.
- > New employment focus to the north-west of the station.
- > Finer grain road network in residential area.

#### Figure 7-5Draft Leumeah Structure Plan





#### 7.4.6 Draft Campbelltown Structure Plan

The draft Campbelltown Structure Plan, shown in Figure 7-6, includes:

- > Increased residential density in the north-east quadrant of the precinct.
- > Increase commercial density in the south-east quadrant of the precinct.
- > Lower density commercial in the south-west to north-west.
- > Low density residential and industrial uses in the outer west.
- > Potential transit and active transport link from Badgally Road to Broughton Road.

#### Figure 7-6 Draft Campbelltown Structure Plan





#### 7.4.7 Draft Macarthur Structure Plan

The draft Macarthur Structure Plan, shown in Figure 7-7, includes:

- > Maintenance of most land uses in their current location.
- > Addition of high density residential to the north of the station and low medium density residential to the west.
- > New connections through large parcels of land, connecting the surrounding residential areas to the station and shopping centre.
- > Potential transit link from Menangle Road to Camden Road.
- > Maximisation of green corridors.

#### Figure 7-7 Draft Macarthur Structure Plan





### 7.5 Key considerations

Cardno

The forecast population and employment growth in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor provides an insight into how the study area will growth over the next 25 years. Key considerations for the Integrated Transport Strategy include:

- > The forecast population for the study area is estimated to increase between 2011 and 2036 by approximately 33,800 people, which represents an increase of 63% on 2011 population. Glenfield is expected to increase by 90% in population from 7,800 in 2011 to 14,900 in 2036 and Macarthur is expected to increase by more than two times the current population from 4,800 in 2011 to 12,200 in 2036. This forecast resident population growth will place a higher demand on transport networks and is likely to require a shift in transport mode choice to more efficient modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.
- > Using the same rate of resident workforce containment rates in 2011, the resident workforce (residents who live and work in the corridor) is forecast to grow from 26,900 in 2011 to 43,900 in 2036. The estimated increase in the available local workforce should be supported by employment self-containment; a key consideration is the provision of good local connections to centres and known employment areas to support this growth.
- Employment within the study area is expected to increase in the study area by 52% between 2011 and 2036. This rate of growth is below that of the forecast resident population, which suggests there will continue to be employment opportunities for people living in the area to gain employment closer to home. The development of new workplaces is an opportunity to form good transport habits early.
- > The implications of the rezoning of industrial land to other uses needs to be analysed to determine the impact and displacement to the freight network.
- > Proposed land use intensification needs to consider the future use of the rail corridor, particularly the amplification of railway lines and additional rail traffic and associated noise. Space to facilitate the amplification and an appropriate buffer must be maintained.



## 8 Constraints and opportunities

Transport constraints and opportunities for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor were identified through the background review, travel demand and population analysis and assessment of the existing and future transport networks. There are many opportunities to improve the transport network which would support and be justified by the land use change concepts of the structure plans developed for the precincts in the corridor.

A summary of these constraints and opportunities is set out in **Table 8-1** and **Table 8-2**. The constraints and opportunities are presented by mode, along with general and travel demand issues, and opportunities with land use changes.



| Mode        | Constraint/ Issue  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| General     | Lack of street and land activation on western side of railway line   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Large impenetrable street blocks in portions of the corridor   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Hume Highway and the railway line create a cross corridor barrier and an inaccessible area between them                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of east-west connections from South West Growth Centre to corridor and across the Hume<br>Highway and railway line  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel      | High proportion of workers travelling to jobs in the area travel by car  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| demands     | High vehicle mode share and vehicle kilometres travelled compared with other parts of Sydney                             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Potential poor perception of public and active transport   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Significant amount of retail in the corridor is in shopping centres which are internally rather than externally oriented |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Design of road network and urban environment supports car use  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking     | Footpaths constructed to minimum widths which do not permit two-way passage for prams and wheelchairs.                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Many locations where footpaths are not provided  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Large blocks create impermeable walking environment. Lack of connected grid network.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of active street frontages  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Walkability of corridor is reduced in a car-dependant environment  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of weather protection   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Poor amenity for walking in the network surrounding the transport interchanges   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Land uses are dispersed, and low density. Multiple destinations are not easily accessible by foot                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycling     | Lack of completed routes   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Busy roads with high traffic volumes may discourage cyclists   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Train/ Rail | Several stations are inaccessible due to large blocks adjacent to stations   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Poor connectivity particularly to the west of the rail line into the surrounding land use and transport network          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Long journey times may discourage motorists to shift their travel mode to train  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | The services on this line are currently running at 114% capacity as they approach the city in the AM peak hour.          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | The passenger rail tracks are shared with suburban, regional and interstate services                                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Stabling at Campbelltown is at capacity  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bus         | Infrequent services throughout the day and on weekend  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of connectivity to the train stations, and indirect bus routes with slow travel times                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of bus priority impacts on reliability and journey times.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motor       | Regional road network capacity reached in some locations during peak periods.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicles    | Lack of grid network reduces route choice and increases congestion on key roads  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Lack of legibility of road network   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Freight     | The freight line is configured as a single track.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Table 8-1 Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor transport constraints



| Table 8-2           | Gienfield to Macarthur Corridor transport opportunities  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mode                | Opportunities  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General             | Land available for redevelopment, particularly on western side of railway line   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Good mix of land uses in most precincts, supports increased density around stations  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Bi-directional / cross corridor movements due to destinations in the corridor such as UWS and hospital   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Future proof corridor for transport needs  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Identification of future east-west links, smaller block sizes, and upgraded intersections to improve<br>connectivity and route choice                                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land use<br>changes | New employment locations in Leppington and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Airport provide opportunities for complementary development and to form improved integrated transport networks. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Higher densities close to the stations will increase number of people able to walk / cycle to public transport and reduced reliance on motor vehicles.                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Higher densities encourages development of goods/services area in the local area to achieve trip containments  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Provision of zoning that supports mix of land uses in high density areas   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Co-location of new residential, employment and public transport facilities   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel              | High proportion of households do not own a motor vehicle   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| demands             | High proportion of work trip containment within the corridor   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Travel demand management strategies: promotion, education, programs, transport finance options, incentives for activity centres and major employment hubs.                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking             | Develop Green Grid through the corridor to connect to the regional networks where these opportunities exist.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Urban renewal presents opportunity to provide direct links, safer crossings and a closer spaced network.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycling             | Connect cycling network between key destinations   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Provide cycling routes to each station precinct  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Develop Green Grid through the corridor to connect to the regional networks where opportunity arises.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Provide sufficient bicycle parking at interchanges   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Train/ Rail         | Increased frequencies  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Plan service levels for precincts commensurate with size, function and demands.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Badgerys Creek airport transport links   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Protect the integrity of the rail corridor to facilitate long term expansion and future SSFL duplication.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bus                 | Develop an integrated local and regional network consistent with Sydney's Bus Future.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Provision of three tiers of bus routes to provide a more legible network   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Rationalise bus routes and stops to connect with the train and active transport network  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Develop a route along the eastern edge of precincts  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motor               | Commuter car parks limited to train passengers only (e.g. through Opal)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicles            | Provision of parking balanced with accessibility of station precincts by other modes.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Freight             | Duplication of freight line when demand justifies investment.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                     | Additional east-west road links will support freight traffic to and from the Hume Highway  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Table 8-2 Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor transport opportunities



## 9 Corridor objectives and recommendations

The purpose of this strategy is to develop a concept transport network and complementary initiatives that support a proposed increase in population and employment in the corridor. The corridor has diverse characteristics and as a result a diverse set of transport requirements for both people and freight.

The provision of high quality active and public transport combined with development intensification near the existing transport hubs will support an increase in population while reducing the reliance and impact of more private vehicles on the regions road network.

The industrial and employment land uses and their intensification will continue to rely on and place higher demands on the freight transport network. It is essential to provide the capacity to accommodate these demands to support economic and employment growth in the region.

To ensure that planning and investment for the transport network through the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is targeted, addresses the areas of highest priority and addresses the current and future transport demands, a set of strategic objectives is proposed. The objectives provide a framework for achieving an efficient and supportive transport system for the residents, workers, students, visitors and freight in the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor.

### 9.1 Strategic transport objectives

The strategic transport objectives for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor were developed to align with the NSW Government's *Long Term Transport Master Plan* (LTTMP) objectives and the goals of *A Plan for Growing Sydney*.

The LTTMP's broad objectives for delivery of an integrated transport network for NSW are presented in **Table 9-1** and the four strategic goals from *A Plan for Growing Sydney* are presented in **Table 9-2**. The proposed strategic transport objectives for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor directly relate to the eight objective areas from the LTTMP and support the Goals 1 and 3 from *A Plan for Growing Sydney*. The strategic transport objectives for the corridor as a whole are presented in **Table 9-3** and specific strategic precinct objectives are also detailed in **Section 9.2**.

| Objective                                  | Description  |
|--|--|
| Improve quality of service                 | By putting the customer at the centre of transport planning and service delivery, improving the quality of travel experiences, offering more travel choices and providing integrated services that directly meet travel requirements.                                  |
| Improve liveability                        | By improving connectivity, customer service and ease of movement in our major cities and activity centres.   |
| Support economic growth and productivity   | By providing a transport system that responds directly to customer needs, is more efficient, increases freight efficiency and improves the connectivity and accessibility of people to other people, opportunities, goods and services.                                |
| Support regional development               | By improving accessibility to jobs, services and people, improving freight connections to markets and providing better links between clusters of business activity.  |
| Improve safety and security                | By placing a high priority on addressing the causes and risks of transport accidents and security incidents.   |
| Reduce social disadvantage                 | By reducing transport disadvantage through improved access to goods, services and employment and education opportunities for people across all parts of the State.   |
| Improve sustainability                     | By optimising the use of the transport network, increasing mass transit capacity, growing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes such as public transport, walking and cycling, becoming more energy efficient and the use of higher capacity freight vehicles. |
| Strengthen transport<br>planning processes | By making improvement to integrated transport planning processes and identifying areas where evidence should be collated for future decision making and continually improving governance and administration of the transport system.                                   |

#### Table 9-1 NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan objectives



#### Table 9-2 A Plan for Growing Sydney's Goals

| Goal | Description   |
|------|---|
| 1    | A competitive economy with world-class services and transport.  |
| 2    | A city of housing choice, with homes that meet our needs and lifestyles.  |
| 3    | A great place to live with communities that are strong, healthy and well connected.   |
| 4    | A sustainable and resilient city that protects that natural environment and has a balanced approach to the use of land and resources. |

The strategic transport objectives for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor were developed through:

- > Consideration of the objectives of the LTTMP and A Plan for Growing Sydney's goals.
- > Consultation with NSW Government stakeholders.
- > Consideration of the growth forecast for the area including that associated with the individual station precincts.
- > Identification of the areas of focus for shifting mode share towards non-car transport modes.

17 strategic transport objectives have been developed for the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor and are set out in **Table 9-3**. They are presented in the eight objective areas from the LTTMP.

In order to assess progress towards achieving the strategic transport objectives, the indicators are proposed, as summarised in **Table 9-3**. At least one transport measure and indicator is provided for each strategic transport objective.



| Objective area             | #   | Objective  | #   | Measure/Action   | Indicator   | Relevant<br>mode    |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Improve quality of service | 1   | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public | 1.1   | Increase number of express train services that stop at key employment and residential precincts in the AM and  | Peak period patronage                             | Train               |
|                            | transport   | transport  |   | PM peak and implement supporting public transport connections and commuter parking in strategic locations.   | Journey to Work mode share                        | Train               |
|                            | 2 Improve reliability and reduce<br>waiting times for public<br>transport |  | 2.1   | Improve train service frequency to all stations through the corridor in off-peak periods to increase   | Off-peak period patronage                         | Train               |
|                            |   |  | attractiveness of the train service all day.  | Household Travel Survey mode share   | Train   |                     |
|                            |   | 2.2  | Improve bus services through provision of a suburban<br>bus route along eastern corridor of precincts with<br>increased frequencies and bus priority.         | Travel times   | Bus   |                     |
|                            |   | 2.3  | Increase reliability of bus services through provision of<br>bus priority and route amendments through congested<br>intersections.                            | Travel times   | Bus   |                     |
|                            | 3 Improve the customer<br>experience for public transport<br>journeys     | 3.1  | Support precinct legibility through provision of wayfinding signage from, to and through each transport interchange to connect with other transport modes and | Number of complaints received and addressed  | Public transport                                  |                     |
|                            |   |  |   | key destinations.  | Time taken to interchange between transport modes | Public transport    |
|                            |   |  |   |  | Wayfinding audit of area                          | Walking and cycling |
| Improve<br>liveability     |   | Encourage people to walk and cycle more              | 4.1   | Encourage healthy and active lifestyles through<br>provision of safe, direct and legible infrastructure for<br>walking and cycling, including high quality paths linking<br>to green spaces and cycle parking and other end-of-trip<br>facilities at key destinations. | Demand for and number of cycle parking spaces     | Cycling             |
|                            |   |  |   |  | Cycling and pedestrian counts                     | Walking and cycling |
|                            |   |  | 4.2   | Reduce the high reliance on motor vehicles for travel to jobs in the corridor by identifying walking routes and provide safe facilities from each train station to employment districts in the precincts.  | Journey to Work mode share                        | Walking             |

#### Table 9-3 Strategic transport objectives, measures and indicators for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor

## Cardno°\_

| Objective area               | #   | Objective   | #   | Measure/Action   | Indicator   | Relevant<br>mode                                   |                  |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|------------------|
|                              | 5 Increase density in key transport locations |   | 4.3   | Enhance pedestrian connectivity by providing additional pedestrian links from residential areas to station precincts.  | Walking catchment sizes   | Walking  |                  |
|                              |   |   | 4.4   | Increase cycling safety and attractiveness by providing<br>a safe and direct off-road cycling route through the<br>corridor that parallels the railway line and has good<br>connections to destinations in the precincts.  | Mode share, satisfaction surveys<br>Off-road cycling catchment size   | Cycling  |                  |
|                              |   | 4.5   | Improve direct and convenient access for pedestrians<br>and cyclists to each station by reducing the block sizes<br>on the western side of the railway line.                              | Size of walking and cycling catchments to train stations   | Walking and cycling   |  |                  |
|                              |   | 5.1   | Support higher density development (residential, commercial and mixed use) close to transport interchanges to encourage trip self-containment and higher active and public transport use. | Mix of land uses close to train stations   | Land use  |  |                  |
| ę                            |   |   | 5.2   | Consolidate commuter parking into single site multi-<br>storey car parks to reduce the amount of at-grade<br>parking and allow redevelopment of sites adjacent to the<br>stations.   | Proportion of at-grade parking<br>versus multi-storey commuter<br>parking   | Private<br>vehicles                                |                  |
|                              | 6   | Improve street legibility for all modes of transport    | 6.1   | Establish a coherent street network throughout the<br>corridor with defined function, hierarchy and modal<br>priority that is appropriate for the mix of land uses.<br>Active and public transport modes should be prioritised<br>close to stations. This includes applying the<br>Metropolitan Road Freight Hierarchy on applicable<br>roads. | Transport network hierarchy   | All  |                  |
| Support regional development | 7   | Minimise through traffic in local and industrial areas. | 7.1   | For residential zones, minimise through traffic and road<br>freight from local vehicle trips and public transport<br>services by reducing the attractiveness of local roads to<br>through traffic while recognising that some freight trips<br>must access local areas.  | Proportion of traffic on a road<br>that is through traffic and that<br>which is for access, measured<br>with Origin-Destination surveys | Private<br>vehicles, freight                       |                  |
|                              | 8   | 8   | Optimise use of station supporting facilities   | 8.1  | Support shared use of transport facilities such as<br>commuter parking with other uses to increase efficiency<br>of infrastructure.     | Parking occupancy during non-<br>commuting periods | Private vehicles |
|                              | 9   |   | 9.1   | Implement priority measures to improve reliability and<br>dedicated facilities for freight movement, including rail  | Travel times  | Freight  |                  |
|                              |   |   |   |  | Volume of freight   | Freight  |                  |

\_\_\_\_\_

## Cardno'\_

| Objective area               | #  | Objective   | #    | Measure/Action   | Indicator  | Relevant<br>mode                                  |
|------------------------------|----|---|------|--|--|---|
|                              |    | Support and facilitate efficient<br>movement of freight<br>throughout the corridor. |      | improvements. A freight priority program will be developed in the NSW Freight & Ports Strategy context.  | Travel times and directness of route   | Freight   |
|                              |    |   | 9.2  | Protect and secure the rail corridor from urban<br>encroachment to facilitate implication of railway tracks<br>through the corridor.   | Easement maintained and no future development in land easement.  | Rail  |
|                              |    |   | 9.3  | Apply the Road Freight hierarchy and enhance truck access.   | Road upgrades to consider<br>geometric requirements for<br>freight vehicles. The road<br>network facilitates more direct<br>trips between freight movement<br>locations. | Freight   |
| Support regional development | 10 | Improve connections to<br>regionally significant areas                              | 10.1 | Cater for the growing number of trips to the corridor<br>from the South West Growth Centre and provide direct<br>public transport routes to the South West Growth<br>Centre, Western Sydney Employment Area and key<br>employment centres. | Frequency of public transport services   | Bus   |
|                              |    |   |      |  | Public transport patronage   |   |
|                              |    |   | 10.2 | Investigate the transport network impact of providing additional east-west connections over the railway line for active transport and vehicles.  | Number of connections  | All   |
|                              |    |   | 10.3 | Improve public transport services for the workers who<br>live in Wollongong, Wollondilly Shire and the Southern<br>Highlands and travel to the corridor for jobs.  | Travel times and frequency of service  | Bus and train                                     |
| Improve safety and security  | 11 | Improve road safety around key transport hubs                                       | 11.1 | Enhance safety for public transport users by providing safe crossing facilities on approach to each train station and bus stop.  | Number, type and severity of pedestrian crashes  | Walking   |
|                              |    |   | 11.2 | Prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles around train stations through low speed environments.  | Number, type and severity of pedestrian and cyclist crashes  | Walking and<br>cycling                            |
|                              | 12 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                                 | 12.1 | Reduce perceived safety risks by providing short, visible<br>and well-lit walks from surrounding area and commuter<br>parking to train station entries.  | Transport customers' perception<br>of issues including safety and<br>security of public transport<br>(including at night-time)   | Walking and<br>Park &<br>Ride/private<br>vehicles |

\_\_\_\_\_

## Cardno'\_

| Objective area             | #        | Objective   | #    | Measure/Action   | Indicator  | Relevant<br>mode                                  |
|----------------------------|----------|---|------|--|--|---|
|                            |          |   |      |  | Number of theft or attacks   | Walking and<br>Park &<br>Ride/private<br>vehicles |
|                            |          |   | 12.2 | Reduce personal security concerns through making<br>waiting areas associated with bus stops, taxi and Kiss &<br>Ride safe environments, particularly at night time.  | Transport customers' perception<br>of issues including safety and<br>security of public transport<br>(including at night-time) | All   |
|                            |          |   |      |  | Number of theft or attacks   | All   |
| Reduce social disadvantage | antage u | Maximise integration with land<br>use and other transport<br>modes      | 13.1 | Improve public transport coverage by ensuring most<br>corridor residents and workplaces be within 400 metres<br>of a convenient public transport service.            | Percentages of dwellings and<br>workplaces within 400 metres<br>(5-minute walk) of a public<br>transport service               | Public<br>transport,<br>walking                   |
|                            |          |   | 13.2 | 13.2 Integrate public transport modes by providing bus services to connect outer eastern parts of precincts with the train network and to align with train services. | Time taken to interchange between transport modes  | Public transport                                  |
|                            |          |   |      |  | Total travel time on public transport  | Public transport                                  |
|                            | 14       | Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active<br>transport | 14.1 | Provide equitable access by ensuring all transport<br>infrastructure and new developments are fully<br>accessible by mobility-impaired and sight-impaired            | Compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act  | Public transport                                  |
|                            |          |   |      | people. Specifically, provide an accessibility upgrade at Macquarie Fields Station.  | Satisfaction of mobility-impaired and vision-impaired people   | Public transport                                  |
|                            |          |   | 14.2 | Enhance impact of road upgrade projects by incorporating bus priority and active transport infrastructure such as separated bike lanes.                              | Proportion of road upgrades<br>which incorporate bus priority<br>and active transport facilities                               | Bus, walking,<br>cycling                          |
| Improve<br>sustainability  | 15       | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                | 15.1 | Enhance the amenity of the university and TAFE areas<br>and provide attractive active transport links between the  | Pedestrian and cyclist counts  | Walking,<br>cycling                               |

# Cardno"\_\_\_\_\_

| Objective area                      | #  | Objective  | #    | Measure/Action   | Indicator  | Relevant<br>mode  |  |
|-------------------------------------|----|--|------|--|--|---|--|
|                                     |    |  |      | tertiary institutions in Macarthur and Campbelltown Hospital.  |  |   |  |
|                                     |    |  | 15.2 | Support trip containment and reduce the need to travel<br>by locating complementary land uses close to each<br>other, e.g. new residential close to essential retail/other<br>services, and to varied employment opportunities.                | Vehicle kilometres travelled   | Private vehicle,<br>walking, cycling  |  |
|                                     |    |  | 15.3 | Reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by implementing travel demand management strategies.   | Vehicle kilometres travelled   | All   |  |
|                                     |    |  | 15.4 | Reduce traffic congestion through provision of real and convenient transport alternatives to private vehicles for short trips within the corridor.   | Household Travel Survey mode share                                       | All   |  |
| Strengthen<br>transport<br>planning | 16 | 16 Support collaboration with the<br>business community, Council<br>and NSW Government to<br>improve transport for all<br>stakeholders | 16.1 | Work with businesses, Council and transport operators to achieve an integrated transport network that addresses all customer needs.  | Feedback from stakeholders on<br>planning process                        | All   |  |
| processes                           |    |  |      |  | 16.2   | Better integrate train stations with each precinct's activity hub or economic centre. | Proportion of active street<br>frontages associated with<br>stations |
|                                     |    | Develop controls that support<br>walking, cycling and public<br>transport  | 17.1 | Require non industrial new developments to contribute<br>to attractive and safe street environment for<br>pedestrians, cyclists and public transport customers with<br>active street frontages, permeable blocks and human<br>scale buildings. | Level of engagement with and<br>contribution to new development<br>plans | All   |  |
|                                     |    |  | 17.2 | Establish appropriate parking supply rates and parking policy to align with transport objectives for the precinct.   | Number of spaces for car share, carpooling, motorbikes                   | Private vehicles  |  |
|                                     |    |  |      |  | Demand for and number of<br>parking spaces                               | Private vehicles  |  |



## 9.2 Recommended improvements

The corridor is located in an area where natural growth is anticipated and significant regional development is planned in the surrounding areas. This proposed integrated transport network accounts for forecast growth within the area and supports major employment locations, and known travel patterns within the study area. These factors are used to identify strategic and precinct level opportunities for transport improvements to support proposed growth.

This section is structured into regional improvements and precinct level improvements. These enhancements have been developed to create and support liveable communities and to achieve the objectives of the study area set in **Section 9.1**. This section details improvements to cycling, rail, freight, bus and road networks to enhance the study area's transport options and self-containment.

#### 9.2.1 Policy and planning

Policy and planning interventions for transport and land use can enable positive change through developing a framework of principles and rationale for increasing walking, cycling and public transport use. Policy and planning enhancements may include subjective/ qualitative and objective/ quantitative principles to allow government and the private sector to better understand expectations.

The study area has seven of distinct precincts, all of which have different characteristics, land use mix and demographics. There are however commonalities for transport and land use improvements to sustain residential and employment growth. The list below outlines these objectives, measures/actions and recommendations for the study area as identified in **Table 9-3**.

| Objective 4            | Encourage people to walk and cycle more  |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Measure/ action<br>4.1 | Encourage healthy and active lifestyles through provision of safe, direct and legible infrastructure for walking and cycling, including high quality paths linking to green spaces and cycle parking and other end-of-trip facilities at key destinations.   |  |  |
| Recommendations        | <ol> <li>Complete a walking plan and cycling plan for the local government area (LGA). These<br/>plans should identify regional and local networks, infrastructure requirements, end of<br/>trip facilities and implementation priorities. It is likely these plans would be in the form of<br/>a Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan(s) (PAMP) and a Bike Plan(s).</li> </ol> |  |  |
|                        | <ol> <li>Investigate 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity Areas around railway stations and town<br/>centres to improve safety and amenity for people walking, cycling and using public<br/>transport.</li> </ol>   |  |  |

| Objective 5         | Increase density in key transport locations   |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Measure/ action 5.1 | Support higher density development (residential, commercial and mixed use) close to transport interchanges to encourage trip self-containment and higher active and public transport use  |  |  |
| Recommendations     | <ol> <li>Identify areas within close proximity of key transport hubs that would encourage self-<br/>containment of trips, walking, cycling and public transport use. In general this would be<br/>areas within 800 metres of train stations.</li> </ol>   |  |  |
|                     | <ol> <li>Develop strategic land use, density and associated controls to encourage organic<br/>sustainable growth within the study area</li> </ol>   |  |  |
|                     | <ol> <li>Balance with the need to provide a buffer zone from freight precincts and the railway<br/>lines to maintain the option to amplify the railway tracks in the future and for noise and<br/>vibration considerations.</li> </ol>  |  |  |
| Measure/ action 5.2 | To consolidate commuter parking into single site multi-storey car parks to reduce the amount of at-grade parking and allow redevelopment of sites adjacent to the stations.   |  |  |
| Recommendations     | <ol> <li>Encourage the efficient use of parking and consolidation of parking into single lot<br/>parking structures within each precinct. This is particularly relevant for higher demand<br/>areas, such as Campbelltown and Ingleburn. It is also recommended an economic<br/>feasibility analysis is completed to inform the timing and measures to enable this to<br/>occur.</li> </ol> |  |  |
|                     | <ol> <li>Maintain a balance of parking that encourages growth, however does not significantly<br/>reduce the viability of development in key locations.</li> </ol>  |  |  |



| Objective 10         | Improve connections to regionally significant areas   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Measure/ action 10.1 | Cater for the growing number of trips to the corridor from the South West Growth Centre and provide direct public transport routes to the South West Growth Centre, Western Sydney Employment Area and key employment centres.  |  |
| Recommendation       | <ol> <li>The NSW Government and local governments work with residents and the business community to plan for regional transport connections to key employment areas within the surrounding region. This could include:         <ul> <li>Update structure plans for the North West and South West Growth Centres to realise the full potential of investment in new infrastructure;</li> <li>Continue rezoning land in the North West and South West Growth Centres to maintain a steady supply of greenfield sites for development; and</li> <li>Co-ordinate and deliver enabling infrastructure at the local level to assist the conversion of zoned land into homes.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> |  |

| Objective 14            | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Measure/ action<br>14.1 | Provide equitable access by ensuring all transport infrastructure and new developments are fully accessible by mobility-impaired and sight-impaired people   |
| Recommendation          | All new and amended public infrastructure to provide accessibility for people with a disability. It is<br>noted this is a current legislative requirement under the Disability Discrimination Act, however<br>there are significant barriers within the community to accessing and using walking and cycling<br>routes and public transport. Specifically, provide an accessibility upgrade at Macquarie Fields<br>Station.<br>This will continue to become a more significant issue as Sydney's population ages and becomes<br>more sensitive to infrastructure deficiencies. |
| Measure/ action 14.2    | Enhance impact of road upgrade projects by incorporating bus priority and active transport infrastructure such as separated bike lanes   |
| Recommendation          | <ol> <li>Ensure new roads and road upgrades plan, design and deliver:         <ul> <li>Public transport priority along key public transport routes; and</li> <li>Active transport facilities to minimum Austroads Guidelines and according to preferences identified in Sydney's Walking and Cycling Future.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Set a minimum criteria for active transport, for example footpaths shall be provided on one side of a road for local roads and on both sides of the road for identified key connections.</li> </ol>  |

| Objective 15            | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle   |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Measure/ action<br>15.2 | Support trip containment and reduce the need to travel by locating complementary land uses close to each other, e.g. new residential close to essential retail/other services, and to varied employment opportunities  |  |
| Recommendations         | <ol> <li>Support the structure plans which propose to increase land use variety and density close to existing transport hubs.</li> <li>Develop strategic land use, density and associated controls are developed to encourage sustainable growth within the study area</li> </ol>  |  |
| Measure/ action<br>15.3 | Reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by implementing travel demand management strategies  |  |
| Recommendation          | <ol> <li>Improve public transport access, frequency, trip time and reliability to increase public<br/>transport patronage. These measures must be supported by promotional material,<br/>sustainable/green transport plans and formal planning controls. Ensure that rezonings<br/>and large employment regions are required to develop sustainable/green transport<br/>plans that accompany applications</li> </ol> |  |

Objective 16 Support collaboration with the business community, Council and NSW Government to improve transport for all stakeholders



| Measure/ action 16.1 | Work with businesses, Council and transport operators to achieve an integrated transport network that addresses all customer needs   |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Recommendations      | <ol> <li>Investigate the benefit of forming a key stakeholders group by Council or NSW<br/>Government that meets on a regular basis to discuss transport and land use issues<br/>and potential solutions in the Campbelltown LGA. This group should consist of<br/>representatives that understand the wider context and implications to ensure that<br/>transport planning and strategic goals are the focus of discussion. This group could<br/>include representatives from:</li> </ol> |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Transport for NSW;</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Department of Planning and Environment;</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Roads and Maritime Services;</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Campbelltown City Council;</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Business chamber and Chamber of Commerce;</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Key community groups; and</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Bicycle user groups.</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                      | <ol> <li>Engage with the community to better understand personal security priorities to guide<br/>soft and hard infrastructure investment. This would include understanding real and<br/>perceived security concerns and developing campaigns to improve understanding and<br/>implementing infrastructure, such as lighting, to increase personal security within the<br/>study area.</li> </ol>  |  |  |

| Objective 17            | Develop controls that support walking, cycling and public transport  |  |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Measure/ action<br>17.1 | Require new developments to encourage an attractive and safe street environment for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport customers with active street frontages, permeable blocks and human scale buildings.   |  |
| Recommendations         | <ol> <li>Council identify and create objectives and/or controls within the planning framework<br/>that indicate primary and secondary activity streets. It is recommended these streets<br/>include active frontages, a mix of day and night time uses, continuous shelter, all night<br/>lighting where awnings are provided, visual diversity in facades with a recommended<br/>single use street frontage of 10 meters, Crime Prevention Through Environmental<br/>Design (CPTED) principles, low speed environments, multiple safe crossing<br/>opportunities and landscaping.</li> <li>Create objectives and/or controls for residential areas that require high levels of<br/>walking connectivity, encourage passive surveillance to all public areas (including</li> </ol> |  |
|                         | creeks and water ways), provide footpaths on one side of the road at a minimum,<br>create low speed environments, require safe crossing facilities at intersections and<br>minimise walking distance to public transport connections   |  |
| Measure/ action 17.2    | Establish appropriate parking supply rates and parking policy to align with transport objectives for the precinct.   |  |
| Recommendation          | <ol> <li>Council investigate and align on-street parking policy with the catchment of the land<br/>use that is generating the parking demand. For the study area this means a<br/>combination of town centre, education, shopping and rail demand. Examples of<br/>potential controls are shown in <b>Table 9-4</b>.</li> </ol>  |  |

#### Example of on street parking controls Table 9-4

| Neighbourhood characteristic   | Recommended control  | Operating days                      |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| Areas with little to no parking demand, example low density residential street.                            | Nil  | Nil                                 |
| Areas with limited parking demand, example residential areas on<br>the fringe of town centres and stations | 4P<br>8am-4pm  | Mon-Fri                             |
| Areas with moderate to consistent parking demand, example town centre with railway station                 | 1/2P-2P (depending on<br>adjacent land use)<br>8am-10pm (dependent<br>on demand times) | Mon-Sun<br>(dependent on<br>demand) |



A balanced approach must be taken for on-street parking to cater for differing needs, including residents, businesses, visitors and commuters. As a result it is recommended that some all-day parking is retained in residential areas to balance all needs. It is recommended a parking study be undertaken when considering area parking controls to ensure appropriate controls are implemented.

In areas of low density, parking for commuters can be used to encourage the use of rail, however this may also reduce the viability of bus usage within the local area.

2) Commuter car parking to be owned and operated by TfNSW as an important asset for Park & Ride. Often these facilities are located within close proximity to other high demand land uses, such as a shopping centre. In these locations it is crucial that the parking provided is used by commuters and not occupied by people driving to work in the local area or to complete a single shopping trip in peak commuter periods.

It is recommended that car parking areas with high demand are investigated for potential for increased management measures. These car parks could be integrated with the Opal card system and provide free parking for Park & Ride commuters who live beyond an 800m catchment of any station or have special needs. This would be detected when the person taps on at the station, providing free parking, and charge commercial rates for people who do not transition onto a public transport service.

3) Monitor parking requirements for development in the study area over the short, medium and long term to understand market trends and reduced parking rate feasibility. Parking associated within a development is a long term infrastructure facility, with most buildings remaining for decades prior to major building works or redevelopment. It is for this reason that parking separate from a buildings can create the short term flexibility to encourage growth and in the longer term provide the opportunity to reassess parking requirements at a precinct level. It is recommended that:

- Initiatives are investigated to decouple development parking provision from on-site and promote sharing of facilities;
- > Car share within developments is investigated for feasibility and potential rates; and
- > A reduction in parking rates near railways station and town centres is investigated.

The recommendations within this section seek to create medium and long term initiatives that will support the growth of the study area while encouraging a mode shift to walking, cycling and public transport. Some of the recommended actions require detailed investigation to understand the effects on potential development, economic performance and business feasibility. In particular, any area parking or development parking rate amendments will require analysis to clearly articulate short, medium and long term benefits.

#### 9.2.2 Active Transport

Walking and cycling is an easy way to travel for short trips; it is healthy, quick, environmentally friendly and flexible in route choice. The following objectives and measures are related to active transport.

| Objective 3         | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys  |
|---------------------|--|
| Measure/ action 3.1 | Support precinct legibility through provision of wayfinding signage from, to and through each transport interchange to connect with other transport modes and key destinations.  |
| Recommendation      | Complete a wayfinding audit for walking and cycling wayfinding signage at each precinct. Upon completion of the audit install wayfinding signage installed to guide people walking and cycling where key destinations are located. |

Objective 4 Encourage people to walk and cycle more



| Measure/ action<br>4.1 | Encourage healthy and active lifestyles through provision of safe, direct and legible infrastructure for walking and cycling, including high quality paths linking to green spaces and cycle parking and other end-of-trip facilities at key destinations   |  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|--|
| Recommendation         | <ol> <li>Provide a cycle network, with regional and local routes for each precinct. This network<br/>can include a combination of cycle infrastructure including separated cycleways,<br/>shoulder lanes, mixed traffic, off-road cycle paths and shared paths.</li> <li>Investigate the feasibility to provide incentives for commercial operation of bike shops/</li> </ol> |  |  |
|                        | services centres at or near transport hubs.   |  |  |
| Measure/ action 4.2    | Reduce the high reliance on motor vehicles for travel to jobs in the corridor by identifying walking routes and provide safe facilities from each train station to employment districts in the precincts.   |  |  |
| Recommendation         | Support the structure plans which proposed to increase land use variety and density close to existing transport hubs.   |  |  |
| Measure/ action 4.3    | Enhance pedestrian connectivity by providing additional pedestrian links from residential areas to station precincts.   |  |  |
| Recommendation         | Support the structure plans which proposed to increase links and provided shorter spaced street network.  |  |  |
| Measure/ action<br>4.4 | Increase cycling safety and attractiveness by providing a safe and direct off road cycling route through the corridor that parallels the railway line and has good connections to destinations in the precincts.  |  |  |
| Recommendation         | Provide a cycle network, with regional and local routes for each precinct. This network can include a combination of cycle infrastructure including separated cycleways, shoulder lanes, mixed traffic, off-road cycle paths and shared paths.  |  |  |
| Measure/ action<br>4.5 | Improve direct and convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists to each station by reducing the block sizes on the western side of the railway line.  |  |  |
| Recommendation         | Support the structure plans which proposed to increase links and provided shorter spaced street network.  |  |  |

| Objective 6            | Improve street legibility for all modes of transport   |
|------------------------|--|
| Measure/ action<br>6.1 | Establish a coherent street network throughout the corridor with defined function, hierarchy and modal priority that is appropriate for the mix of land uses. Active and public transport modes should be prioritised close to stations.       |
| Recommendation         | Provide a cycle network, with regional and local routes for each precinct. This network can include a combination of cycle infrastructure including separated cycleways, shoulder lanes, mixed traffic, off-road cycle paths and shared paths. |

| Objective 12         | Improve personal security around key transport hubs  |
|----------------------|--|
| Measure/ action 12.1 | Reduce perceived safety risks by providing short, surveyed and well-lit walks from surrounding area and commuter parking to train station entries. |
| Recommendation       | Support the structure plans and planning controls to enforce the action.   |

| Objective 15         | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle  |
|----------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 15.1 | Enhance the amenity of the university and TAFE areas and provide attractive active transport link between the tertiary institutions in Macarthur and Campbelltown Hospital. |
| Recommendation       | Work with land owners to audit active transport facilities linking these land uses.   |

| Objective 15            | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Measure/ action<br>15.1 | Enhance the amenity of the university and TAFE areas and provide attractive active transport link between the tertiary institutions in Macarthur and Campbelltown Hospital. |
| Recommendation          | Work with land owners to audit active transport facilities linking these land uses.   |



#### Cycling network

The purpose of a regional cycling network is to provide links to surrounding areas within five kilometres as identified within the NSW Government's *Sydney's Cycling Future*. For the study area, this requires a focus on the north-south corridor with supporting east-west connections for each precinct. Regional networks do not necessarily connect to the main centre or major transport hubs, however provide an option to cycle between centres/hubs with local connections that enable direct access to the centres/hubs.

Bicycle catchments are most attractive for short trips generally up to five kilometres to centres. A typical cycling catchment for interchanges is about two kilometres. A well-developed bicycle network has the potential to considerably increase a stations active transport catchment.

Successful bicycle networks use regional routes and branch local routes off this to allow cyclists to reach key destinations. Regional routes provide an arterial corridor for cyclists to use when travelling outside of the local area.

Local routes should be implemented to complement regional routes to maximise the value of the investment and ridership. Local routes radiate from each station and connect to the regional network across the rail corridor. Ideally these should aim to serve various land uses along their routes; i.e. educational, retail, residential, recreational to maximise ridership. Along busy streets local routes could be configured as kerbside shared paths and along quiet local streets only signage and stencils may be required.

The existing regional cycling infrastructure within the study area is considered to be inadequate to enable mode shift and to provide a viable alternative to motorised transport modes. Large lengths of the network are shoulder lanes with car parking adjacent. These place cyclists between moving traffic and the door opening zone of parked cars. This type of infrastructure presents high risk to cyclist safety.

#### Station end of trip facilities

Bicycle parking facilities have generally been upgraded with the Transport Access Program. As demand for bicycle parking increases, investigation should be focused on providing bike sheds at each station.

Secure bike sheds have been provided in other states in Australia and around the world. These offer an efficient use of space, particularly when compared against bicycle lockers.

Public Transport Victoria provide bicycle parking at stations under the "Parkiteer" program which is managed by Bicycle Network. This is continually being rolled out across the Victorian public transport network. The sheds feature access via a swipe card which is issued after the payment of a refundable security deposit. At some stations there is a waiting list due to the popularity of the scheme. TfNSW could integrate access to the sheds with the Opal card system to maximise mode integration.

#### 9.2.3 <u>Rail</u>

Railway provides the highest capacity and generally highest average speed land based public transport mode. It is environmentally friendly and reduces end of trip parking demand. The following objectives and measures are related to railway use.

| Objective 1            | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport   |
|------------------------|--|
| Measure/ action<br>1.1 | Increase number of express train services that stop at key employment and residential precincts in the AM and PM peak and implement supporting public transport connections and commuter parking in strategic locations. |
| Recommendation         | Investigate the feasibility of express rail services along the corridor.   |

| Objective 2         | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport   |
|---------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 2.1 | Improve train service frequency to all stations through the corridor in off peak periods to increase attractiveness of the train service all day. |
| Recommendation      | Periodically review rail operations to ensure the level of services is appropriately matched with demand and growth in the corridor.              |



| Objective 3         | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys  |
|---------------------|--|
| Measure/ action 3.1 | Support precinct legibility through provision of wayfinding signage from, to and through each transport interchange to connect with other transport modes and key destinations.                    |
| Recommendation      | Complete a wayfinding audit within the catchment of each station for walking and the precinct for walking and cycling. Key destinations should be highlighted in the walking and cycling networks. |

| Objective 12         | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys   |
|----------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 12.2 | Reduce personal security concerns through making waiting areas associated with bus stops, taxi and Kiss & Ride safe environments, particularly at night time.   |
| Recommendation       | Undertake a personal safety and security audit for each station taking into consideration Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles when planning for upgrades and improvements. This task should seek to maximise passive and active surveillance and improve lighting. |

| Objective 14            | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Measure/ action<br>12.2 | Provide equitable access by ensuring all transport infrastructure and new developments are fully accessible by mobility-impaired and sight-impaired people. Specifically, provide an accessibility upgrade at Macquarie Fields Station. |
| Recommendation          | TfNSW to continue to investigate, plan and implement the Transport Access Program.  |

| Objective 16         | Support collaboration with the business community, Council and NSW Government to improve transport for all stakeholders |
|----------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 16.2 | Better integrate train stations with each precinct's activity hub or economic centre.                                   |
| Recommendation       | Support the structure plans which proposed to increase land use variety and density close to existing transport hubs.   |

#### 9.2.4 Freight

The South West Sydney area is a significant freight and logistics region. This area provides a hub for distribution of goods throughout NSW. The study area is a portion of this wider area that requires strategic and detailed planning to cater for Sydney's population and employment growth needs for goods. The road and rail networks provide a network to move, deliver and receive goods from the study area.

The East Coast Rail Network provides the rail connections for freight in NSW. The SSFL line has recently been completed and as such it is anticipated that capacity, reliability and competitive requirements determined the configuration of the built infrastructure. As such it is expected that it will adequately serve the demand for the interim to medium term period.

The Hume Motorway is the primary road network connection for the study area. The Motorway provides access to intermodal connections from and to the rail network, access to various ports and to inland NSW regions. Within the study area the Motorway enables industrial uses to operate and conglomerate to create efficiencies for infrastructure investment in road and rail.

The proposed Western Sydney Employment Area and Badgerys Creek Airport will increase transport requirements on regional networks, however these additional movements are not expected to greatly affect cross corridor movements in the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor. It is expected there would be additional demands on the Hume Motorway and potentially the freight rail line.

Freight and logistics for the study area must be considered in a wider context for NSW strategies to cater for growth and determine priorities for improvement.

The following are relevant objectives for freight in the study area:

Objective 9 Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor


| Measure/ action<br>9.1 | Implement priority measures to improve reliability and dedicated facilities for freight movement, including rail improvements                                    |
|------------------------|--|
| Recommendation         | <ol> <li>Consider the land use and transport implications and noise attenuation requirements in<br/>detailed precinct planning and building design.</li> </ol>   |
|                        | <ol> <li>Monitor the road network and investigate the requirement for additional upgrades or<br/>management to facilitate efficient freight movement.</li> </ol> |

|  | Objective 16            | Support collaboration with the business community, Council and NSW Government to improve transport for all stakeholders                           |
|--|-------------------------|---|
|  | Measure/ action<br>16.1 | Work with businesses, Council and transport operators to achieve an integrated transport network that addresses all customer needs.               |
|  | Recommendation          | Engage and plan with businesses in the study area to understand freight growth and transport requirements and opportunities at a strategic level. |

## 9.2.5 <u>Bus</u>

It is recommended that a wider bus network review is undertaken to integrate with the bus and road network changes as the South West Growth Centre and Western Sydney Employment Lands are developed. This will maximise employment opportunities and access to retail, entertainment and educational uses. The following are relevant objectives and recommendations for a bus network review to consider in the study area:

| Objective 2         | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport.  |
|---------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 2.2 | Improve bus services along eastern corridor of precincts with increased frequencies and bus priority.                       |
| Recommendation      | Undertake wider network review to examine the feasibility of more regular services.   |
| Measure/ action 2.3 | Increase reliability of bus services through provision of bus priority and route amendments through congested intersections |
| Recommendation      | Investigate the potential for bus priority and route amendments.  |

|  | Objective 3         | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys   |
|--|---------------------|---|
|  | Measure/ action 3.1 | Support precinct legibility through provision of wayfinding signage from, to and through each transport interchange to connect with other transport modes and key destinations.   |
|  | Recommendation      | Complete a wayfinding audit within each station for walking and the precinct for walking and cycling. Key destinations should be highlighted in the walking and cycling networks. |

| Objective 10            | Improve connections to regionally significant areas  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Measure/ action<br>10.1 | Cater for the growing number of trips to the corridor from the South West Growth Centre and provide direct public transport routes to the South West Growth Centre, Western Sydney Employment Area and key employment centres. |
| Recommendation          | Investigate the potential for routes to the SWGC and WSEA as part of the wider area bus network review.  |
| Measure/ action 10.2    | Investigate opportunities to increase the number of east-west connections over the railway line for active transport and vehicles.   |
| Recommendation          | Undertake a wider area bus network review.   |
| Measure/ action 10.3    | Improve public transport services for the workers who live in Wollongong, Wollondilly Shire and the Southern Highlands and travel to the corridor for jobs.  |
| Recommendation          | Undertake a wider area bus network review.   |

Objective 13 Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes



| Measure/ action 13.1 | Improve public transport coverage by ensuring most corridor residents and workplaces to be within 400 metres of a convenient public transport service.          |
|----------------------|---|
| Recommendation       | Investigate the potential for enhanced bus connections from outer eastern precincts to train stations.  |
| Measure/ action 13.2 | Integrate public transport modes by providing bus services to connect outer eastern parts of precincts with the train network and to align with train services. |
| Recommendation       | Investigate the potential for enhanced bus connections from outer eastern precincts to train stations.  |

| Objective 14         | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport  |
|----------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 14.1 | Provide equitable access by ensuring all transport infrastructure and new developments are fully accessible by mobility-impaired and sight-impaired people.   |
| Recommendation       | Continue to plan, design and implement the Transport Access Program (TAP) across the Sydney Trains network. This is a DDA requirement and TfNSW are currently in the process of upgrading all interchanges through the Transport Access Program, this is most relevant for Macquarie Fields Station which does not have step-free access. |

| Objective 15            | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle   |
|-------------------------|--|
| Measure/ action<br>15.3 | Reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by implementing travel demand management strategies  |
| Recommendation          | Investigate opportunities to encourage more people to use the bus as part of a wider area bus network review.                                      |
| Measure/ action<br>15.4 | Reduce traffic congestion through provision of real and convenient transport alternatives to private vehicles for short trips within the corridor. |
| Recommendation          | Investigate the potential for service improvements for north-south and east-west routes as part of a wider area bus network review.                |

Within the study corridor, the key transport link is the rail corridor. The travel behaviour for the parallel bus routes to the railway needs to be better understood. There are three variations of north-south routes parallel to the railway line within the study corridor, indicating that there may be reasonable demand for these services. It is not understood if customers are using these services along a length of their journey, to transfer to train or to access town centres. It is recommended that further data collection and analysis is completed to inform a wider network review.

The future road network also identified transit corridors through the SWGC linking with the Glenfield to Macarthur corridor. It is recommended that bus routes along these corridors are investigated as part of the network review to support sustainable transport in the region. Rapid and suburban routes identified in Sydney's Bus Future should be supported by local feeder routes to simplify the network and improve legibility.

## 9.2.6 <u>Road</u>

The road network distributed traffic within the study area. Vehicle use is the most common travel mode within the study area, with increased reliance of private vehicles leading to greater congestion on roads and travel times, emissions, lack of on/ off-street parking and economic repercussions as a result of interference to freight movements on the road network as a crucial piece of infrastructure. The following objectives and measures are related to roads.

Objective 6 Improve street legibility for all modes of transport



| Measure/ action<br>6.1 | Establish a coherent street network throughout the corridor with defined function, hierarchy and modal priority that is appropriate for the mix of land uses. Active and public transport modes should be prioritised close to stations.  |
|------------------------|---|
| Recommendation         | Establish a road hierarchy and network that promotes active (walking and cycling) and public transport modes whilst facilitating freight and essential vehicle movements around the town centres and into larger road classifications. No proposed road hierarchy amendments are included within this strategy. |

| Objective 7         | Minimise through traffic in local areas  |
|---------------------|--|
| Measure/ action 7.1 | Separate through traffic and road freight from local vehicle trips and public transport services by reducing the attractiveness of local roads to through traffic by implementing LATMs.   |
| Recommendation      | Apply the freight network performance indicators delivering NSW Freight & Ports Strategy Action 1A   |
|                     | Undertake 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity Area/ LATMs for each precinct to determine suitable traffic calming measures including horizontal and vertical deflection devices to promote a low speed pedestrian friendly environments. Provide additional connections to roads multiple bigger functions to promote traffic diversion from local roads, pending detailed analysis/modelling. |

| Objective 8         | Maximise investment in station supporting facilities  |
|---------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 8.1 | Support shared use of transport facilities such as commuter parking with other uses to increase efficiency of infrastructure.   |
| Recommendation      | Undertake precinct parking studies to determine parking demand and supply ratios for areas.<br>Investigate areas of time-restricted parking surrounding stations to support local businesses and<br>encourage public/ active forms of transport to and from stations. |

| Objective 9            | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor.   |
|------------------------|---|
| Measure/ action<br>9.1 | Implement priority measures to improve reliability and dedicated facilities for freight movement, including rail improvements                     |
| Recommendation         | Protect freight corridors through strategic transport and land use planning and local development controls to support regional freight movements. |

| Objective 10 Improve connections to regionally significant areas          |                | Improve connections to regionally significant areas  |
|---|----------------|--|
| Measure/ action Increase the number of east-west connections of vehicles. |                | Increase the number of east-west connections over the railway line for active transport and vehicles.              |
|   | Recommendation | Investigate further planning of road links as identified within each precinct in subregional and planning context. |

| Objective 11         | Improve road safety around key transport hubs  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Measure/ action 11.1 | Enhance safety for public transport users by providing safe crossing facilities on approach to each train station and bus stop.  |  |
| Recommendation       | Incorporate safety improvements in 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity Area/ LATM studies.   |  |
| Measure/ action 11.2 | Prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles around train stations through low speed environments.  |  |
| Recommendation       | <ol> <li>Undertake Road Safety Audits surrounding train stations to ensure the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other commuters to ensure safe manoeuvrability around the station.</li> <li>Promote pedestrian pathways as right of way, to improve and encourage pedestrian connections to station as well as act as traffic calming measures to reduce traffic</li> </ol> |  |
|                      | speeds and desirability of vehicle travel around station.  |  |



| Objective 14         | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport  |
|----------------------|--|
| Measure/ action 14.2 | Enhance impact of road upgrade projects by incorporating bus priority and active transport infrastructure such as separated bike lanes.  |
| Recommendation       | <ol> <li>Undertake traffic modelling for road upgrades to provide appropriate bus priority along<br/>key routes to improve bus travel times and connections within the precincts, including<br/>provision of bus lanes and queue jumps at intersections.</li> <li>Include separated cycling facilities along key routes to be delivered with appropriate<br/>road projects.</li> </ol> |

| Objective 15            | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle  |
|-------------------------|---|
| Measure/ action 15.3    | Reduce the vehicle kilometres travelled by implementing travel demand management strategies.  |
| Recommendation          | <ol> <li>Promote greater connectivity to public transport services with the improved road<br/>networks and cross sections that offer convenient cycle routes and footpaths to<br/>encourage active travel.</li> </ol> |
|                         | <ol> <li>Undertake car park demand and capacity studies to implement parking restrictions to<br/>reduce undesirable impacts of parking demand on local traffic levels.</li> </ol>                                     |
|                         | <ol> <li>Improve and distribute carpool information, particularly for large organisations such as<br/>universities and hospitals, and investigate high occupancy vehicle lanes where<br/>appropriate.</li> </ol>      |
| Measure/ action<br>15.4 | Reduce traffic congestion through provision of real and convenient transport alternatives to private vehicles for short trips within the corridor.  |
| Recommendation          | Improve connectivity to stations and town centres with additional/ upgraded cycle routes/ racks and footpaths to promote active travel and decrease general traffic congestion and car park demands.                  |

## 10 Concept transport network

Cardno

This section discusses the regional and local transport networks. The concepts have been developed on a basis of providing direct regional routes for all modes throughout the corridor.

It is important to note that most of the concepts have not been subject to detailed analysis, feasibility study, have funding or are committed. These are presented to generate thought and discussion about how the transport network could be progressed in line with the objectives for the corridor.

The regional plans consider how the cycling, bus and road network will integrate with each precinct and provide a direct, legible regional network. Walking has been a lesser consideration at a regional level, however the proposed cycling network would support a shared or adjacent walking function.

The rail network in this area for short trips is acceptable, however as identified in *Sydney's Rail Future* the East Hills and Airport Lines will experience a high level of demand. This is a significant challenge for TfNSW to analyse and develop options for improvement. With approximately 15% of employed residents within the study area working in Inner Sydney, the level of service is an important consideration for transport and planning in this area. It is recommended that additional services are implemented to alleviate this issue in the short-medium term and infrastructure solutions are developed for the medium-long term.

The bus network is currently comprehensive within the study area, it covers the majority of the precincts well. However, this comes with the cost of less frequent services and a variety of routes throughout the study area. It is recommended that a regional system is investigated and implemented as outlined in **Section 9.2.5** to provide more frequent and direct services to stations and town centres.

The road network has some constraints near Campbelltown and Macarthur during peak periods. Transport modelling was undertaken for the study area using the NSW Government's Sydney Strategic Travel Model. This model seeks to understand demand for all transport modes. The model provides an indication as to which regions are likely to have notable capacity constraints, however the outputs are too coarse to provide detailed intersection analysis.

## 10.1 Regional network

The regional transport improvements are detailed in the following sections, which cover all modes of transport. Overall the transport networks for the precinct structure plans take into consideration strategic transport considerations for the region and seek to improve local connections for walking, cycling and the road network within each precinct.

## 10.1.1 Regional cycling network

The proposed regional cycling network for the corridor integrates with other proposed regional routes, including the Liverpool to Parramatta rail trail, the M7 cycle path and the proposed South West Growth Centre arterial road network.

It is anticipated the regional route would be constructed of kerbside shared paths as is current practice for many arterial road upgrades in metropolitan Sydney.

Figure 10-1 shows the concept regional cycle network for the study area.



## Figure 10-1 Corridor proposed regional cycle network



# Cardno'\_

## Parallel to corridor regional routes

A Campbelltown to Liverpool rail trail route was identified in the 2009 Liverpool City Council Bike Plan which was anticipated to be fully funded by the RMS.

It is recommended that this regional route is developed parallel to the railway line to create the spine of the bicycle network. The purpose of this route is to provide opportunities for more people to connect with stations and other land uses. The bicycle network would increase the station customer catchment along the rail corridor as stations are spaced in excess of typical walking catchments.

### Recreational routes

The purpose of these routes are to take advantage of green open space and the proposed green grid, as a result these routes support recreational activity and seek to support regional and local routes where possible. The proposed network includes a regional route adjacent to the railway corridor on the eastern side. This may need to cross the railway corridor at various points due to land use and opportunities to use current north-south corridors. This would also provide a key corridor to link some local routes to their nearest station.

Additionally a regional network is proposed along the waterways which also run along the study corridor. These waterways from north to south include Bunbury Curan Creek, Bow Bowing Creek, Smiths Creek.

#### Cross corridor regional routes

Key regional routes should be provided perpendicular to the railway corridor adjacent to a proposed core road network as outlined in **Table 10-1** and **Figure 10-1**.

| Station      | Regional route   |
|--------------|--|
| Glenfield    | Proposed Cambridge Avenue/ Glenfield Road extension with a link to Camden Valley Way |
| Ingleburn    | Macdonald Road corridor to Edmondson Park<br>Proposed Denham Court Road upgrade      |
| Minto        | St Andrews Road<br>Raby Road   |
| Leumeah      | Raby Road  |
| Campbelltown | Badgally Road/ Gregory Hills Drive<br>Narellan Road                                  |
| Macarthur    | Narellan Road  |

#### Table 10-1Proposed regional routes

## 10.1.2 Regional bus network

#### Concept routes

Based on consultation with TfNSW, six key bus routes are presented for consideration in a wider network review.

The potential routes are designed to complement the railway corridor by serving areas not within the walking catchment. They are be designed to be direct and service Campbelltown and Glenfield stations, which are key interchanges within the study corridor. It is envisaged that a network review would consider new opportunities for existing bus services that service the same destinations.

New cross corridor routes are proposed to integrate with the proposed South West Growth Centre, thus providing opportunities for sustainable transport use between the two regions and to provide station feeder services.

The concept bus network in relation to the study corridor is shown in **Figure 10-2** and the routes are discussed as follows:



## Route 1: Campbelltown to Liverpool via Leppington and Oran Park

This route has been identified in Sydney's Bus Future as a "Rapid Route". It is intended that this would have a high frequency with a relatively long service span. This service would link the SWGC with the rail corridor at Liverpool, Leppington and Campbelltown.

## Route 2: Campbelltown to Liverpool

Cardno

This route operates parallel to the rail corridor between Campbelltown and Liverpool. It would service the eastern precincts between Glenfield and Campbelltown and potentially serve Moorebank intermodal shipping terminal. This could be designed to operate outside of the typical railway station catchment of 800 metres, but potentially connections to key railway station interchanges such as Campbelltown, Glenfield and Liverpool. The route proposes to operate directly and provide a better balance on speed, directness and coverage, than current bus routes.

## **Route 3: Campbelltown to Wollongong**

The wider network review should investigate the feasibility of a more direct service between Campbelltown and Wollongong. Given the relatively long distance of the route, the service takes approximately 1.25 hours to complete. Time savings could be achieved by operating with limited stops and more direct routing.

## **Route 4: Campbelltown to Narellan**

A number of routes operate on Narellan Road. It is recommended to investigate a review of bus operations along this corridor. It is anticipated operations could be simplified with Narellan becoming a minor network hub.

## Route 5: Campbelltown to South West Growth Corridor via Badgally Road.

It is expected that Badgally Road will be upgraded to a transit corridor and could eventually provide a direct connection to the proposed Badgerys Creek airport. This is reliant on both the upgrade and completion of Badgally Road and the development of the transport network in the South West Growth Centre. Given these factors, this route is a considered a long term consideration.

## **Route 6: Campbelltown to Leppington**

As the development of the South West Growth Centre progresses the demand and viability of this service could be investigated to provide relatively directly link the two railway transport hubs. This route is also reliant on the completion of the road network. This route is considered a long term consideration.

## Local Routes

The local routes have been developed and improved over many years serving their respective areas and feeding stations along the corridor. It is expected they have been refined to provide the most useful service to the communities these routes serve.

Any redesign of routes would require detailed analysis of the community needs to understand trip behaviour and destinations at a local level. This is expected to be undertaken as part of a wider bus network review.



## Figure 10-2 Indicative connections to bus network





#### 10.1.3 <u>Regional road network</u>

The strategy seeks to provide additional regional road links for the primary benefit of freight movement through the region. Two road links are suggested for further analysis, discussed as follows:

- > Cambridge Avenue extension to Campbelltown Road as modelled and discussed in Section 7.3.1. This could potential provide benefits to the proposed Moorebank Intermodal Shipping Terminal.
- > Devon Road and Chester Road link between Williamson Road and Cumberland Road as considered in Section 7.3.3.

## 10.1.4 Regional car parking

This transport strategy seeks to support and encourage sustainable transport modes. As such, no additional car parking is proposed for the region or precincts. It is sought to implement management measures to balance the existing supply and demand and ultimately relocate significant at grade facilities to multi-storey or basement facilities to create activated street frontages and more efficient use of land.

Detailed car parking studies are required to determine appropriate provision, policy and management.

## **10.2 Precinct network plans**

The concept precinct network plans were developed to enhance the existing networks, achieve the objectives of this integrated transport strategy while also supporting the structure plans and land use intensification. The networks focus around each precincts station and improved access to the stations.

This section outlines the concept pedestrian and cyclist networks for each precinct. These combine the existing network with additions/ links for consideration. Other modes require more detailed assessments at corridor level and are discussed at lesser detail within each precinct. It is anticipated that the active transport networks could be developed and refined in respective PAMP's and Bike Plans.

#### 10.2.1 <u>Glenfield</u>

The Glenfield precinct has significant potential for land use density and transport improvements. Opportunities for the area include improving walking and cycling mode shares and reducing the reliance on vehicles for day to day tasks.

The likely impacts of the Glenfield Structure Plan on the local transport network include:

- > A greater demand on the transport network due to the increase of land use density around the station.
- > More direct and convenient route options due to the finer grained road network.
- > Enhanced walking and cycling networks due to maximisation of green corridors.

It is recommended to increase public transport services to support the increased activity. The following objective provides direction for the development of the Glenfield precinct future transport network:

To support and encourage local residential and employment growth through the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The concept Glenfield precinct transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections to the Glenfield Railway Station;
- > Reduce circuitous bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve road/street legibility and permeability.

These improvements, and others as outlined in the following sections, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

## Walking

There is only one railway pedestrian crossing in Glenfield which is located at the station. It is proposed that this will remain the key pedestrian railway crossing point in the precinct.

The footpath on the north-west side of the railway line is limited to that provided adjacent to the railway line. The Hurlstone Agricultural High School dominates the land use to the west of the station and it is expected to remain in the location in the longer term and as such there are minimal proposals on the north-west side of the railway line.

It is proposed to extend the footpath network north of Glenfield Road to provide a shorter link to the residential precinct on the north-west side of the railway corridor. It is noted a connection is available along Glenfield Road under the Cambridge Avenue bridge.

On the south-east side of the railway corridor, Railway Parade provides the key network spine which is used to branch the proposed key pedestrian network routes to the residential precincts on the south-east side of the railway line. A brief description of the routes and crossings of the key pedestrian network is outlined in **Table 10-2** as follows.

| Roads   | Key Crossing<br>locations   | Description  | Proposed Improvements  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Railway Parade  | Hoskin Crescent<br>signalised intersection<br>Pedestrian refuge<br>adjacent to Glenfield<br>Public School<br>Trafalgar Street<br>roundabout refuges<br>Pedestrian refuge<br>north of Belmont Road | Key access route to station<br>adjacent to the railway corridor  | Increase width of footpath on east side of carriageway.  |
| Chesham Parade,<br>Lalor Street, Harrow<br>Road             | Canterbury Road/<br>Harrow Road, no<br>existing facilities  | East access route to residential area  | Footpath through Lalor Park.<br>Formal crossing across<br>Canterbury Road at Lalor Street.                           |
| Trafalgar Street  | Canterbury Road signalised crossing   | East route   | Footpath on south side of carriageway.   |
| Hosking Crescent,<br>Belmont Road                           | Belmont Road/<br>Canterbury Road<br>signalised crossing, all<br>legs  | South-east access route. Path<br>on north side of Belmont Road<br>only. Key route to Glenwood<br>Public School | Formal crossing of Belmont<br>Road at Hosking Crescent.<br>Footpath on south side of<br>carriageway on Belmont Road. |
| Bougainville Road   | Belmont Road at<br>Bougainville Road, no<br>formal crossing<br>facilities   | South-east route linking from Belmont Road.  | None expected to be required   |
| Wentworth Avenue,<br>Hurlstone Avenue                       | Fawcett Street, no<br>formal crossing<br>facilities   | South route, no paths are provided   | Footpath on at least one side of<br>carriageway of both Wentworth<br>Avenue and Hurlstone Avenue.                    |
| Newtown Road  | Fawcett Street, kerb<br>ramps provided<br>however non-compliant   | South route servicing town hall and Seddon Park  | Provide pedestrian refuges at<br>intersections and compliant kerb<br>ramps   |
| Private access road<br>(north-west side of<br>railway line) | Glenfield Road<br>roundabout  | North route to residential precincts.  | New north-south footpath from<br>Glenfield Road roundabout to<br>Britannia Drive                                     |
| Glenfield Road  | Glenfield Road roundabout   | North route  | None expected to be required   |

## Table 10-2 Core pedestrian network to/ from station

Cardno

#### Draft structure plan impacts on walking network

The majority of pedestrian activity will remain on the eastern side of the railway corridor. The proposed street network block sizes are smaller and as a result pedestrian permeability and walkability within the precinct will increase.

Green links are proposed that will facilitate recreational, and potentially some transport, use along creek lines, easements and bushland linking to the precinct. These green links are generally located around the



outer edges of the precinct effectively creating and outer orbital walking path. These integrate with the proposed walking network.



## Figure 10-3 Glenfield proposed walking network





## Cycling

All key local network routes will branch from the proposed regional railway route. The proposed streets for the local routes include:

- > Chesham Parade linking Harrow Road to the north-east of the station.
- > Hosking Crescent and Belmont Road providing a very direct link east from the station past Glenwood Public School.
- > Newtown Road linking to the south.

These local routes provide greater convenient reach than the pedestrian network and link various residential areas within the precinct, as well as Glenwood Public School and Seddon and Kennett Parks.

On the north-west side of the rail corridor, the regional link provides convenient access to the station and Glenfield town centre via station facilities and it links to Camden Valley Way and the M7 bicycle path.

Figure 10-4 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Glenfield.

#### Draft structure plan impact on cycling network

The cycling network integrates with the structure plan areas being located near to the key cycling network. The network will be supplemented by the addition of the new link roads which are to be low speed and low volume environments.



## Figure 10-4 Glenfield proposed local cycleway





#### Bus

Consideration should be given to providing local services to route through areas to the east of the station and north of Belmont Road. This could be achieved by diverting the S9 service, which would require an analysis of potential customer demand and route directness to encourage trip containment and connections to and from the station.

#### Draft Structure plan impact on bus network

All major roads will remain and any bus network route changes will be restricted to higher order roads.

### Road

The extension of Cambridge Avenue may produce broader benefits in terms of network connectivity for freight vehicles, especially with Cambridge Avenue linking to Moorebank Avenue and the proposed Moorebank Intermodal Terminal.

It is recommended that a detailed transport analysis is undertaken to better understand the benefits and impacts taking into consideration the study area objectives in **Section 9**.

#### Draft structure plan impact on road network

The proposed road network will provide smaller block sizes in the station precinct, opportunities for rear lane access and an overall finer grained network. These proposed road network changes could be designed to provide a low speed environment due urban design and smaller blocks. While additional conflict points will be created, this will be managed with LATM measures to provide a safer environment for all road users.

#### Summary draft structure plan impact on transport network

- > Increasing land use density around the station inducing greater demand on the transport network, and public transport will become a more convenient mode to access land.
- > More fine grained network with smaller block sizes to provide more direct and convenient route options;
- > Maximising use of green corridors for walking and cycling networks;
- > Increasing public transport services to support the increased activity.
- > The development intensification in the station precinct will provide an optimal outcome in terms of increasing dwellings and business floor areas while reducing the impact on the road network.

## Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the freight movements expected on the local road network.

#### Draft structure plan impact on freight network

A finer grain street network is expected to improve freight/ delivery access within the station precinct. The potential Cambridge Avenue extension has the potential to improve the regional road freight network.



## 10.2.2 <u>Macquarie Fields</u>

Cardno

The transport catchment of Macquarie Fields Station is limited by Redfern Creek, Bunbury Curan Creek and Macquarie Links Golf Club. These natural and man-made features effectively place the station on an access restricted peninsula.

The Macquarie Fields Station is located over one kilometre away from the main shopping precinct and transport links are somewhat indirect. As such the station operates as a transport interchange point only and serves the local residential population within the station catchment.

The key opportunities for the Macquarie Fields precinct are to improve connectivity between the railway station, the retail centre and education land uses, increase walking and cycling catchments and increase key public transport services within the peak period. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support and encourage residential growth through the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including new connections to the commercial centre, and walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The Macquarie Fields precinct has a significant amount of potential for land use density, transport improvements and new connections. The current Macquarie Fields Station is non-DDA compliant.

The concept transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections between Macquarie Fields Station and the shopping centre;
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve road/street legibility and permeability.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

The network is structured to provide east-west links between the station and major trip generating land uses.

The key desire lines run east-west on the south east side of the station. It is proposed to create a new connection over Redfern Creek to the north-east of the station to service the north-east to station desire line.

The station walking network is based on creating a grid system to connect people from all areas east of the station. Demand from residential areas to the east of the precinct to access main trip generating locations such as the station, will require key pedestrian routes along Saywell, Parliament and Victoria Roads, which are aligned in the east-west direction. These routes connect to Railway Parade which runs in a north-south orientation, and follows from the rail corridor.

Additional trip generating areas, such as the retail centre at the intersection of Parliament and Saywell Roads and the Macarthur Adventist College, would create a desire line in a north-south direction. The route along Atchison Road would cater for these trips.

On the western side of the corridor a new connection is proposed to link the Macquarie Links residential estate to Macquarie Fields town centre via the station, subject to agreement with the Golf course land owners.

The locations of the recommended upgrades is listed in Table 10-3.



| Roads  | Key Crossing locations   | Description   | Proposed<br>Improvements   |
|--|--|---|--|
| Railway Parade   | Redfern Creek, no crossing provided  | Key access along the rail corridor.<br>Missing link at Redfern Creek<br>reduces near travel distance<br>catchment.  | Provide Redfern Creek<br>crossing between<br>Railway Parade and<br>Victoria Road   |
| Victoria Road,<br>Atchison Road,<br>Fraser Street                              | Victoria Road/ Atchison Road roundabout  | North-east route  | Provide footpath on at least one side of carriageway.  |
| Victoria Road  | Victoria Road/ Atchison Road<br>roundabout   | East route. With the Redfern<br>Creek crossing this would form a<br>direct link to the east passing<br>Macarthur Adventist College,<br>South Western Sydney TAFE and<br>Glenquarie Town Centre. | Provide pedestrian<br>refuge crossings at<br>intersections.  |
| Alexander<br>Crescent,<br>Windsor Street,<br>Atchison Road<br>and First Avenue | Redfern Creek bridge links<br>between Alexander Crescent<br>and Windsor Street.<br>Atchison Road between<br>Windsor Street and First<br>Avenue. No formal facilities are<br>provided, however a painted<br>median is located along this<br>region of Atchison Road | East route which forms the most<br>direct route between the station<br>and Glenfield Library and<br>Glenquarie Town Centre  | Provide pedestrian<br>refuge crossings at<br>intersections.  |
| Saywell Road   | Saywell Road at Church Street,<br>no formal facility provided.<br>Saywell Road/ Atchison Road/<br>Parliament Road signalised<br>intersection, no crossing on<br>north leg.   | South-east route, access to<br>Saywell Road/ Parliament Road<br>retail precinct.  | Provide footpath on<br>south side of<br>carriageway.<br>Provide pedestrian<br>refuge crossings at<br>intersections.<br>Provide crossing at<br>Saywell Road/ Fields<br>Road intersection. |
| Parliament Road  |  | East route  | Provide crossing on<br>north leg of Saywell<br>Road/ Atchison Road/<br>Parliament Road<br>intersection.  |
| Waratah Crescent   | Saywell Road at Waratah<br>Crescent, no formal facility<br>provided  | South route which can be used to access Milton Park.  | Footpath on at least one side of Waratah Crescent.   |

#### Table 10-3Core pedestrian network to/from station

The existing and non-existing paths on the network are shown in **Figure 10-5**.

#### Structure plan impact on pedestrian network

Within the entire precinct additional road links are proposed, resulting in smaller street blocks which would benefit walkability.

To complement the pedestrian network, green links are proposed that will facilitate recreational use along creek lines, easements and through bushland. The green links are located predominantly around the outer edges of the precinct.

The land use intensity increase proposed in the structure plan would benefit most from pedestrian network improvements given the area is generally located between the station and existing shopping centre and educational facilities.

## Cardno'







## Cycling

To maximise the benefit of the regional network, local routes have been developed that link from the surrounding residential areas to Macquarie Fields Station. The Macquarie Fields network would focus on the south-east side of the railway corridor. The Redfern Creek crossing is a key component of the railway corridor regional route and increases the near travel distance catchment of the station to the north. The proposed streets for the local cycle routes include:

- > Victoria Road to the east of the station passing Macarthur Adventist College, Glenquarie Shopping Centre and Macquarie Fields State College.
- > Saywell Road is a key route to the south-east of Macquarie Fields. This passes through the small retail/ commercial precinct at the Parliament Road junction.
- > Parliament Road links to Saywell Road. This route provides a link in an easterly direction and passes to the south of James Meehan High School.

Figure 10-6 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Macquarie Fields.

#### Structure plan impact on cycling network

The cycling network integrates with the structure plan and the increase in activity would support the networks use of the network.



## Cardno<sup>®</sup>







#### Bus

The existing 876 loop service does not cover the northern precincts of Macquarie Fields. The completion of the proposed Redfern Creek bridge would allow the service to operate on a larger loop, capturing a larger area along Victoria Road with minimal route distance increase. It would also allow the service to provide a better connection between Macquarie Fields Station and Glenquarie Town Centre.

#### Structure plan impact on bus network

Minimal if any impact is expected on the bus network. The structure plan places the increased land use intensity between the station, retail and educational land uses.

#### Road

A bridge is proposed over Redfern Creek between Railway Parade and Victoria Road which would significantly improve access to the station without providing a significant through traffic route.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

The proposed road network will provide smaller block sizes and an overall finer grained network. These proposed road network changes provide the opportunity to provide a road environment which encourages reduced vehicle speeds. This will provide a safer environment for all road users.

No significant arterial roads are proposed or considered necessary in this precinct, with the existing key arterial routes remaining.

#### Structure plan impact on transport network

The structure plan proposes to increase residential density around Macquarie Fields Station, improve connections to the nearby retail centre, and provide a walking and cycling link to improve the north-east catchment. This is likely to encourage more walking and cycling in the local area. Additional street links are proposed to create a finer grained network, improving walkability throughout the precinct. The cycling network uses intuitive routes that maximise the reach of the cycling catchment.

Key network improvements include:

- > New walking and cycling network to support access to the station and between the station, retail and educational land uses;
- > Maximising and integrating green corridors for walking and cycling networks; and
- > Increasing in public transport services to support the increased activity.

## Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the freight movements expected through the precinct.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

A finer grain street network is expected to improve freight/ delivery access to properties within the station precinct.



Cardno

## 10.2.3 <u>Ingleburn</u>

The precinct has a split function; with retail, commercial and residential on the southern side, and industrial on the northern side. The separation of vehicular networks between the north and south results in minimal mix of heavy vehicles accessing the residential, retail and commercial uses. The south-east side of the railway corridor has a relatively fine grained grid street network. The road network on the north-west side of the railway is a large block structure as a result of the land use in that precinct. There are large areas dedicated to at-grade car parking in the town centre evident of the dominance of private vehicle mode share.

The key transport challenges for Ingleburn precinct are lack of access across the railway line and low density housing close to the station and retail hubs. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support, reinforce and grow Ingleburn as a centre within the region through residential and employment growth with the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The Ingleburn precinct has potential for land use density, transport improvements and new connections. The current Ingleburn Interchange is undergoing an upgrade as part of the Transport Access Program.

The proposed transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections to Ingleburn Station and the town centre;
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve direct street legibility and permeability.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

Ingleburn has a fine-grained street network to the south east of the station that permits a high level of permeability. Additional paths are proposed to encourage walking to both the station and town centre. Many of the proposed paths are located to the south of the station. These will support the extensive residential catchment further south and south-west. To a lesser extent, paths are proposed on the north-west side of the track to support links between employment land uses, the station and the town centre.

The key pedestrian network is built on a legible grid layout. Four routes are proposed in an east-west direction on each side of the station. The east-west routes are along Macquarie Road, Oxford Road, Chester Road, Aero Road, Memorial Avenue and Devon Road. These east-west routes are supported by three north-south routes distributed throughout the precinct. The north-south routes are along Stanley Road, Ingleburn Road and Cumberland Road.

Given the relatively finer-grained road network, there are a greater number of crossing locations and therefore a more extensive review of crossing facilities will be required.

The locations of the recommended upgrades is listed in Table 10-4.



#### Table 10-4 Core pedestrian network to/from station

| Roads  | Key Crossing locations   | Description  | Proposed Improvements   |
|--|--|--|---|
| Ingleburn Road, Macquarie<br>Road, Carlisle Street,<br>Cumberland Road, Oxford<br>Road, Norfolk Street,<br>Suffolk Street, Chester<br>Road | Oxford Road/ Ingleburn<br>Road, roundabout<br>Oxford Road/ Nardoo<br>Street, roundabout/ shared<br>zone<br>Oxford Road/ Carlisle<br>Street, roundabout<br>Oxford Road/ Cumberland<br>Road, signalised<br>Norfolk Street/ Ingleburn<br>Road, roundabout<br>Norfolk Street/ Carlisle<br>Street, roundabout<br>Norfolk Street Cumberland<br>Road, priority control, no<br>facilities across<br>Cumberland Road at<br>intersection<br>Suffolk Street/ Carlisle<br>Street, roundabout<br>Suffolk Street/ Carlisle<br>Street, roundabout<br>Chester Road Ingleburn<br>Road, roundabout and<br>proposed crossing across<br>railway line<br>Chester Road/ Carlisle<br>Street, roundabout | Key grid network on the<br>south-east side of the<br>railway line  | Footpath on at least one<br>side of Suffolk Street.<br>Assess all crossing<br>treatments. |
| Koala Walk   | Cumberland Road, refuge  | An eastern route<br>connecting to the south-<br>east grid, also a<br>recreational walk   | Identify measures to<br>improve personal security.  |
| Treelands Walk   | Cumberland Road, zebra<br>crossing south west of<br>Norfolk Street   | A south recreational route   | Identify measures to<br>improve personal security.  |
| Stanley Road   | At Memorial Avenue intersection, zebra.  | North west route. Links to footbridge over Bunbury Curan Creek.  | Provide footpath along western side of street   |
| Aero Road  |  | Continuation of Stanley<br>Road to the north<br>employment precinct.<br>Limited facilities to the<br>south-west of the station | Provide continuous<br>footpath of at least one<br>side of the carriageway.                |
| Devon Road   |  | Continuation of Stanley<br>Road to the south-west  | Provide footpath on at least one side of carriageway.                                     |
| Broadhurst Road  |  | South-west route, no footpaths   | Provide footpath on at least one side of carriageway.                                     |
|  |  |  |   |

#### Structure plan impact of pedestrian network

The structure plan benefits from the existing short spaced street grid layout and is complemented by green links that provide additional direct links to the town centre and station. The structure plan will increase use of the pedestrian network.



## Figure 10-7 Ingleburn concept walking network





## Cycling

The network runs in a north-east to south-west direction adjacent to the railway corridor and an additional route runs in a north-west to south-east direction. These two major routes create good access opportunities for cycling to the railway station and town centre.

The proposed north-west to south-east regional network would be located along Oxford Road through the main activity centre and past Ingleburn High School and along Memorial Avenue linking to the south west growth centre.

The proposed local cycle routes include:

- > West of the railway lines would be via Stanley Road and Aero Road for the north-west and via Stanley Road and Broadhurst Road for the south-west employment area.
- > East of the railway lines would be via Norfolk Street, Cumberland Road to the Treelands Walk (Redfern Creek) providing a large residential catchment to the south and via Chester Road providing links to many of the quieter residential streets.
- Links to the east of the station are proposed via Carlisle Street, Cambridge Street, Cumberland Road and onto Koala Walk. While this route has some initial zig zagging in the town centre, it is considered the most intuitive route to Koala Walk. This would provide access to much of the residential area to the east of the station.

Figure 10-8 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Ingleburn.

#### Structure plan impact on bicycle network

No additional impacts from the concept bicycle network are anticipated from the structure plans.



#### Figure 10-8 Ingleburn concept local cycle network





#### Bus

The 873 provide good coverage to the south-east of the station, however the route configuration and looping means the service returns back on itself, using the same intersection (Collins Promenade/ Chester Road) twice. Further precincts to the south of Ingleburn are serviced by a very indirect service.

Ingleburn is extensive enough for two overlapping loop services or one large loop service, pending feasibility analysis.

#### Structure plan impact on bus network

Minimal, if any impact, is expected on the bus network. Additional demand may occur for regional bus routes.

#### Road

A concept second rail crossing road link between Williamson Road and Cumberland Road has been considered, potentially along Devon Road and Chester Road corridor. This link would provide an additional east west connection for the local area for all modes of transport. The link is south of the town centre and as such may also improve amenity by reducing through traffic in the town centre.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

The proposed road network will provide smaller grid sizes with the opportunity to create a road environment that encourages a slow speed environment, which will provide a safer environment for all road users.

The increase in density in both Ingleburn and the region may justify the provision of a second rail crossing to the south-west of Ingleburn Station. This will require more detailed analysis to determine its feasibility, impact and preferred alignment.

## Structure plan impact on transport network summary

The proposed transport network at Ingleburn aims to enhance the existing network with the addition of some links and infrastructure improvements.

It is proposed to create a finer grained road network to the north-west of the railway corridor to support higher density residential and retail land uses near the station. It is not proposed to provide a road link in the town centre between the two sides, although a road link across the rail corridor is proposed to the south-west of the station. The pedestrian and bicycle network will maximise the use of the bridge at the station.

Key network improvements include:

- Enhanced walking and cycling network to support access to the station and the retail and commercial centre;
- > Maximised use of green corridors and integrating with walking and cycling networks;
- > Increase in rail and bus services in the peak periods to reflect land use role in region; and
- > Investigate the feasibility of a road link across the rail corridor.

#### Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the freight movements expected. Investigation to improve links including:

- > Access to the precinct from the south along the Hume Motorway.
- > The potential for a more direct link between Brooks Roads south-east across the Bunbury Curan Creek.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

Some land uses on the west side of the railway line are proposed to be rezoned to business and residential land uses. The transport will need to consider the need to minimise freight movements through the rezoned area and private trips from the rezoned area through the industrial precinct.



## 10.2.4 <u>Minto</u>

The Minto Station is located in the centre of the precinct, with industrial use adjoining the south and west and residential and commercial uses adjoining the north-east of the station. The Minto precinct has a large industrial use focus and includes the Minto Intermodal Shipping Terminal to the south of the station.

The key opportunities and challenges for the Minto precinct include maintaining and supporting industrial land uses while maximising residential amenity for transport, planning for residential and industrial transport growth and encouraging walking and cycling in an area that is largely industrial. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support, reinforce and grow Minto as a residential and industrial precinct within the region through housing and employment growth with the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including infrastructure and services across all transport modes.

The Minto precinct has potential for land use density, transport improvements and new connections.

The concept transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections to Minto Station and the town centre;
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve direct street legibility and permeability.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

The concept network focuses on completing the core grid network to the east of the station, encouraging more walking and supporting intensification of land use in the precinct. Missing links are proposed to be completed to provide stronger links to residential and employment land uses to the west. While residential land uses are beyond the 800 metre catchment to the west, it is likely there would still be potential for people with more time and willingness to walk longer distances.

The majority of the pedestrian demand is expected to remain to the north-west and north-east side of the station using existing desire lines north-south along Airds Road, Somerset Street, Minto Road and Kent Street. Demand for residential areas to the east will be accessed via existing links following Minto Road, Durham Street, Stafford Street and Redfern Road that connect to the main trip generating locations such as the station, retail and commercial areas. Additional east-west links along Ben Lomond Road and Sussex Street will be provided to encourage movement through the industrial precincts to the west. Access over the railway line will be provided by the existing station facilities.

Additional treatments are required for crossings, particularly any location across Ben Lomond Road and Pembroke Road. The locations of the recommended upgrades are listed in **Table 10-5**.

| Roads/ Areas  | Key Crossing locations  | Description   | Concept Improvements   |
|---|---|---|--|
| Minto Road,<br>Surry Street,<br>Kent Street,<br>Durham Street,<br>Warwick Street,<br>Stafford Street,<br>Redfern Road | Minto Road/ Durham Street, kerb ramps<br>across Durham Street only<br>Durham Street/ Surrey Street, roundabout,<br>kerb ramps, path only across south leg.<br>Minto Road/ Warwick Street, kerb ramps<br>across east leg only<br>Warwick Street/ Surrey Street, kerb ramps,<br>no footpaths<br>Warwick Street/ Kent Street, kerb ramps,<br>painted islands<br>Warwick Street/ Pembroke Road, kerb<br>ramps over west leg only.<br>Stafford Street/ Minto Road, kerb ramps<br>eastern leg only. | Eastern grid, some<br>retail/ commercial<br>access adjacent to the<br>station and access to<br>core residential<br>precinct. Redfern Street<br>links directly to Minto<br>Marketplace. Stafford<br>Street links to<br>education precinct. | Provide continuous path<br>at least one side of the<br>carriageway on Surrey<br>Street and Warwick<br>Street<br>Formal crossing at<br>Stafford Street/<br>Pembroke Road. |

#### Table 10-5 Core pedestrian network to/ from station



| Roads/ Areas                                    | Key Crossing locations  | Description  | Concept Improvements  |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | Stafford Street/ Surrey Street, kerb ramps.<br>Stafford Street/ Kent Street, kerb ramps.<br>Stafford Street/ Pembroke Road, no<br>crossing.<br>Redfern Road adjacent to station entry,<br>pedestrian refuges.<br>Redfern Road/ Surrey Street, roundabout<br>with refuges.<br>Redfern Road/ Surrey Street, roundabout<br>with refuges. |  |   |
|   | Redfern Road/ Kent Street, roundabout<br>with refuges.<br>Redfern Road/ Pembroke Road, signals<br>and pedestrian crossings.   |  |   |
| Coronation Park                                 | Ben Lomond Road/ Pembroke Road, roundabout  | South-east routes,<br>potential to provide<br>path though Rose<br>Reserve  | Improve crossing<br>facilities at Ben Lomond<br>Road/ Pembroke Road.  |
| Ben Lomond<br>Road                              | Wiltshire Street/ Lincoln Street, kerb ramps<br>Airds Road, roundabout<br>Holmes Road. Cary Grove, roundabout<br>Campbelltown Road, formal crossing on<br>south leg only.   | West route to access<br>employment precinct<br>and residential precinct<br>west of Campbelltown<br>Road.   | Provide path on north<br>side of carriageway.<br>Improve crossing<br>facilities at all crossings.<br>Provide crossing on north<br>leg of Campbelltown<br>Road                                     |
| Airds Road<br>(south of Ben<br>Lomond Road)     |   | Access to south<br>employment precinct,<br>west of railway.  | Complete missing link on<br>east side of carriageway<br>south of Ben Lomond<br>Road   |
| Somerset Street                                 | Station access, zebra crossing  | Key access along west<br>side of station. A<br>pedestrian path<br>provides a link to Bow<br>Bowing.  |   |
| Lincoln Street,<br>Sussex Street,<br>Airds Road | Lincoln Street/ Sussex Street, roundabout<br>Airds Road, no mid-block facilities  | Proposed north-west<br>shortcut route. A desire<br>line is evident between<br>Airds Road and Bouddi<br>Street through Bow<br>Bowing Creek reserve. | Provide footpath on at<br>least one side of Lincoln<br>Street, Sussex Street<br>and Airds Road.<br>Provide formal crossing<br>of Airds Road.<br>Footpath between Airds<br>Road and Bouddi Street. |

## Structure plan impact on pedestrian network

The proposed key pedestrian network integrates with the proposed structure plan and provides justification of improved facilities in the residential grid.



## Figure 10-9 Minto concept walking network





## Cycling

Three regional concept routes connect to the Minto Station:

- > The main north-south regional railway corridor route which also links to local routes to the north east of the station.
- > A regional route to link with the station is proposed along Ben Lomond Road to the west. This would provide the opportunity to connect with St Andrews Road and Raby Road via Campbelltown Road. The route would also form the key bicycle link to St Andrews where it is also possible to connect with Raby via a freeway overpass connecting Byrne Reserve in St Andrews to Blain Park in Raby.
- > A third regional route is to the north of the station along Essex Street and Somerset Street. This would link to Bouddi Street and St Andrews Road to the west which is proposed to be a key link to the South West Growth Centre.

To maximise cycling, proposed key local routes have been developed that link from regional routes, the surrounding residential areas to the Minto Station and the main street. The proposed streets for the local routes include:

- > A route along Surrey Street would run parallel two street blocks east of the railway corridor route assisting to capture the nearby residential precincts.
- Stafford Street/ Monaghan Street provides a relatively direct route to the east of the station passing between Minto Marketplace shopping centre and the education and recreation precinct to the north of Minto Marketplace.
- > A route through Coronation Park and diagonally across Ben Lomond Road/ Pembroke Road to Rose Reserve would capture the relatively new residential precinct to the south and south-east. Paths through Coronation Park are already constructed.
- > Redfern Road between the station and Minto Marketplace. This route already exists with both on-street and off-street facilities.

The concept cycling paths build on the north-south regional route which would most likely be located on the Minto Road side of the railway corridor. This provides the greatest benefit of access to the station for commuters to the east of the station. This regional route has the potential to cross to the western side of the railway corridor at Ben Lomond Road to bypass the Minto intermodal shipping terminal (MIST) which is connected to the rail network. Alternatively the route could be diverted to Pembroke Road around MIST.

An east west regional route along Ben Lomond Road links the industrial and commercial and shopping area in the precinct and has the potential to continue west to link the South West Growth Centre.

Local cycle routes will branch from the regional cycle routes on the western side along Somerset Street and Essex Street. On the eastern side, a local cycle route will be provided along Stafford Street, Surrey Street and through Coronation Park to Ben Lomond Road. These links provide connections between residential, retail and commercial land uses within the precinct and link across the railway at the train station.

Figure 10-10 shows the proposed regional and local cycle network for Minto.

## Structure plan impact on proposed cycling network

The concept cycling network integrates with the proposed structure plan.



#### Figure 10-10 Minto concept local cycle network





#### Bus

The 873 operates as a local route through Minto servicing to some extent the north-east and eastern precincts from the station. The south-east precincts are reliant on the 870, 871 and 872 services which do not provide connections to Minto Station.

The precinct and station may be better be served by a Minto only loop service in conjunction with the proposed services.

#### Structure plan impact on bus network

The structure plan would not impact on any existing bus routes and maintains flexibility for potential route changes.

#### Road

An additional road link concept was considered to the north of the precinct, however it was found to induce traffic as outlined in **Section 7.3.4**, so it is not recommended.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

Within the retail, and residential areas in the north-east quadrant of the precinct, the proposed road network will provide smaller street block sizes which will also be advantageous to the pedestrian network. This proposed road network provides an opportunity to create a road environment that encourages low speeds through the use of urban design and traffic management techniques. This will provide a safer environment for all road users.

No significant new road links are considered necessary for the remaining areas of the precinct, with the existing higher order roads operating at satisfactory levels.

#### Summary of structure plan impact on transport network

The precinct has a primary industrial function and secondary residential and commercial function. The structure plan proposes to increase residential density in the north-east quadrant of Minto Station and improve local street connections. This allows the industrial lands to the west and south to continue to operate while also catering for residential growth. The residential area will also have a main street that would cater for local goods and services. This will reduce the demand for more regional travel to shopping centres.

Key network improvements include:

- > New walking and cycling network to support access to the station and the retail and commercial centre;
- > Increase in rail and bus services in the peak periods;
- > Increase in housing density and residential land use around the station while maintaining key industrial land uses and freight connections.

#### Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the increase in freight movements expected. Investigations should be undertaken to improve access between the industrial precinct and the Hume Motorway, particularly access to and from the south.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

The proposed structure plan is maintain and enhance land uses in their existing location. Additional road links on the east side are expected to increase freight and delivery access to the residential precincts.



Cardno

## 10.2.5 Leumeah

The Leumeah Station is located in the centre of the precinct, with the entertainment uses to the east, residential use to the east and south-east, commercial use to the south-west and industrial to the north. The precinct has a large focus on entertainment with the Campbelltown Sports Stadium and supporting services, such as West Leagues Club. This use induces high demand for access in short periods of time, which requires the local walking network to be well defined and sufficient capacity provided.

The key opportunities and challenges for the precinct are establishing walking and cycling networks, connections into the surrounding area and accommodating high peak demand during events. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support, reinforce and grow Leumeah as a local residential, entertainment and light industrial area within the region through housing and employment growth with the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The Leumeah precinct has potential for land use density and transport improvements. The current Leumeah Interchange consists of bus facilities, bike parking, Kiss & Ride, Park & Ride and taxi spaces.

The concept transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections from Leumeah Station to the town centre and entertainment centre;
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve road/ street legibility.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

The concept network includes a new link that enables a direct link from the station south-east to the residential precincts. This also forms a direct link to Smiths Creek reserve. Much of the southern residential precinct is not served by any footpaths.

The core network proposes to encourage more walking from Woodbine to Leumeah through additional footpaths, new links and crossings across Campbelltown Road.

The locations of the potential upgrades is listed in Table 10-6.

| Roads/ Areas   | Key Crossing locations   | Description   | Concept Improvements   |
|--|--|---|--|
| Old Leumeah Road/<br>Leumeah Road  | Pembroke Road/ Old<br>Leumeah Road, signalised<br>crossing north-west and<br>north-east leg only | East access, very direct                                      | Maintain crossing and<br>investigate any need for<br>path widening.<br>New signalised crossing<br>leg on south-west leg of<br>Pembroke Road/ Old<br>Leumeah Road |
| Pembroke Road (north-<br>east of Old Leumeah<br>Road)                          | Ross Payten Drive  | North-east access   | Maintain as is. Consider<br>long term footpath offset<br>and/or widening from kerb<br>on south side of<br>carriageway.   |
| Cut through path between<br>retail precinct linking to<br>Smiths Creek reserve | Pembroke Road,<br>pedestrian refuge provided<br>off-set to path                                  | Key south-east route,<br>splitting at Smiths Creek<br>Reserve | Provide segregated path<br>and integrate with any<br>proposed development in<br>the precinct.  |
|  |  |   | Provide formal crossing at<br>Pembroke Road  |

#### Table 10-6 Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station



| Roads/ Areas                     | Key Crossing locations  | Description  | Concept Improvements   |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Smiths Creek Reserve             |   | East recreational route,<br>alternative route for nearby<br>residential catchment. | Investigate opportunities to<br>improve personal security.   |
| Angle Road                       |   | South route, no paths  | Provide footpath on at least one side of the carriageway.  |
| O'Sullivan Road                  | O'Sullivan Road/<br>Pembroke Road,<br>roundabout  | South route  | Investigate upgrade of intersection to signals.  |
| Rudd Road                        |   | Links from O'Sullivan Road to the south-west                                       | Maintain as is. Investigate<br>any need for path<br>widening.  |
| Kingsclare Street                | Rudd Road, no formal<br>crossing facility   | South access route.  | Provide footpath on east side of carriageway.  |
| Plough Inn Road, Harbord<br>Road | Plough Inn Road/ Airds<br>Road, roundabout<br>Plough Inn Road/ Hollylea<br>Road, kerb ramps across<br>Hollylea Road<br>Plough Inn Road/<br>Campbelltown Road/<br>Harbord Road, signalised<br>crossing on all legs.<br>Harbord Road/ Rennie<br>Road, roundabout. | North-west route to<br>Woodbine residential<br>precinct.                           | Provide continuous<br>footpath on north and east<br>side of carriageway.<br>Complete missing link of<br>footpath on Harbord Road<br>between Rennie Road and<br>Campbelltown Road on<br>north side. |
|                                  | Harbord Road/ North<br>Steyne Road, offset<br>pedestrian refuges on all<br>legs   |  |  |
| Campbelltown Road                | Campbelltown Road/ Rose<br>Payton Drive, signals on<br>south and east leg only.<br>Campbelltown Road/<br>Collaroy Road, pedestrian<br>refuge  | North-west connection to residential area  | Maintain as is.  |
| Collaroy Road                    | Collaroy Road   |  | Provide footpath for north<br>side of road from<br>Campbelltown Road to<br>North Steyne Road   |
| Airds Road                       |   | North access to employment precinct  | Complete missing link to<br>Rose Payten Drive  |
| Airds Road to Palm Court         | Proposed new link from<br>Airds Road to Palm Court<br>via Campbelltown Road<br>(essentially an extension of<br>Court Road)  | North-west access to Woodbine.   | Investigate feasibility of<br>providing direct through<br>route  |

#### Structure plan impact on pedestrian network

The majority of the walking demand will remain on the southern side of the railway corridor as a result of close proximity residential precincts and higher density land uses.

Green links will be integrated into the pedestrian network to facilitate both commuting and recreational use which will follow creek lines, easements and bushland. The majority of these green links are on the southern side of the rail corridor, which converge at the centre of the precinct.

The structure plan will support the use of the proposed network improvements with additional links to improve inter-precinct permeability.


### Figure 10-11 Leumeah concept walking network







## Cycling

The regional cycling route continues to runs parallel to the rail corridor through the precinct.

The concept local routes will provide good coverage and access to the station and town centre.

There are five local routes that connect to Leumeah Station.

- > A local route is proposed to closely follow Plough Inn Road and Harbord Road to the residential precinct to the north-west of the station. There is opportunity beyond the 800 metre station radius to provide a link to across the Hume Freeway on the pedestrian/ bike bridge linking Mary Wade Park in Woodbine with Fullwood Place in Claymore.
- > The residential precincts closest to Leumeah Station are located on the south-east side of the railway line. A single local route could connect Leumeah Station through the centre of the existing retail/ commercial precinct bound by O'Sullivan Road/ Old Leumeah Road/ Pembroke Road to a key junction point at the intersection of Pembroke Road and Smiths Creek reserve. From this location, the local routes would diverge into four separate routes discussed as follows:
  - Leumeah Road linking the eastern residential precinct;
  - Smiths Creek Reserve linking both as a recreation and transport route alternative to the east;
  - Angle Road/ Angle Road South providing the key south-east catchment link; and
  - Illawong Road, O'Sullivan Road, Tallawarra Road and Kingsclare Street providing a link to the south residential catchment.

Figure 10-12 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Leumeah.

#### Structure plan impact on cycling network

The concept key cycling network integrates with the proposed structure plan.



## Figure 10-12 Leumeah concept local cycle network





#### Bus

Leumeah is serviced by two local routes, the 881 and 882, however only the 881 has a stop at the station. The 881 also provides the best coverage of Leumeah and also encompasses Minto Heights and a link to Campbelltown Station.

There is potential for route refinement to both straighten the route in some sections and minimise crossover to increase coverage and speed, however within the study area, service to and from the station is reasonably direct.

#### Structure plan impact on bus network

The structure plan would not impact on any existing bus routes and maintain flexibility for potential route changes.

#### Road

No new connections are proposed within the Leumeah precinct.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

The overall proposed road network will remain largely similar to existing conditions, with additional minor links on local roads to provide increased connectivity for residents.

#### Structure plan impact on transport network summary

The structure plan proposes to increase residential density in the south-east quadrant of Leumeah Railway Station and improve walking and cycling connections to the town centre and entertainment uses. This allows the town centre and entertainment uses to be accessed by local residents and entertainment patrons on event days.

Key network improvements include:

- > New walking and cycling network to support access to the entertainment area, station and the retail and commercial centre; and
- > Recommended increase in rail and bus services in the peak periods

### Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the increase in freight movements expected.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

The proposed structure plan is maintain and enhance land uses in their existing location. Additional road links on the east side are expected to increase freight and delivery access to the residential precincts.

## 10.2.6 Campbelltown

Cardno

The precinct provides regional land uses and a high amount of employment, which means that demand for space in this area is at a premium.

The Campbelltown Station is located in the centre of the precinct, with residential use from the north-east to the south-east, commercial use from the south-east to the north-west adjoining the railway line and industrial use to the outer west of the precinct. Large areas of land surrounding the station contain at-grade car parking, particularly to the north-west of the station indicating the station as a key Park & Ride location in the study area.

The key opportunities for the precinct are providing regional connections to the town centre, improving walking and cycling networks and legibility and developing policies for development parking rates and onstreet parking. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support, reinforce and grow Campbelltown as a residential, retail, commercial and industrial area within the region through housing and employment growth with the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The Campbelltown precinct has potential for land use density and transport improvements. The current Campbelltown Interchange consists of large bus interchange, bike parking on both sides of the station, Kiss & Ride, Park & Ride and taxi spaces.

The concept transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections within Campbelltown CBD (including the station);
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve road/street legibility.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

Campbelltown has a well-established pedestrian network. The diversity of land uses within Campbelltown CBD results in the town centre requiring more key local routes. The railway line limits permeability across the corridor which has been used to separate industrial land uses with retail/ commercial land uses. The main pedestrian crossing location is through the station.

On the south side of the station, the key north-west to south-east routes provide access to residential areas along Chamberlain Street, Broughton Street, Cordeaux Street/ Condamine Street and Dumaresq Street. This route is very direct and extends for a considerable distance aiding legibility. The key north-east to south-west pedestrian routes include Hurley Street, Queen Street, Carberry lane/ Howe Street and Oxley Street/ Moore Street. The network on the southern side of the station is comprehensive and provides connections to the majority of the town centre.

On the north side of the station, routes are provided on Farrow Road, Badgally Road and a new connection to Blair Athol. These connections will provide direct access to the station and town centre.

The locations of the concept upgrades are listed in Table 10-7.



| Table 10-7         Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station   |  |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Roads/ Areas  | Key Crossing locations   | Description  | Concept Improvements  |  |  |
| Hurley Street, Broughton<br>Street, Railway Street,<br>Dumaresq Street,<br>Cordeaux Street, Oxley<br>Street and Queen Street. | Underpass adjacent to<br>station access<br>Hurley Street north-east of<br>Patrick Street, signalised.<br>Broughton Street/ Queen<br>Street, signalised crossings<br>on all legs<br>Broughton Street/ Moore<br>Street, signalised<br>crossings, no crossing on<br>north-east leg<br>Railway Street/ Queen<br>Street, signalised crossing<br>on north-west and south-<br>west legs.<br>Cordeaux Street/ Oxley<br>Street, no signalised<br>crossing on south-west leg<br>Dumaresq Street/ Queen<br>Street, signalised crossings<br>on all legs<br>Dumaresq Street/ Oxley<br>Street, signalised, no<br>south-west pedestrian leg | The core Campbelltown<br>CBD grid  | Consider alternative<br>solution or closing existing<br>tunnel under Hurley Street<br>to improve personal<br>security.<br>Broughton Street/ Moore<br>Street, provide north-east<br>pedestrian leg<br>Hurley Street crossing<br>south-west of<br>Campbelltown Mall car<br>park access, to link into<br>Koshigaya Park<br>Cordeaux Street/ Oxley<br>Street, provide pedestrian<br>crossing on south-west leg<br>Crossing on north-east leg<br>of Railway Street/ Queen<br>Street.<br>Dumaresq Street/ Oxley<br>Street, provide pedestrian<br>crossing on south-west leg |  |  |
| Farrow Road   | Blaxland Road/ The Kraal<br>Drive/ Farrow Road,<br>signalised crossings on all<br>legs   | West route to residential<br>precinct  | Provide footpath on north side of carriageway.  |  |  |
| Farrow Road to John Kidd<br>Drive (proposed)  | Blaxland Road  | Proposed shortcut link to residential precinct to the north-west of the station. | Provide shortcut path using<br>easement between 45 and<br>47 John Kidd Drive.<br>Requires crossing at<br>Blaxland Road  |  |  |
| Badgally Road   | Blaxland Road/ Badgally<br>Road, signalised, no north-<br>east pedestrian leg.   | North route to employment and business precinct.                                 | Complete missing link on<br>north side of carriageway.<br>Provide north-east<br>pedestrian leg at signals.  |  |  |

## Table 10-7 Concept core pedestrian network to/ from station

## Structure plan impact on pedestrian network

The structure plan benefits from the existing fine grain grid layout and is complemented by green links that provide additional direct links to the town centre and station. The structure plan will increase use of the network.









### Cycling

Campbelltown would form a key junction in the concept regional bicycle network. In addition to the parallel railway corridor route, a path along the Badgally Road/ Broughton Street corridor would link with the South West Growth Centre and south-west to the proposed Smiths Creek Reserve recreational path. A link along Blaxland Road is provided to link the Narellan Road path to the existing Farrow Road shared path.

Only one local route links directly with the station, other local routes are proposed to link to the station via the regional railway corridor route cycle route. This route would comprise of Railway Street, potentially through Mawson Park, Cordeaux Street down to Lindesay Street and continuing down Condamine Street. This would service the southern catchment of the station.

Serving the eastern catchment would be the Landon Avenue, Iolanthe Street and Beverley Road, which includes an extension from Iolanthe Street to Beverley Road. This route would also pass Campbelltown Performing Arts High School, Lomandra School, Beverly Park School and Campbelltown North Public School via the Campbelltown Road bridge.

Routes to the south of the study area should be investigated further to connect into the Condamine Street proposed local route to provide accessibility from this area of Campbelltown.

Figure 10-14 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Campbelltown.

#### Structure plan impact on cycling network

The concept key cycling network integrates with the proposed structure plan.

## Figure 10-14 Campbelltown concept local cycle network





#### Bus

Campbelltown is served by multiple local services capturing nearby suburbs and feeding to/ from Campbelltown station. These include the 880, 881, 882, 883, 884 and 885. Together these services provide comprehensive coverage of the Campbelltown precinct and the route alignments seem logical and legible.

As discussed in **Section 7.3.6** the potential provision of a transit link between Badgally Road and Broughton Street would provide an alternative cross railway corridor link for bus services with the potential and flexibility to operate services over both sides of the railway corridor.

#### Structure plan impact on bus network

The structure plan may generate demand to warrant additional local bus services on the north side of the railway corridor. It is expected these would be designed to integrate with the existing and proposed road network.

#### Road

A concept Badgally Road/ Broughton Street transit link requires further analysis but could provide benefits to the local and regional bus network.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

The structure plan changes are proposed to create a finer street network close to the station. This would improve pedestrian, cycling and vehicle connectivity. It is envisaged the road network would be designed to facilitate a lower speed environment.

#### Summary of structure plan impact on transport network

The structure plan proposes to increase residential density in the north-east quadrant, increase commercial density in the south-east quadrant and have lower density commercial in the south-west to north-west with low density residential and industrial uses in the outer west. The plan also develops a clear walking and cycling network within the precinct, which will enable local and regional access to the town centre and the Campbelltown Station. Suburban bus services are extensive and it is proposed to enhance services to cater for the wider regional demand for access to Campbelltown, increasing access and assisting in moderating the demand for car parking in the Campbelltown Precinct.

Key network improvements include:

- Enhanced walking and cycling network to support access to the station and the retail and commercial centre;
- > Use of green corridors for walking and cycling networks;
- > Potential new transit link over railway line;
- > Suburban bus routes to service the town centre; and
- > Increase in rail and bus services in the peak periods.

### Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the increase in freight movements expected.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

The proposed structure plans to rezone existing employment land uses within the station precinct into higher density residential areas on both sides of the railway line. The transport network will be designed to negate any benefit from freight vehicle movements through residential precincts and private movements through the remaining industrial and business precincts. Where residential developments surround both sides of existing freight routes, design measures will be incorporated to provide the appropriate amenity while maintain the integrity of the freight route.





## 10.2.7 <u>Macarthur</u>

The Macarthur Station precinct, has residential use in the outer south, retail and bulky goods adjoining the railway line in the south, hospital in the south-east and educational uses in the north. The precinct provides a regional shopping centre, a university, TAFE and hospital. The land uses are diverse however the scale of each of the major uses and the transport network limit the walkability in the precinct.

The key opportunities for the precinct are providing walking and cycling connections through large blocks of land, providing additional opportunities to cross Menangle Road and reducing the reliance on private motor vehicle use for access to the key regional land uses. The concept improvements aim to support the primary precinct objective:

To support, reinforce and grow Macarthur as a residential, retail and education area within the region through housing and employment growth with the provision of sustainable transport enhancements, including walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure and services.

The Macarthur precinct has potential for increased land use density and transport improvements. The current Macarthur Interchange was upgraded in 2010 and includes a Park & Ride, Kiss & Ride, taxi stand, bus interchange and bike parking.

The concept transport network seeks to:

- > Improve walking and cycling connections from Macarthur Station to the residential areas to the south;
- > Improve directness of local bus routes and increase route reliability; and
- > Improve road/street legibility.

These improvements, and others as outlined, will encourage more people to walk, cycle and use public transport more often for local and regional trips.

#### Walking

The footpath network is relatively modern in Macarthur and continues to be expanded with land use development in the precinct. The concept network completes some minor missing links and proposes improved crossing facilities at key locations. Development surrounding Macarthur Square shopping centre continues, however it would be ideal for a north-south footpath be provided on the west side of the shopping centre for a more direct link to residential precincts to the south.

On the north side of the station, the existing footpaths from the station to the education precinct and beyond will be maintained along with a new connection to western Blair Athol.

On the south side of the station, priority pedestrian routes are proposed along Bolger Street/ Parc Guell Drive and Hidcote Road.

The locations of the concept upgrades is listed in **Table 10-8**.



| Roads/ Areas                                  | Key Crossing locations  | Description  | Concept Improvements  |
|---|---|--|---|
| Menangle Road                                 | Menangle Road,<br>pedestrian bridge.  | Access adjacent to and<br>along the south side of the<br>railway corridor. West route<br>to residential precinct.  | Provide path on the north<br>side of the carriageway to<br>link to a proposed crossing<br>at Bolger Street                                |
| Macarthur Square                              |   | South route through shopping centre.   |   |
| Bolger Street, Parc Guell<br>Drive            | Menangle Road/ Bolger<br>Street, proposed crossing.<br>Bolger Street/ Kellicar<br>Road, signalised crossings<br>on north, south and west<br>legs. | East through to south<br>access. Link to<br>Campbelltown Hospitals.  | Signalised crossing on east<br>leg of Kellicar Road/ Bolger<br>Street.<br>Widen footpath between<br>Kellicar Road and Gilchrist<br>Drive. |
| Gilchrist Drive                               | East of Englorie Park<br>Drive, roundabouts and<br>priority control<br>Gilchrist Drive/ Narellan<br>Road, signalised                              | South option from Bolger<br>Street or Hidcote Road.  | Improve crossing facilities<br>at roundabouts at Gilchrist<br>Drive/ Therry Road and<br>Gilchrist Drive/ Englorie<br>Drive                |
| Talby Street, Barber<br>Reserve, Hidcote Road | Menangle Road/ Talby<br>Street, roundabout.<br>Talby Street/ Stowe<br>Avenue, proposed  | South route option with<br>some western residential<br>catchment.  | Provide formal crossing at<br>Stowe Avenue and Talby<br>Road/ Menangle  |
| University Basin Reserve                      | Goldsmith Avenue,<br>assumed crossing will be<br>completed with new road<br>alignment.  | North route to education<br>precinct. Potential to<br>connect north to Narellan<br>Road but no real<br>catchment.  | None anticipated to be required   |
| Goldsmith Avenue                              |   | East west route along<br>stations northern<br>catchment. Educational<br>land uses including<br>University of Western<br>Sydney and Campbelltown<br>TAFE College. | It is expected that high<br>quality paths will be<br>provided on both sides of<br>the carriageway when<br>completed.                      |

| Table 10-8 | Concept core pedestrian network to/from station |
|------------|---|
|------------|---|

#### Structure plan impact on pedestrian network

The structure plan is based on enhancing the network with minor links. There are two pedestrian routes running parallel to the rail corridor, along Menangle Road and Gilchrist Drive/ Goldsmith Avenue.

Green links within and surrounding the precinct will be integrated with the pedestrian network.



#### Figure 10-15 Macarthur concept walking network





### Cycling

It is anticipated the concept parallel regional corridor route could continue south-west of Macarthur towards Menangle. A key link between the station and Narellan Road path between the University of Western Sydney and Campbelltown TAFE College improves connectivity.

A number of local routes to the north and south of the station, include:

- > Goldsmith Avenue which would link to the residential development to the west.
- > Much of the urban environment to the south of the railway line is relatively new. All paths tie in with the regional railway corridor route. Routes would include:
  - Bolger Street and Parc Guell Drive along the east side of Macarthur Square linking to the residential precinct and Campbelltown Hospital to the east. This route would also continue in a U-shape along Gilchrist Drive connecting to the parallel regional route to the west of Macarthur Station; and
  - Talby Street and Barber Reserve route to form a more direct link to the south.

Continuing directly south from Macarthur Station is difficult due to the size and location of Macarthur Square shopping centre, hence all routes continuing along the railway corridor away from the centre before diverting.

Figure 10-16 shows the concept regional and local cycle network for Macarthur.

#### Structure plan impact on cycling network

The concept key cycling network integrates with the proposed structure plan.



### Figure 10-16 Concept cycle network Macarthur





#### Bus

It is proposed to undertake a wider network review of bus services given the low patronage at some key stops. Many existing services between Macarthur and Campbelltown simply replicate the railway service. Many buses to/ from Narellan Road heading towards Campbelltown deviate to Macarthur. The benefit and disadvantage of this operation requires further assessment.

The 887 is also a regional route and the local operation south of Macarthur reduces the effectiveness as a regional service. Overall, the precinct coverage is good.

The 887 could be separated into a local route and a regional route in line with the desired service characteristics to separate local and regional services south of Macarthur.

#### Road

Pending the outcome of the wider bus network review, the feasibility of the Menangle Road to Camden Road transit link under Narellan Road which could provide benefits to the local and regional bus networks.

#### Structure plan impact on road network

The proposed road network will be largely unchanged.

#### Summary of structure plan impact on transport network

The structure plan proposes to maintain the land uses in their current location and improve local transport connections. The plan creates new connections through large parcels of land, connects the surrounding residential areas to the station and shopping centre and utilises green corridors for active transport routes.

Key network improvements include:

- Enhanced walking and cycling network to support access to the station, the shopping centre and educational faculties;
- > Maximise and integrates the use of green corridors for walking and cycling routes; and
- > Increase public transport services.

#### Freight

The integrity of key arterial roads should be maintained to facilitate the increase in freight movements expected, particularly to the retail land uses.

#### Structure plan impact on freight network

No impact is expected as a result of changes to the minor changes proposed for the precinct.



The objectives developed as part of the transport strategy were also used to qualitatively assess the package of works for each precinct, categorised into mode type to confirm an overall benefit and to rank each package of works against each other. In terms of infrastructure improvements of the 17 objectives developed for the corridor, only objectives 1 to 15 are relevant.

The scoring ranged from 1 to 5:

- > 1: Major reduction;
- > 2: Minor reduction;
- > 3: Same;
- > 4: Minor improvement; and
- > 5: Major improvement.

Overall scores less than 45 indicate the package of works may reduce the state of transport compared to the existing scenario, scores of 45 - 50 would likely retain a similar level of service and scores greater than 50 would likely result in an improvement in conditions. The scoring results are provided in **Table 10-9**.

| Table 10-9         MCA precinct and mode scores |         |         |     |      |  |  |  |
|---|---------|---------|-----|------|--|--|--|
| Precinct  | Walking | Cycling | Bus | Road |  |  |  |
| Glenfield                                       | 67      | 64      | 66  | 59   |  |  |  |
| Macquarie Fields                                | 66      | 66      | 58  | 66   |  |  |  |
| Ingleburn                                       | 67      | 64      | 53  | 64   |  |  |  |
| Minto   | 55      | 60      | 51  | 53   |  |  |  |
| Leumeah   | 63      | 66      | 57  | 47   |  |  |  |
| Campbelltown                                    | 63      | 67      | 56  | 56   |  |  |  |
| Macarthur                                       | 52      | 64      | 50  | 48   |  |  |  |

The scoring shown in **Table 10-9** indicates that the proposals are generally beneficial, however the benefits to the road network in Leumeah and Macarthur are not as beneficial as the other precincts.

The detailed multi-criteria assessment (MCA) and scoring for each precinct is provided in Appendix C.

## 11 Summary and conclusion

Cardno

The Glenfield to Macarthur corridor is an area that NSW Government has identified as having potential for sustainable targeting of population, employment and economic growth. The NSW Government engaged Cardno to document, investigate, analyse and plan for future natural growth in this area, as well as assess the potential for the transport network to accommodate additional housing and employment in seven station precincts: Glenfield, Macquarie Fields, Ingleburn, Minto, Leumeah, Campbelltown and Macarthur. Projected population and employment growth have been determined for each precinct and a structure plan developed, which details the proposed changes to land uses and the street network.

The NSW Government are proposing an increase of 9,000 in population above previously that forecast over a 20 year period, which is 0.03% of the South West Growth Centre's 300,000 population growth or 0.01% of Sydney's 1,600,000 population growth. It is considered this is a minor growth in transport demand and this Integrated Transport Strategy identifies the improvements recommended to cater for this increase in population and employment.

## Existing land use

The existing land use within the corridor is a mix of low density residential, light-medium industrial, commercial and educational land uses. A summary of each precinct is provided below:

- Glenfield: low density residential housing and educational uses. These uses are supported through a local main street, with essential daily goods. Key statistics 7,800 residents and 1,500 jobs.
- Macquarie Fields: low density residential housing and recreational use (golf course). Glenquarie Town Centre is located approximately 2 kilometres west of Macquarie Fields Station, which creates a somewhat segmented town centre. Key statistics 6,900 residents and 1,600 jobs.
- Ingleburn: medium sized town centre that provides goods and services for the local area. Ingleburn is one of the larger precincts in the corridor. Ingleburn has industrial land uses adjacent to the Hume Motorway that provides good access to the arterial network and reduces through routing within retail and residential areas. Key statistics 14,500 residents and 11,800 jobs.
- Minto: large industrial land use element along the railway line, with MIST located in this precinct. Minor low density residential use for the remaining portion of the precinct. Key statistics 2,100 residents and 3,500 jobs.
- Leumeah: entertainment precinct with a sports stadium (Campbelltown Sports Stadium) and leagues club with some low density residential. Key statistics 7,900 residents and 5,200 jobs.
- Campbelltown: medium sized CBD with commercial and retail, this is identified as a strategic centre in *A Plan to Grow Sydney*. Some bulky goods, light industrial and low density residential. Key statistics 9,600 residents 10,400 jobs.
- Macarthur: large shopping centre (Macarthur Square) with bulky goods, university (University of Western Sydney) and TAFE Campbelltown and low density residential. Key statistics – 4,800 residents and 7,000 jobs.

The existing low density land uses within the corridor create a private vehicle reliant environment, where walking, cycling or using public transport are less convenient and time competitive than using a private vehicle.

## Existing transport network

The walking and cycling networks in the study corridor are incomplete and not legible. There are missing links in the basic network and also barriers to crossing major features, such as creeks and main roads. The network also does not connect to key destinations which is likely to result in low usage generally.

The Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor is serviced by three lines on the Sydney Trains suburban network (the T2 South Line, the T5 Cumberland Line and the South West Rail Link) and one line on the intercity network (the Southern Highlands Line). City-bound services in the AM peak period run every 15 minutes. The corridor also facilitates regional and interstate rail services.



The bus network servicing the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor includes different types of routes. These routes include local shopping and residential loops, routes that traverse the length of the corridor providing connectivity to sections east of the railway line and routes that provide connections to centres in other regions such as Camden, Wollongong and Liverpool. The network is considered to be a coverage-based network that serves a large portion of the area, however results in less frequent or direct services.

The study corridor has an extensive road network with a clear hierarchy. There are ongoing programs to upgrade and support road performance through the corridor.

#### Existing travel patterns

The top three destinations for residents in the study corridor travelling to work are Sydney – Outer South West (38%), Sydney – City and Inner South (15%) and Sydney – South West (15%). Many people live and work within the region.

The study corridor is highly reliant on private vehicles as a means of transportation and access. 75% of residents drive or are driven to work and for those employed in the study corridor, 91% of people drive or are driven to work. This mode share is high for private vehicle use given over 30% of residents live and work in within the corridor, and many workplace destinations are within to the local area or region. The high private vehicle mode share contributes to local and regional road congestion in some areas of the corridor. In the Sydney Greater Metropolitan Area an average of 1% of people ride to work and 4% of people walk to work. The study corridor mode share is approximately 1% and 2% for riding and walking respectively. These low mode shares also add pressure to the road network.

An analysis of train patronage data for the ten year period 2004 – 2013 indicates that patronage has fallen slightly over the period. When compared to 2004 daily patronage, average daily trips within the corridor vary from a rise of up to 9% in 2009 to a reduction of 6% in 2013. As a comparison, on the Sydney metropolitan railway network patronage increased by 18% over the same period 2004-2013.

Along the study corridor, Campbelltown Station accounts for the highest patronage with typically 25% of the daily passengers and an average of approximately 12,600 daily passengers over the 10 year period. This is followed by Glenfield at 20% and an average 10,000 daily passengers. The least patronised station is Macquarie Fields accounting for only 5% of daily passenger volumes within the corridor.

Opal data, which represents a main payment method for bus use, was assessed for major bus stops in the study corridor for February 2015. The key findings of the analysis for tap on movements found that:

- > Eight out of the top ten busiest stops are at train stations;
- > The top ten stops accommodated 4,400 passenger trips on an average weekday;
- > The top ten stops accounted for 80% of all trips; and
- > The busiest bus stop location by passenger volume was Campbelltown Interchange with just over 2,150 trips on an average weekday.

#### Precinct structure plans and the future transport network

Each precinct structure plan outlines a method to cater for population and employment growth within the study area and to create a more liveable environment. This includes encouragement of walking, cycling and use of public transport through dwelling location, density and urban design. The structure plans propose to increase density around railway stations to maximise accessibility within the corridor and connectivity to wider Sydney for employment and other events. The proposed local street design is supportive of low speed environments and also presents opportunities for use of rear lane access for deliveries, reducing the amount of heavy vehicles on local roads and increasing amenity for people on the street.

To guide the development of the concept transport network, which supports the precinct structure plans, a number of objectives were developed to ensure the Integrated Transport Strategy's recommended improvements were sustainable and aligned with NSW Government goals.

The concept transport network presented in this Integrated Transport Strategy for the Glenfield to Macarthur Corridor supports the structure plans with recommended improvements to walking, cycling, public transport and street networks to reduce the reliance on private motor vehicles. The proposed regional and local transport networks seek to provide increased accessibility and mobility for residents and employees.



The concept transport network includes:

- > A well-defined walking network and increased permeability;
- > A well-defined cycling network and associated parking facilities;
- > Improved reliability and reduced waiting times for public transport;
- > Road safety reviews around key transport hubs;
- > A review of bus routes to consider service-based network along key routes;
- > Planning and facilitation of freight movements in the region through rail and motorway initiatives; and
- > The potential for new concept road links across the railway line for improved connectivity between the eastern and western sides of the corridor for all transport modes.

#### Next steps and opportunities

This strategy also identifies actions to be undertaken to further analyse and plan for the study corridor in more detail, including:

- > Local government development of:
  - A walking plan and cycling plan for the area; and
  - Local road and parking strategies, including analysis and management of parking at a precinct level, particularly for Campbelltown and Leumeah.
- > Planning and development controls to support the concept transport network;
- > Assessment of appropriate land uses and separation adjacent to the rail corridor;
- > Potential reprioritisation of transport initiatives within existing programs;
- > Further consideration within:
  - Bus network reviews;
  - South West Growth Centre planning; and
  - Rail opportunities and strategic planning.
- Detailed precinct planning: including assessment and identification of transport infrastructure interventions;
- Strategic road network analysis: to determine the cumulative impacts within the South West area. This should include the South West Growth Centre, Badgerys's Creek Airport, Macarthur South and Western Sydney Employment area.
- > Local area road network analysis: to understand local road network performance and potential negative impacts as a result of the proposed concept links across the railway corridor.
- > Local area transport network design: detailed planning and design of the street network to support a safe low-speed environment, including investigation of 40km/hr high pedestrian activity areas and local area traffic management facilities.

This Integrated Transport Strategy provides a framework to enable more walking cycling and public transport use through the corridor and recommends the integration of transport provisions with the precinct structure plans to accommodate future travel demand. The concept transport network and associated policy and planning initiatives could be implemented over a number of years to maximise benefit to the community and minimise local social and environment impacts.



# APPENDIX A LAND ZONING

| Station      | LEP 2002  |
|--------------|---|
| Glenfield    | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway  |
|              | > Land to the east is 3(c) Neighbourhood Business 5(a) Special Uses A Car Park, with<br>predominately 2(b) Residential B surrounding. |
|              | > Land to the west is zoned 5(a) Special Uses School.   |
| Macquarie    | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
| Fields       | > To the east is predominately 2(b) Residential, south east of the station is 5(a) Special Uses<br>Parking.                           |
|              | > Land to the west is classified under Campbelltown LEP 112 Macquarie Field House.  |
| Ingleburn    | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
|              | > Land to the east is zoned 10(b) District Comprehensive Centre.  |
|              | > Land to the west is a mix of 4(b) Industry B and 4(c) Industry C.   |
| Minto        | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
|              | > To the east is 3 (c) Neighbourhood Business and 6(a) Local Open Space.  |
|              | > To the west is 4(b) Industry B.   |
| Leumeah      | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
|              | > To the east is 10(c) Local Comprehensive Centre and 6(a) Local Open Space.  |
|              | > To the west is 5(a) Special Uses A Car Parking which is surrounded by 4(b) Industry B.  |
| Campbelltown | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
|              | > To the east is 10(a) Regional Comprehensive Centre and 6(a) Local Open Space.   |
|              | > To the west is 4(b) Industry B with some 5(a) Special Uses Car Parking.   |
| Macarthur    | > Station is zoned 5(a) Special Uses A Railway.   |
|              | > Land surrounding is 10(a) Regional Comprehensive Centre.  |







Study Area

Corridor

Corridor Corridor

**Precinct Name** 

Minto

Minto

Non centre

ΤZ

3289

3290

3291

## Study area and precinct definitions

Table 11-1 – Equivalence deck: TZ to Precinct and s

|         | <ul> <li>Equivalence deck</li> </ul> | : TZ to Precinct and |   | 3292         | Non centre | 9            | Corrid  | or      |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--------------|------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| dy area | 1                                    |                      |   | 3293         | Leumeah    |              | Corrid  | or      |
| ΤZ      | Precinct Name                        | Study Area           |   | 3294         | Non centre | 9            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3200    | Campbelltown                         | Corridor             |   | 3295         | Minto      |              | Corrid  | or      |
| 3201    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 3298         | Non centre | 9            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3202    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 3299         | Non centre | 9            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3211    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 3301         | Non centre | 9            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3212    | Leumeah                              | Corridor             |   | 3302         | Non centre | 2            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3213    | Campbelltown                         | Corridor             |   | 3804         | Non centre | e            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3214    | Macarthur                            | Corridor             |   | 3805         | Non centre | 2            | Corrid  | or      |
| 3215    | Campbelltown                         | Corridor             | 5 | Source: Bas  | ed on BT   | S data reque | st 1481 | 8 and   |
| 3216    | Campbelltown                         | Corridor             | n | nodified stu | dy brief   |              |         |         |
| 3217    | Macarthur                            | Corridor             |   |              |            |              |         |         |
| 3218    | Non centre                           | Corridor             | т | able 11-2 -  | - Fauivale | nce deck: SA | 1 to P  | recinct |
| 3219    | Campbelltown                         | Corridor             | ' |              |            |              |         |         |
| 3220    | Macarthur                            | Corridor             |   | SA           | 1          | Precinct     |         |         |
| 3221    | Macarthur                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 202        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3244    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 203        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3246    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 214        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3247    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 243        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3248    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 213        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3249    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 244        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3250    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 215        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3251    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 211        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3252    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 212        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3253    | Ingleburn                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 206        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3269    | Leumeah                              | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 207        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3270    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 250        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3271    | Leumeah                              | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 208        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3272    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 209        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3273    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 210        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3274    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 217        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3277    | Glenfield                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 218        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3278    | Glenfield                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 241        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3279    | Glenfield                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 216        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3280    | Glenfield                            | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 242        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3281    | Macquarie Fields                     | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 201        | Glenfield    |         |         |
| 3282    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 003        | Ingleburn    |         |         |
| 3283    | Macquarie Fields                     | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 015        | Ingleburn    |         |         |
| 3284    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 016        | Ingleburn    |         |         |
| 3287    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 017        | Ingleburn    |         |         |
| 3288    | Non centre                           | Corridor             |   | 1144         | 018        | Ingleburn    |         |         |

| SA1     | Precinct         |
|---------|------------------|
| 1144020 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144021 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144022 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144023 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144025 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144029 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144030 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144028 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144036 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144007 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144035 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144034 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144011 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144012 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144040 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144039 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144037 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144038 | Ingleburn        |
| 1144342 | Leumeah          |
| 1144312 | Leumeah          |
| 1144101 | Leumeah          |
| 1144114 | Leumeah          |
| 1144118 | Leumeah          |
| 1144135 | Leumeah          |
| 1144108 | Leumeah          |
| 1143705 | Leumeah          |
| 1143723 | Leumeah          |
| 1144121 | Leumeah          |
| 1144124 | Leumeah          |
| 1144107 | Leumeah          |
| 1144122 | Leumeah          |
| 1144125 | Leumeah          |
| 1144109 | Leumeah          |
| 1144110 | Leumeah          |
| 1143735 | Macarthur        |
| 1143734 | Macarthur        |
| 1143704 | Macarthur        |
| 1144239 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144240 | Macquarie Fields |

Cardno<sup>®</sup>\_

| SA1     | Precinct         |
|---------|------------------|
| 1144224 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144235 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144223 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144237 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144238 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144252 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144219 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144220 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144221 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144222 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144236 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144225 | Macquarie Fields |
| 1144328 | Minto            |
| 1144337 | Minto            |
| 1144338 | Minto            |
| 1144339 | Minto            |
| 1144343 | Minto            |
| 1144342 | Minto            |
| 1144312 | Minto            |
| 1143723 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143718 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143728 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143727 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143722 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143709 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143604 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143717 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143716 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143712 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143715 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143616 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143725 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143739 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143732 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143721 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143737 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143738 | Campbelltown     |
| 1143733 | Campbelltown     |

Source: TMA analysis

# Journey to work: mode of travel

Cardno

The Census requires the completion of a number of questions relating to the journey to work. Question 45 (in 2011), asked that each of the modes of travel used be marked in the list of alternatives. There were twelve travel alternatives and two non-travel alternatives (worked at home and did not go to work). No information is collected about the order of use of the modes.

Preparation of Journey to Work tables is described in *'2011 Journey to Work User Guide'* May 2013 Release, BTS. Several different mode definitions are applied to the processing of Question 45 and this is based around the concept of 'priority mode'. The following is extracted from page 14 of the JTW User Guide:

Mode Priority – where a journey to work is comprised of more than one mode, a *priority* mode is allocated to the following hierarchy, which is generally the mode with the largest likely (but necessarily actual) duration of the trip:

> Train

HIGHEST

- > Bus
- > Ferry
- > Tram/Light Rail
- > Taxi
- > Vehicle Driver
- > Vehicle Passenger
- > Truck
- > Motorbike
- > Bicycle
- > Other mode (not specified)
- > Walk only

## LOWEST

Various JTW tables produced by BTS apply different levels of modal aggregation, ranging from Mode 9 through to Mode 235 (which covers each of the combinations of the twelve modes indicated on the Census form). Generally, as the spatial detail of tables increase the modal resolution reduces (i.e., Table 10 of the 2011 JTW reports SLA to SLA movements using Mode 32, whereas Table 19 of the 2011 JTW reports travel zone to travel zone movements using Mode 9; and at higher levels of modal detail, there is no linking of origins and destinations, such as Table 14 with origin at travel zone and mode at Mode 235, but no information about the trip's destination).

The following table identifies the different modal definitions used for reporting purposes in this report. The first two (Mode 15 and Mode 9) are standard codings applied to the data by BTS; the modes reported for the Live and Work analysis are aggregations of Mode 9, and are formulated to provide comparisons between modal characteristics of different precincts in the study area.

## Journey to work travel distribution

This appendix contains additional tables of commuter journeys:

- > The first seven tables identify the top ten destinations at SA4 of commuter journeys originating in each of the Precincts;
- > The second seven tables identify the top ten origins at SA4 of commuter journeys destination in each of the Precincts.

Commuter destination analysis

#### Table 11-3 Top ten destinations (sa4) of Glenfield Precinct's resident workers

| Rank | Destination SA4                   | Trips | %    |
|------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - City and Inner South     | 785   | 22%  |
| 2    | Sydney - Outer South West         | 784   | 22%  |
| 3    | Sydney - South West               | 610   | 17%  |
| 4    | Sydney - Inner South West         | 357   | 10%  |
| 5    | Sydney - Parramatta               | 321   | 9%   |
| 6    | Sydney - Inner West               | 113   | 3%   |
| 7    | No fixed address (GMA)            | 113   | 3%   |
| 8    | Sydney - Blacktown                | 89    | 3%   |
| 9    | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby | 82    | 2%   |
| 10   | Sydney - Ryde                     | 52    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                 | 3,306 | 95%  |
|      | Total                             | 3,492 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-4 Top ten destinations (sa4) of Macquarie fields Precinct's resident workers

| Rank | Destination SA4               | Trips | %    |
|------|-------------------------------|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West     | 852   | 29%  |
| 2    | Sydney - City and Inner South | 540   | 18%  |
| 3    | Sydney - South West           | 503   | 17%  |
| 4    | Sydney - Parramatta           | 280   | 9%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Inner South West     | 270   | 9%   |
| 6    | No fixed address (GMA)        | 115   | 4%   |
| 7    | Sydney - Inner West           | 105   | 4%   |
| 8    | Sydney - Blacktown            | 71    | 2%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Eastern Suburbs      | 52    | 2%   |
| 10   | Sydney - Ryde                 | 43    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten             | 2,831 | 95%  |
|      | Total                         | 2,983 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

#### Table 11-5 - Top ten destinations (sa4) of Ingleburn Precinct's resident workers

| 2         Sydney - City and Inner South         1,164         18%           3         Sydney - South West         951         15%           4         Sydney - Parramatta         590         9%           5         Sydney - Inner South West         545         8%           6         No fixed address (GMA)         202         3%           7         Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby         163         3%           8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95% | Rank | Destination SA4                   | Trips | %    |
|---|------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| 3         Sydney - South West         951         15%           4         Sydney - Parramatta         590         9%           5         Sydney - Inner South West         545         8%           6         No fixed address (GMA)         202         3%           7         Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby         163         3%           8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%   | 1    | Sydney - Outer South West         | 2,162 | 34%  |
| 4         Sydney - Parramatta         590         9%           5         Sydney - Inner South West         545         8%           6         No fixed address (GMA)         202         3%           7         Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby         163         3%           8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%   | 2    | Sydney - City and Inner South     | 1,164 | 18%  |
| 5         Sydney - Inner South West         545         8%           6         No fixed address (GMA)         202         3%           7         Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby         163         3%           8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%  | 3    | Sydney - South West               | 951   | 15%  |
| 6No fixed address (GMA)2023%7Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby1633%8Sydney - Inner West1623%9Sydney - Blacktown1222%10Sydney - Eastern Suburbs681%Sub-total top ten6,12995%   | 4    | Sydney - Parramatta               | 590   | 9%   |
| 7         Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby         163         3%           8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%   | 5    | Sydney - Inner South West         | 545   | 8%   |
| 8         Sydney - Inner West         162         3%           9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%  | 6    | No fixed address (GMA)            | 202   | 3%   |
| 9         Sydney - Blacktown         122         2%           10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%   | 7    | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby | 163   | 3%   |
| 10         Sydney - Eastern Suburbs         68         1%           Sub-total top ten         6,129         95%   | 8    | Sydney - Inner West               | 162   | 3%   |
| Sub-total top ten 6,129 95%   | 9    | Sydney - Blacktown                | 122   | 2%   |
| · · · · · ·   | 10   | Sydney - Eastern Suburbs          | 68    | 1%   |
|   |      | Sub-total top ten                 | 6,129 | 95%  |
| lotal 6,419 100%  |      | Total                             | 6,419 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

 Table 11-6
 Top ten destinations (sa4) of Minto Precinct's resident workers

RankDestination SA4Trips%1Sydney - Outer South West28239%



| 2         | Sydney - City and Inner South     | 146 | 20%  |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|------|
| 3         | Sydney - South West               | 90  | 12%  |
| 4         | Sydney - Parramatta               | 64  | 9%   |
| 5         | Sydney - Inner South West         | 44  | 6%   |
| 6         | No fixed address (GMA)            | 26  | 4%   |
| 7         | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby | 19  | 3%   |
| 8         | Sydney - Blacktown                | 15  | 2%   |
| 9         | Sydney - Inner West               | 15  | 2%   |
| 10        | Sydney - Sutherland               | 9   | 1%   |
|           | Sub-total top ten                 | 710 | 97%  |
|           | Total                             | 731 | 100% |
| Source: F | STS 2011 ITW Table 10             |     |      |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-7 Top ten destinations (sa4) of Leumeah Precinct's resident workers

| Rank | Destination SA4                        | Trips | %    |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 1,560 | 44%  |
| 2    | Sydney - City and Inner South          | 464   | 13%  |
| 3    | Sydney - South West                    | 462   | 13%  |
| 4    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 262   | 7%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 243   | 7%   |
| 6    | No fixed address (GMA)                 | 147   | 4%   |
| 7    | Sydney - Inner West                    | 88    | 2%   |
| 8    | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby      | 72    | 2%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Blacktown                     | 69    | 2%   |
| 10   | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 31    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 3,399 | 96%  |
|      | Total                                  | 3,532 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-8 Top ten destinations (sa4) of Campbelltown Precinct's resident workers

| Rank                  | Destination SA4                   | Trips | %          |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|------------|
| 1                     | Sydney - Outer South West         | 1,911 | 48%        |
| 2                     | 2 Sydney - City and Inner South   |       | 12%        |
| 3 Sydney - South West |                                   | 467   | 12%        |
| 4                     | Sydney - Parramatta               | 270   | 7%         |
| 5                     | Sydney - Inner South West         | 231   | 6%         |
| 6                     | No fixed address (GMA)            | 152   | 4%         |
| 7                     | 7 Sydney - Blacktown              |       | 3%         |
| 8                     | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby | 65    | 2%         |
| 9                     | Sydney - Inner West               | 54    | 1%         |
| 10                    | Illawarra                         | 50    | 1%         |
|                       | Sub-total top ten                 | 3,783 | <b>96%</b> |
|                       | Total                             | 3,948 | 100%       |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

### Table 11-9 Top ten destinations (sa4) of MacArthur Precinct's resident workers

| Rank | Destination SA4                   | Trips | %    |
|------|-----------------------------------|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West         | 876   | 39%  |
| 2    | Sydney - City and Inner South     | 432   | 19%  |
| 3    | Sydney - South West               | 252   | 11%  |
| 4    | Sydney - Parramatta               | 184   | 8%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Inner South West         | 116   | 5%   |
| 6    | No fixed address (GMA)            | 64    | 3%   |
| 7    | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby | 58    | 3%   |
| 8    | Sydney - Ryde                     | 55    | 2%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Blacktown                | 51    | 2%   |
| 10   | Sydney - Inner West               | 33    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                 | 2,121 | 95%  |
|      | Total                             | 2,221 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-10 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Glenfield Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4                             | Trips | %          |
|------|--|-------|------------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 792   | 59%        |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                    | 212   | 16%        |
| 3    | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 47    | 4%         |
| 4    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 43    | 3%         |
| 5    | Sydney - Baulkham Hills and Hawkesbury | 25    | 2%         |
| 6    | Illawarra                              | 24    | 2%         |
| 7    | Sydney - Sutherland                    | 24    | 2%         |
| 8    | Sydney - North Sydney and Hornsby      | 22    | 2%         |
| 9    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 20    | 2%         |
| 10   | Sydney - City and Inner South          | 19    | 1%         |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 1,228 | <b>92%</b> |
|      | Total                                  | 1,332 | 100%       |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

Cardno

## Table 11-11 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Macquarie fields Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4                             | Trips | %    |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 998   | 71%  |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                    | 159   | 11%  |
| 3    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 47    | 3%   |
| 4    | Riverina                               | 33    | 2%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Sutherland                    | 26    | 2%   |
| 6    | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 22    | 2%   |
| 7    | Illawarra                              | 22    | 2%   |
| 8    | Sydney - Inner West                    | 20    | 1%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 19    | 1%   |
| 10   | Sydney - City and Inner South          | 15    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 1,361 | 97%  |
|      | Total                                  | 1,396 | 100% |

## Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-12 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Ingleburn Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4                             | Trips | %    |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 5,307 | 56%  |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                    | 1,657 | 17%  |
| 3    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 554   | 6%   |
| 4    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 301   | 3%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Blacktown                     | 274   | 3%   |
| 6    | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 273   | 3%   |
| 7    | Sydney - Sutherland                    | 253   | 3%   |
| 8    | Illawarra                              | 204   | 2%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Baulkham Hills and Hawkesbury | 129   | 1%   |
| 10   | Southern Highlands and Shoalhaven      | 100   | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 9,052 | 95%  |
|      | Total                                  | 9,483 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-13 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Minto Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4                             | Trips | %   |
|------|--|-------|-----|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 1,851 | 60% |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                    | 491   | 16% |
| 3    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 156   | 5%  |
| 4    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 99    | 3%  |
| 5    | Illawarra                              | 98    | 3%  |
| 6    | Sydney - Sutherland                    | 84    | 3%  |
| 7    | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 56    | 2%  |
| 8    | Sydney - Blacktown                     | 55    | 2%  |
| 9    | Southern Highlands and Shoalhaven      | 37    | 1%  |
| 10   | Sydney - Baulkham Hills and Hawkesbury | 35    | 1%  |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 2,962 | 95% |

Total 3,110 100%

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-14 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Leumeah Precinct

| Rank                           | Origin SA4                               | Trips | %    |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1                              | Sydney - Outer South West                | 3,098 | 68%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2                              | Sydney - South West                      | 527   | 11%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3                              | 3 Sydney - Inner South West              |       | 5%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Sydney - Parramatta          |  | 148   | 3%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5                              | Illawarra                                | 103   | 2%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6                              | 6 Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains |       | 2%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7                              | Sydney - Blacktown                       | 89    | 2%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8                              | Sydney - Sutherland                      | 78    | 2%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9                              | Southern Highlands and Shoalhaven        | 52    | 1%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10                             | Sydney - Baulkham Hills and Hawkesbury   | 43    | 1%   |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                | Sub-total top ten                        |       | 97%  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                | Total                                    | 4,586 | 100% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Source: BTS 2011 ITM/ Table 10 |  |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-15 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within Campbelltown Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4  | Trips | %          |
|------|---|-------|------------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West                             | 6,944 | 75%        |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                                   | 736   | 8%         |
| 3    | 3     Illawarra       4     Sydney - Inner South West |       | 4%         |
| 4    |   |       | 3%         |
| 5    | Sydney - Parramatta                                   | 165   | 2%         |
| 6    | 6 Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains              |       | 1%         |
| 7    | Southern Highlands and Shoalhaven                     | 134   | 1%         |
| 8    | Sydney - Sutherland                                   | 105   | 1%         |
| 9    | Sydney - Inner West                                   | 91    | 1%         |
| 10   | Sydney - Blacktown                                    | 79    | 1%         |
|      | Sub-total top ten                                     | 8,982 | <b>98%</b> |
|      | Total   | 9,198 | 100%       |
| 0    |   |       |            |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19

## Table 11-16 Top ten origins (sa4) of workers within MacArthur Precinct

| Rank | Origin SA4                             | Trips | %    |
|------|--|-------|------|
| 1    | Sydney - Outer South West              | 4,569 | 74%  |
| 2    | Sydney - South West                    | 549   | 9%   |
| 3    | Illawarra                              | 183   | 3%   |
| 4    | Sydney - Inner South West              | 153   | 2%   |
| 5    | Sydney - Parramatta                    | 146   | 2%   |
| 6    | Sydney - Outer West and Blue Mountains | 126   | 2%   |
| 7    | Southern Highlands and Shoalhaven      | 100   | 2%   |
| 8    | Sydney - Inner West                    | 87    | 1%   |
| 9    | Sydney - Sutherland                    | 75    | 1%   |
| 10   | Sydney - City and Inner South          | 58    | 1%   |
|      | Sub-total top ten                      | 6,046 | 97%  |
|      | Total                                  | 6,213 | 100% |

Source: BTS 2011 JTW Table 19



# APPENDIX C MULTI- CRITERIA ASSESSMENT

## Cardno<sup>®</sup>

## Glenfield infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| # | Objective   | Walking   |       | Cycling   |       | Bus  |       | Road  |    |
|---|---|---|-------|---|-------|--|-------|---|----|
|   |   | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment  | Score | Comment   | Sc |
|   | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Increased permeability in the precinct would reduce the walking distance for some customers, hence improving the attractiveness of PT.  | 5     | New routes, improved network and<br>bicycle parking provided closer to<br>station access point increases<br>convenience compared to park &<br>ride. | 5     | Subject to investigation of feasibility and<br>funding. Proposed suburban bus routes<br>increase route directness and therefore speed<br>of service. With increased frequency and<br>service span these would increase<br>competitiveness. | 5     | Provides people access to public transport by way of Kiss & Ride and Park & Ride.   | 3  |
|   | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | Increased frequency would reduce waiting<br>times, particularly for interchange with other<br>PT services.   | 5     | Potential, dependent of public transport priority measures  | 4  |
|   | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys                 | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 4     | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 4     | The customer experience on buses is largely controlled by the service operator.  | 5     | Finer grain street network provides a slight improvement  | 4  |
|   | Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Improved finer grain network could encourage<br>people to walk and cycle more. The network will<br>also support an increase in density and<br>therefore there will be more people to walk                             | 5     | Designated cycle routes provide<br>attractive options to encourage more<br>cycling and increase convenient<br>catchment.                            | 5     | Higher frequency and more direct route bus<br>services are expected have an effect of<br>increasing the user catchment to each stop.<br>This would encourage more walking by way of<br>accessing stops.                                    | 4     | Dependent of road network design,<br>activated frontages, space and<br>priority allocation.   | 4  |
|   | Increase land use density in key transport locations                          | Land use density is proposed to be increased<br>near to the station which would increase the<br>viability of walking in the precinct by way of co-<br>location of goods and services.                                 | 5     | Land use density supports the investment in infrastructure  | 4     | Glenfield to remain a key transport interchange in the study corridor.   | 4     | Supports land use density increase  | 5  |
|   | Improve legibility of transport   | Proposed network hierarchy will be evident in<br>the infrastructure typology and through local<br>wayfinding signage would improve legibility.  | 5     | Proposed network infrastructure and wayfinding would improve legibility   | 5     | Proposed regional bus network improves legibility.   | 5     | Dependant on street infrastructure typology.  | 4  |
|   | Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas                             | Additional pedestrian priority/ crossings can be implemented to minimise through traffic  | 4     | Subject to detailed network design,<br>providing through access in some<br>locations to bicycle only while<br>restricting cars to main routes.      | 4     | More people on buses would result in less private vehicle traffic.   | 4     | No major through routes proposed.<br>Dependant on through linkages or<br>access only roads with through<br>pedestrian, bicycle links and<br>overall urban design. | 3  |
|   | Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | Supports both the station and local community.<br>Pedestrian network also relies on station<br>facilities. Assists to reduce the investment in<br>additional station car parking.                                     | 4     | Supports proposed bicycle parking<br>investment and reduces dependence<br>and expense of commuter car<br>parking.                                   | 4     | Bus feeder services can increase the catchment of the station thereby maximising the use of the investment.  | 4     | Supports access and movement to station   | 4  |
|   | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 3     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 3     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.  | 4     | Proposed roads would support local freight/ delivery movements.   | 4  |
| כ | Improve connections to regionally significant areas                           | Some regionally significant areas within the walking catchment.   | 4     | Proposed regional network provides access to regionally significant areas   | 5     | Connections to regionally significant areas<br>improved.   | 4     | Proposed Cambridge Avenue<br>extension improves regional<br>connectivity.   | 4  |
| 1 | Improve road safety around key<br>transport hubs                              | Higher volumes of pedestrians can increase<br>driver awareness and reduce the attractiveness<br>and demand for driving thereby increasing<br>safety. Finer grain street network conducive to<br>lower vehicle speeds. | 5     | Assistive measure to reduce vehicle traffic, therefore improve road safety.   | 4     | Reduced vehicle movements at transport hubs increases user safety.   | 4     | Reliant of implementation of LATM/<br>40km/h HPAA.  | 4  |
| 2 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                           | Higher volumes of pedestrians create collective<br>improvement in personal security and increase<br>the economic feasibility of businesses remaining<br>open later into the night.                                    | 5     | More people on the street means a higher level of passive surveillance and therefore perception of security   | 4     | Personal security is improved by increased use of bus and presence of bus driver.  | 4     | No change   | 3  |
| 3 | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes                  | Provides more options to access all parts of the precinct.  | 5     | Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements.  | 5     | Bus services can use existing and proposed<br>road network to continue the integral use of<br>the land and transport network.  | 5     | Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks  | 5  |
| 4 | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport             | Very supportive   | 5     | Very supportive   | 5     | Increased transport catchment particularly those within an active transport distance of stops  | 5     | Subject to detail design, potential to improve accessibility and support active transport.  | 5  |
| 5 | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                      | Provides more amenable walking options, hence<br>reduction in private vehicle reliance. Land use<br>co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.                        | 5     | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.  | 4     | Bus services reduce the reliance on private vehicle.   | 4     | Unlikely to reduce reliance on private vehicle use.   | 3  |
|   | Total   |   | 67    |   | 64    |  | 66    |   | 59 |
|   | Recommendation  | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed  |       | Proceed with exception of<br>Cambridge Road extension.  |    |

## Macquarie Fields infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| VectorConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStoreConnectStore<  | #  | Objective                          | Walking   |       | Cycling  |       | Bus   |       | Road  |       |
|--|----|------------------------------------|---|-------|--|-------|---|-------|---|-------|
| Improve competitivings and<br>attractives of public transport         Space of pub   |    |                                    | Comment   | Score | Comment  | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score |
| c         times for public transport         Minipic difficult value direction of the substrate and proceed matching integree matchin          | 1  |                                    | distance for many developed land uses in the  | 5     | bicycle parking provided closer to<br>station access point increases<br>convenience compared to park & | 5     | catchment away from the station. Local services could be modified to take advantage | 4     | Creek provides people access to public transport by way of Kiss & | 5     |
| a)       ministration of the station mapping in the state in the stat         | 2  |                                    | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     |  | 3     | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | 4     |   | 5     |
| Image: space pack to waik and cycle mode in the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode in the station much encouncy is interface of the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy and the station could ancuracy pace pace to waik and cycle mode interface of the station could ancuracy and the station could and the station could ancuracy and the station could and the station could ance and the station could ancuracy and the station could and the station could and the station | 3  |                                    |   | 5     |  | 5     |   | 4     | opportunity to improve customer                                   | 5     |
| 5       Increase land use density inkey       near use density increase land use density increase use objection of goods and services.       5       Driven by station improvements.       3       Supports land use density increase       5         6       Improve legibility of transport       Proposed network infrastructure work density increase is used under the transport location of goods and services.       5       Potential to create simple loop network.       4       Dependent on street infrastructure work density increase is used under the transport location of goods and services.       5       Potential to create simple loop network.       4       Dependent on street infrastructure work density increase is used under the transport location service is used under the transport location is used under the transport location service is used under the transport location is used u   | 4  |                                    | to the station could encourage people to walk<br>and cycle more. The network will also support<br>an increase in land use density and therefore | 5     | attractive options to encourage more cycling and increase convenient                                   | 5     | to whether people are willing to undertake  | 3     |   | 4     |
| 6       Improve legibility of transport       the infrastructure typology and through local wayfinding inguage model ingrove legibility.       5       Potential to create simple loop network       4       Dependiant on Subert Infrastructure 4       4       Dependiant on Subert Infrastructure 4       Dependiant A       Dependiant A <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>near to the station which would increase the viability of walking in the precinct by way of co-</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>Driven by station improvements.</td> <td>3</td> <td>Supports land use density increase</td> <td>5</td>  | 5  |                                    | near to the station which would increase the viability of walking in the precinct by way of co-   | 5     |  | 5     | Driven by station improvements.   | 3     | Supports land use density increase                                | 5     |
| 7       Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas       wehicle movements involves the beneficial and the beneficial actionmet services and network. The major beneficial actionmet services are non-nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, providing through access to increase the cathemet services are non-nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide periods only while restricting cas to main nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide periods are non-nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide periods are non-nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide periods are non-nounces.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide periods areas and movement of restant.       More people on buses would result in less and network design, provide areas multiply build obtained build  | 6  | Improve legibility of transport    | the infrastructure typology and through local   | 5     |  | 5     | Potential to create simple loop network   | 4     | -   | 4     |
| 8       Optimite use of station supporting<br>facilities       inetwork to significant vincrease convenient<br>cathment.       5       Support and facilitate efficient<br>movement.       5       cathment of the station thereby maximising<br>cathment.       4       Support and facilitate efficient<br>movement.       4       Support and facilitate efficient<br>movement.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of<br>freight.       4       Any method to reduce the number of private<br>vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of<br>freight.       4       Redfere Creation Kould<br>support adset assists the efficient movement of<br>freight.       4       Redfere Creation of movements<br>support adset assists the efficient movement of<br>hubs increases user safety.       4       Redfere Creation of movements<br>support adset assists the efficient movement of<br>hubs increases user safety.       4       Redfere Creation of<br>trips assis the<br>efficient movement as transport<br>hubs increases user safety.<   | 7  |                                    | vehicle movements however the benefit is<br>limited by the catchment served by the road<br>network, the major benefit would be to the           | 2     | providing through access in some<br>locations to bicycle only while                                    | 2     |   | 4     | although this would be beneficial for those in the immediate      | 2     |
| 9       movement of freight throughout the vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional levence private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.       Proposed regional  | 8  |                                    | network to significantly increase convenient  | 5     |  | 5     | catchment of the station thereby maximising   | 4     |   | 5     |
| 10significant areas<br>walking catchment.4Propose regional network provides<br>access to regionally significant areas5Connections to regionally significant areas<br>significant areas4significant improve regional<br>significant areas511Improve road safety around key<br>transport hubsSubject to pedestrian priority measures.4Could help regulate traffic<br>access to regionally significant areas4Relant of implementation of LATW/<br>40km/h HPAA.512Improve personal security around key<br>transport hubsHigher volumes of pedestrians create collective<br>improvement in personal security. Would also<br>require street activation of land near station.4Could help regulate traffic<br>passive surveilance<br>and therefore perception of security4Reliant of implementation of LATW/<br>40km/h HPAA.413Maximise integration with land use and<br>other transport modesProvides more options to access all parts of the<br>precinct.4Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>supported by cycle network<br>timprovements.5Bus services can use existing and proposed<br>reduce relance of bus driver.4Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks514Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transportVery supportive5Very supportive5Eace dransport catchment particularly<br>the land and transport catchment particul   | 9  | movement of freight throughout the | vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of   | 5     | private vehicle trips assists the  | 4     | vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of                                     | 4     | local freight/ delivery movements.                                | 4     |
| 11transport hubsSubject to pedestrian priority measures.4Could neip regulate traffic4hubs increases user safety.440km/h HPAA.512Improve personal security around key<br>transport hubsHigher volumes of pedestrians create collective<br>improvement in personal security. Would also<br>require street activation of land near station.4More people on the street means a<br>ad therefore people and presence of bus driver.4Additional vehicle movements may<br>increase passive surveillance.413Maximise integration with land use and<br>other transport modesProvides more options to access all parts of the<br>precinct.4Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements.5Bus services can use existing and proposed<br>road network to continu the integral use of<br>the land and transport catchment particularly<br>those within an active transport distance of<br>stops4Coal be designed to improve<br>accessibility and active transport.514Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transportVery supportive5Very supportive5Increased transport catchment particularly<br>those within an active transport distance of<br>stops4Unlikely to reduce or<br>private vehicle reliance on<br>private vehicle reliance on private<br>measures.4Designed to improve<br>accessibility and active transport.4Unlikely to reduce or<br>measures.614Support positive provision for<br>usc o-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.Assists to reduce private motor<br>vehicle reliance over a greater<br>catchment.4 <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>significantly improve regional</td> <td>5</td>  | 10 |                                    |   | 4     |  | 5     |   | 4     | significantly improve regional                                    | 5     |
| 12Improve personal security around key<br>rransport hubsimprovement in personal security. Would also<br>require street activation of land near station.4higher level of passive surveillance<br>and therefore perception of security4Personal security is improved by grouping of<br>people and resence of bus driver.4Additional venicle movements may<br>increase passive surveillance.413Maximise integration with land use and<br>other transport modesProvides more options to access all parts of the<br>precinct.4Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network5Bus services can use existing and proposed<br>rot land ransport network.4Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks514Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transportVery supportive5Very supportive5Increased transport catchment particularly<br>those within an active transport distance of<br>stops4Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support.515Reduce reliance on private motor<br>vehicleProvides more amenable walking options. Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.6658Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support.316Total66665866  | 11 |                                    | Subject to pedestrian priority measures.  | 4     | Could help regulate traffic  | 4     |   | 4     |   | 5     |
| 13Maximise integration with rand use and<br>other transport modesProvides more options to access all pairs of the<br>precinct.4supported by cycle network<br>improvements.5road network to continue the integral use of<br>the land and transport network.4Kodad network supports rand use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks514Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transportVery supportive5Very supportive5Increased transport catchment particularly<br>those within an active transport distance of<br>stops4Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support and<br>prioritise active transport.515Reduce reliance on private motor<br>vehicle reliance on private motor<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.5Assists to reduce private motor<br>vehicle reliance over a greater<br>catchment.4Bus services reduce the reliance on private<br>vehicle.0Unlikely to reduce reliance on<br>private vehicle use without other<br>measures.316Total6658665866   | 12 |                                    | improvement in personal security. Would also  | 4     | higher level of passive surveillance   | 4     |   | 4     |   | 4     |
| 14Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transportVery supportive5Very supportive5those within an active transport distance of<br>stops4accessibility and support and<br>prioritise active transport.515Reduce reliance on private motor<br>vehicleProvides more amenable walking options. Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.5Assists to reduce private motor<br>vehicle reliance over a greater<br>catchment.4Bus services reduce the reliance on private<br>vehicle.4Unlikely to reduce reliance on<br>private vehicle use without other<br>measures.316Total66665866  | 13 |                                    |   | 4     | supported by cycle network   | 5     | road network to continue the integral use of the land and transport network.        | 4     |   | 5     |
| 15       Reduce reliance of private motor<br>vehicle       use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.       5       vehicle reliance over a greater<br>catchment.       4       Bus services reduce the reliance of private       4       private vehicle use without other<br>measures.       3         Total       66       66       58       66  | 14 |                                    | Very supportive   | 5     | Very supportive  | 5     | those within an active transport distance of  | 4     | accessibility and support and                                     | 5     |
|  | 15 |                                    | use co-located with major public transport  | 5     | vehicle reliance over a greater  | 4     |   | 4     | private vehicle use without other                                 | 3     |
| Recommendation Proceed Proceed Proceed Proceed   |    | Total                              |   | 66    |  | 66    |   | 58    |   | 66    |
|  |    | Recommendation                     | Proceed   |       | Proceed  |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       |

## Ingleburn infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| - | #  | Objective   | Walking   |       | Cycling  |       | Bus   |
|---|----|---|---|-------|--|-------|---|
|   |    |   | Comment   | Score | Comment  | Score | Comment   |
|   | 1  | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Increase in permeability on north-west side of<br>public transport and change of land use would<br>increase attractiveness of public transport.   | 4     | New routes, improved network and<br>bicycle parking provided closer to<br>station access point increases<br>convenience compared to Park &<br>Ride.  | 4     | Reliant on configuration and frequency of<br>local services. Proposed parallel route would<br>operate on Cumberland Road improving<br>usefulness and attractiveness of public<br>transport. |
|   | 2  | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT   | 3     | High frequency of regional route would reduce waiting times.  |
|   | 3  | Improve the customer experience for<br>public transport journeys              | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience, most notable on the north-west side of the railway line.  | 5     | Access and amenity enhancement improves the overall experience.  | 4     | The customer experience on buses is largely controlled by the service operator.   |
|   | 4  | Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Improved finer grain network on the north-west<br>side. Change in land use close to station would<br>encourage more encourage more walking.   | 5     | attractive options to encourage more cycling and increase convenient catchment.  | 5     | Highly dependent on frequency of services as to whether people walk to stops and through centre.  |
|   | 5  | Increase land use density in key transport locations                          | Land use density is proposed to be increased<br>near to the station which would increase the<br>viability of walking and the investment of walking<br>infrastructure in the precinct by way of co-<br>location of goods and services.   |       | Land use density proposal supports<br>the investment in infrastructure   | 4     | Increase the attractiveness of local bus services stopping at the station.  |
|   |    | Improve legibility of transport   | The grid layout of the street network provides a highly legible network, some additional links would continue in the grid layout.   | 4     | Proposed network infrastructure and wayfinding would improve legibility  | 5     | No change in legibility, route legibility is clear.   |
|   | 7  | Minimise vehicular through traffic in<br>local areas                          | A new road connection is proposed to the south-<br>west of the precinct, providing an effective loop<br>road network and not providing through access<br>on both sides of the railway line in the town<br>centre. The loop road will provide a more<br>attractive option to travel around the town centre<br>and potential to reduce existing through<br>movements. |       | Subject to detailed network design,<br>providing through access at the<br>station (users must walk bicycle) and<br>in some locations to bicycle only<br>while restricting cars to main routes. | 4     | Bus network does not provide attractive<br>through route for vehicles as of present.  |
|   | 8  | Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | The proposed structure plan would utilise the existing investment in the pedestrian bridge at the train station.  | 5     | Supports proposed bicycle parking<br>investment and reduces dependence<br>on limited commuter car parking  | 5     | Bus services continue to serve station as of present  |
|   | 9  | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.  | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   |
|   | 10 | Improve connections to regionally<br>significant areas                        | Some regionally significant areas within the walking catchment.   | 4     | Proposed regional network along key<br>transport corridors provides access<br>to regionally significant areas  | 5     | Regional bus route on Cumberland Road improves regional connections.  |
|   | 11 | Improve road safety around key transport hubs                                 | Subject to pedestrian priority measures.  | 4     | Could help encourage a slower speed environment.   | 4     | Bus services assist in reducing other traffic<br>and improve safety at station  |
|   | 12 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                           | Higher volumes of pedestrians create collective<br>improvement in personal security. Additional<br>movements over station pedestrian bridge would<br>also assist in passive surveillance.   | 5     | More people on the street means a higher level of passive surveillance and therefore perception of security  | 4     | Personal security is improved by grouping of people and presence of bus driver.   |
|   | 13 | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes                  | Structure plan and walking catchment based around existing transport node.  | 5     | Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements.   | 4     | Bus services can use existing and proposed road network to continue the integral use of the land and transport network.   |
|   | 14 | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport             | Very supportive   | 5     | Very supportive  | 5     | Bus services generally require customers to<br>walk to, in and surrounding the precinct as per<br>current.  |
|   | 15 | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                      | Provides more amenable walking options Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.   | 4     | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.   | 4     | Bus services reduce the reliance on private vehicle.  |
|   |    | Total   |   | 67    |  | 64    |   |
|   |    | Recommendation  | Proceed   |       | Proceed  |       | Proceed   |

|       | Road  |       |
|-------|---|-------|
| Score | Comment   | Score |
| 5     | New road link across railway has<br>the potential to provide more bus<br>routing options in the precinct. | 4     |
| 5     | Road network will allow the public transport to operate more direct.                                      | 4     |
| 3     | Road network will provide the opportunity to improve customer experience.                                 | 4     |
| 4     | Dependent of road network design, activated frontages and priority.                                       | 3     |
| 4     | Finer grain road network in town<br>centre core supports land use<br>density increase                     | 5     |
| 3     | Dependant on street infrastructure typology.  | 4     |
| 3     | Proposed rail crossing located to<br>avoid through traffic flow in local<br>areas and town centre.        | 5     |
| 3     | Supports more convenient access and movement to station   | 5     |
| 3     | Proposed roads would support local freight/ delivery movements.   | 5     |
| 5     | Road network improvements<br>improve connectivity to the Hume<br>Motorway                                 | 5     |
| 3     | Reliant of implementation of LATM/<br>40km/h HPAA.  | 4     |
| 3     | Improved activation on north side would improve personal security.  | 4     |
| 3     | Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks                                      | 5     |
| 3     | Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support active<br>transport.                              | 4     |
| 3     | Unlikely to reduce reliance on private vehicle use without other measures.                                | 3     |
| 53    |   | 64    |
|       | Proceed, subject to detailed<br>precinct planning for potential road<br>link.                             |       |
|       |   |       |

## Minto infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| #  | Objective   | Walking  |       | Cycling   |       | Bus   |       | Road  |       |
|----|---|--|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|
|    |   | Comment  | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score |
| 1  | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Improved footpath network and crossings to improve the attractiveness of public transport.   | 4     | New routes, improved network and<br>bicycle parking provided closer to<br>station access point increases<br>convenience compared to park &<br>ride. | 5     | Reliant on configuration and frequency of<br>local services. Proposed parallel route would<br>operate on Pembroke Road improving<br>usefulness and attractiveness of public<br>transport. | 5     | Minimal improvement for road based public transport services anticipated.                                     | 3     |
| 2  | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT   | 3     | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | High frequency of regional route would reduce waiting times.  | 5     | No known delays on existing or<br>proposed bus routes through Minto   | 3     |
| 3  | Improve the customer experience for<br>public transport journeys              | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.  | 4     | Access and amenity enhancement improves the overall experience.   | 4     | The customer experience on buses is controlled by the service operator.   | 3     | No impact   | 3     |
| 4  | Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Providing additional facilities will encourage people to walk more.  | 4     | Designated cycle routes provide<br>attractive options to encourage more<br>cycling and increase convenient<br>catchment.                            | 5     | Higher frequency and more accessible bus services closer to people's homes can help to encourage more active transport.   | 4     | Dependent of road network design, activated frontages and priority.   | 4     |
| 5  | Increase land use density in key transport locations                          | Land use density is proposed to be increased<br>near to the station which would increase the<br>viability of walking and the investment of walking<br>infrastructure in the precinct by way of co-<br>location of goods and services. Further the<br>increase in residential density is located<br>between the station and Minto Marketplace<br>shopping centre. | 4     | Land use density proposal supports the investment in infrastructure   | 4     | Limited benefit of bus services close to station.   | 3     | Finer grain road network in town centre core supports land use density increase                               | 5     |
| 6  | Improve legibility of transport   | The grid layout of the street network provides a<br>highly legible network, some additional links<br>would continue in the grid layout.  | 4     | Proposed network infrastructure and wayfinding would improve legibility   | 4     | Direct regional route increases bus service legibility.   | 4     | Dependant on street infrastructure<br>typology. Road network is already<br>highly legible.                    | 4     |
| 7  | Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas                             | The configuration of the road network allows<br>through traffic, however the road network layout<br>provides more direct away from the vicinity of<br>the station, only traffic accessing the precinct<br>use the street network.  | 3     | Road network already minimises<br>through movements while the station<br>bridge provides a rail crossing point<br>for bicycles.                     | 3     | Bus network does not provide attractive through route for vehicles as of present.   | 3     | Proposed additional rail crossing<br>away from precinct core reduces<br>likelihood of vehicles in local area. | 4     |
| 8  | Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | The existing pedestrian bridge forms part of the local network, however the structure plan focuses on improvements to the north-east side of the station. Additional use will occur by way of more people using the station.   | 4     | Supports proposed bicycle parking investment and station pedestrian bridge investment.  | 4     | Bus services continue to serve station as of present  | 3     | Negligible impact on station facilities.  | 3     |
| 9  | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.  | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 3     | Proposed additional rail crossing<br>would provide additional freight<br>route over railway corridor.         | 3     |
| 10 | Improve connections to regionally significant areas                           | Proposed north link over railway line (Essex<br>Street/ Minto Road) would provide a regionally<br>significant route in locality.   | 4     | Proposed regional network along key<br>transport corridors provides access<br>to regionally significant areas                                       | 4     | Regional bus route on Pembrook Road improves regional connections.  | 3     | Road network improvements<br>improve connectivity to the South<br>West Growth Centre                          | 5     |
| 11 | Improve road safety around key<br>transport hubs                              | Subject to pedestrian priority measures.<br>Surrounding streets are already low speed<br>environments.   | 3     | Clear routes and dedicated facilities to improve road safety.   | 3     | Bus services assist in reducing other vehicular traffic near station thereby improving safety at station  | 3     | Existing LATM and geometry<br>provide low speed environment<br>surrounding the station.                       | 3     |
| 12 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                           | Increase in passive and active surveillance<br>through more people on street and higher<br>density housing.  | 4     | More people on the street moving at<br>slower speeds. Rail crossings use<br>station bridge.   | 4     | Personal security is improved by grouping of people and presence of bus driver.   | 3     | Low through route attraction<br>minimises passive surveillance<br>potential.                                  | 3     |
| 13 | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes                  | Structure plan and walking catchment based around existing transport node.   | 3     | Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements.  | 4     | Bus services can use existing and proposed road network to continue the integral use of the land and transport network.   | 3     | Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks  | 3     |
| 14 | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport             | Very supportive  | 3     | Very supportive   | 5     | Bus services are generally require customers<br>to walk to in and surrounding the precinct as<br>per current.   | 3     | Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support active<br>transport.                                  | 4     |
| 15 | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                      | Provides more amenable walking options. Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.   | 4     | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.  | 4     | Bus services reduce the reliance on private vehicle.  | 3     | Unlikely to reduce reliance on private vehicle use without other measures.                                    | 3     |
|    | Total   |  | 55    |   | 60    |   | 51    |   | 53    |
|    | Recommendation  | Proceed  |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed with exception of new<br>road link over railway line  |       |

## Leumeah infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| #  | Objective   | Walking   |       | Cycling   |       | Bus   |       | Road  |       |
|----|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|
|    |   | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score |
| 1  | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Improved footpath network and crossings to<br>improve the directness and therefore<br>attractiveness of public transport.   | 5     | New routes, improved network along<br>green corridors and bicycle parking<br>provided closer to station access<br>point increases convenience<br>compared to park & ride. | 5     | Reliant on configuration and frequency of<br>local services. Proposed parallel route would<br>operate on Pembroke Road improving<br>usefulness and attractiveness of public<br>transport. | 5     | Minimal improvement for road based public transport services anticipated.                       | 3     |
| 2  | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | High frequency of regional route would reduce waiting times.  | 5     | No known delays on existing or<br>proposed bus routes through<br>Leumeah                        | 3     |
| 3  | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys                 | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 5     | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 5     | The customer experience on buses is controlled by the service operator.   | 3     | No impact   | 3     |
| 4  | Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Providing direct routes encourages more walking.  | 4     | Designated cycle routes provide<br>attractive options to encourage more<br>cycling and increase convenient<br>catchment.  | 5     | Higher frequency and more accessible bus services closer to people's homes can help to encourage more active transport.   | 4     | Dependent of road network design<br>and activated frontages and<br>priority.                    | 4     |
| 5  | Increase land use density in key<br>transport locations                       | Residential land use density increase in the south east portion of the station.   | 5     | Land use density proposal supports the investment in cycle infrastructure.  | 5     | Limited benefit of bus services within station walking catchment.   | 3     | Road network should largely<br>support increased land use density<br>near station.              | 3     |
| 6  | Improve legibility of transport   | Minor additional links to improve legibility of walking network.  | 4     | Proposed network infrastructure and wayfinding would improve legibility   | 5     | Direct regional route increases bus service legibility.   | 4     | Dependant on street infrastructure<br>typology. Road network is already<br>highly legible.      | 3     |
| 7  | Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas                             | It is expected the walking network will remain<br>more permeable for pedestrians while<br>maintaining minimal through routes for vehicles.  | 3     | Road network already minimises<br>through movements while the station<br>bridge provides a rail crossing point<br>for bicycles.   | 3     | Improved bus service may help to reduce through traffic on Pembroke Road.   | 4     | No additional through routes proposed.  | 3     |
| 8  | Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | The existing pedestrian bridge forms part of the<br>local network. Any increase in retail/ commercial<br>land use intensity could trigger higher demand<br>for the pedestrian bridge and potentially the car<br>parking. It is expected the commuter car park<br>would also be utilised by people accessing the<br>sports precinct. | 4     | Supports proposed bicycle parking investment and station pedestrian bridge investment.  | 5     | Local bus services continue to serve station as of present  | 3     | Negligible impact on station facilities.  | 3     |
| 9  | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of<br>private vehicle trips assists the<br>efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Proposed new links in employment<br>zone would assist freight<br>movement through the corridor. | 4     |
| 10 | Improve connections to regionally significant areas                           | No regionally significant routes proposed.  | 3     | Proposed regional network along key<br>transport corridors provides access<br>to regionally significant areas   | 5     | Regional bus route on Pembroke Road improves regional connections.  | 5     | Maintains same connections to regional areas  | 3     |
| 11 | Improve road safety around key transport hubs                                 | Subject to pedestrian priority measures and<br>LATM. Surrounding streets are already low<br>speed environments.   | 4     | No significant road safety issue has<br>been identified surrounding the<br>station.   | 3     | Bus services assist in reducing other vehicular traffic near station thereby improving safety at station  | 4     | Existing LATM and geometry<br>provide low speed environment<br>surrounding the station.         | 3     |
| 12 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                           | Structure plan proposed additional retail land<br>use near to station which would lead to an<br>increase in passive and active surveillance.  | 4     | More people on the street moving at slower speeds.  | 4     | Local bus services effectively provide<br>escorted trips closer to people's destinations.<br>No change anticipated.   | 3     | Low through route attraction<br>minimises passive surveillance<br>potential.                    | 3     |
| 13 | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes                  | Structure plan and walking catchment based around existing transport node.  | 5     | Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements.  | 4     | Regional bus service not proposed to integrate but complement rail services.  | 2     | Road network supports land use, bus, walking and cycling networks                               | 3     |
| 14 | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport             | Very supportive   | 5     | Very supportive   | 5     | Bus services are generally require customers<br>to walk to in and surrounding the precinct as<br>per current.   | 4     | Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support active<br>transport.                    | 3     |
| 15 | Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                      | Provides more amenable walking options. Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.  | 5     | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.  | 5     | Bus services reduce the reliance on private vehicle.  | 4     | Unlikely to reduce reliance on private vehicle use without other measures.                      | 3     |
|    | Total   |   | 63    |   | 66    |   | 57    |   | 47    |
|    | Recommendation  | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       |



## Campbelltown infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| Objective   | Walking   |       | Cycling   |       | Bus   |       | Road   |      |
|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|--|------|
|   | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment   | Score | Comment  | Scor |
| Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Improved footpath network and crossings to<br>improve the directness and therefore<br>attractiveness of public transport.   | 4     | New routes, improved network along<br>green corridors and bicycle parking<br>provided closer to station access<br>point increases convenience<br>compared to park & ride. | 5     | Reliant on configuration and frequency of<br>local services. Proposed regional routes<br>would improve competitiveness PT                                   | 5     | Proposed new network have the<br>potential to provide more public<br>transport route options, serve new<br>areas and generally improve the<br>attractiveness and<br>competitiveness. | 4    |
| Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3     | High frequency of regional routes would reduce waiting times and potential transit link.  | 5     | Reliant of priority measures implemented.  | 4    |
| Improve the customer experience for<br>public transport journeys              | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 4     | Access and amenity improvement improves the overall experience.   | 4     | The customer experience on buses is controlled by the service operator.   | 3     | Potential for some improvement   | 4    |
| Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Additional parallel routes are proposed<br>(Beverley Road extension and Howe Street<br>extension) and so other minor links to improve<br>permeability.                    | 4     | Designated cycle routes provide<br>attractive options to encourage more<br>cycling and increase convenient<br>catchment.  | 4     | Higher frequency and more accessible bus<br>services closer to people's homes can help to<br>encourage more active transport to access<br>nearest bus stop. | 4     | Dependent of road network design,<br>priority and activated frontages.<br>Additional links will support walking<br>and cycling activity.   |      |
| Increase land use density in key transport locations                          | Residential land use density supported by proposed walking links. Proposed business land uses on north side adjacent to station.  | 5     | Land use density proposal supports the investment in cycle infrastructure.  | 5     | Limited benefit of bus services within station walking catchment.   | 3     | Road network would support<br>increased land use density near<br>station.  | 5    |
| Improve legibility of transport   | Additional links to complete more of the network grid improving legibility of walking network.  | 4     | Proposed network infrastructure and wayfinding would improve legibility   | 5     | Direct regional route increases bus service<br>legibility. Rationalised region routes would<br>also improve legibility.                                     | 5     | Dependant on street infrastructure<br>typology. Additional links would<br>improve legibility.  | 4    |
| Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas                             | It is expected the walking network will remain<br>more permeable for pedestrians while<br>maintaining minimal through routes for vehicles.                                | 4     | Road network already minimises<br>through movements. Bicycle<br>movements would benefit for extra<br>permeability.  | 4     | Through traffic uses routes surrounding<br>Campbelltown, traffic within precinct is<br>generated from land uses in the precinct.                            | 3     | Reliant of road configuration.   | 3    |
| Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | Proposed development on the north side of the<br>railway line would make use of the existing<br>station bridge to facilitate cross rail corridor<br>pedestrian movements. | 4     | Supports proposed bicycle parking investment and station pedestrian bridge investment.  | 5     | Local bus services continue to serve station as of present  | 3     | Negligible impact on station facilities.   | 3    |
| Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Any method to reduce the number of private<br>vehicle trips and encourages development away<br>from key freight routes assists the efficient<br>movement of freight.      | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 4     | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.   | 3     | Road network to support local freight movements.   | 4    |
| 0 Improve connections to regionally significant areas                         | Improved link between schools and central business district   | 4     | Proposed regional network along key<br>transport corridors provides access<br>to regionally significant areas   | 5     | Proposed regional routes strengthens links to regional areas.   | 4     | Maintains same connections to regional areas   | 3    |
| 1 Improve road safety around key<br>transport hubs                            | Maintains existing safety levels. LATM could be implemented to improve the pedestrian network.  | 4     | Designated bicycle routes and facilities should be designed to provide safety improvement.  | 5     | Existing separated bus infrastructure provides<br>safe environment at Campbelltown station.   | 3     | Existing road configuration is not<br>very permeable for pedestrians.<br>Detailed design to assess<br>opportunities to improve safety.   | 4    |
| 2 Improve personal security around key<br>transport hubs                      | Additional activated land use and density<br>adjacent to station increasing passive and active<br>surveillance.   | 4     | More people on the street moving at slower speeds to observe more and provide more passive surveillance.  | 4     | Local bus services effectively provide<br>escorted trips closer to people's destinations.<br>No change anticipated.   | 3     | Road network surrounding station provides some passive surveillance.   | 3    |
| 3 Maximise integration with land use and<br>other transport modes             | Core network to remain similar near transport,<br>proposed land use intensification near to station   | 5     | Proposed density improvements<br>supported by cycle network<br>improvements. Cycle network<br>integrates with other transport<br>modes.                                   | 5     | Regional bus services proposed to fully integrate with train services.  | 5     | Road network supports land use,<br>bus, walking and cycling networks   | 4    |
| 4 Support positive provision for<br>accessibility and active transport        | Very supportive   | 5     | Very supportive   | 5     | Bus services are generally require customers<br>to walk to stops to access services as per<br>current.  | 3     | Can be designed to improve<br>accessibility and support active<br>transport.   | 4    |
| 5 Reduce reliance on private motor vehicle                                    | Provides more amenable walking options. Land<br>use co-located with major public transport<br>infrastructure reduces private vehicle reliance.                            | 5     | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.  | 4     | Bus services reduce the reliance on private vehicle.  | 4     | Unlikely to reduce reliance on private vehicle use without other measures.   | 3    |
| Total   |   | 63    |   | 67    |   | 56    |  | 56   |
| Recommendation  | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed   |       | Proceed with potential transit link<br>over railway lines, subject to<br>detailed precinct planning.   |      |



## Macarthur infrastructure multi-criteria analysis

| #  | Objective   | Walking   |            | Cycling  |            | Bus   |            | Road   |            |
|----|---|---|------------|--|------------|---|------------|--|------------|
| "  |   |   | Saara      |  | Saara      |   | Saara      |  | Saara      |
| 1  | Improve competitiveness and attractiveness of public transport                | Comment<br>Precinct is relatively new with planned<br>network of footpaths and through route<br>linking with shopping centre and education<br>precinct. Proposed crossing improvements<br>would increase attractiveness of network. | Score<br>4 | New regional routes, improved<br>network along green corridors<br>and bicycle parking provided<br>closer to station access point<br>increases convenience compared | Score<br>5 | Comment<br>Bus network utilises existing routes.  | Score<br>3 | Comment<br>Same amount of links for public<br>transport services.  | Score<br>3 |
| 2  | Improve reliability and reduce waiting times for public transport             | No impact on reliability and waiting times of PT  | 3          | to park & ride.<br>No impact on reliability and<br>waiting times of PT   | 3          | High frequency of regional routes and transit link would reduce waiting times   | 5          | No impact.   | 3          |
| 3  | Improve the customer experience for public transport journeys                 | Minimal differences, reliant of improvement in road crossing facilities.  | 4          | Access and amenity<br>improvement improves the<br>overall experience.  | 4          | The customer experience on buses is controlled by the service operator.   | 3          | No impact.   | 3          |
| 4  | Encourage people to walk and cycle more                                       | Proposed crossing links to encourage more walking.  | 4          | Designated cycle routes provide<br>attractive options to encourage<br>more cycling and increase<br>convenient catchment.   | 5          | Maintain existing service coverage, same amount of encouragement to walk to bus stops   | 3          | Dependent on crossing<br>improvements  | 4          |
| 5  | Increase land use density in key transport locations                          | Similar density proposed as present.<br>Reliant on full development before full<br>utilisation of facilities.   | 3          | Existing land use density and locations support the implementation of an improved cycling network.   | 4          | Proposed land use density to remain as proposed.  | 3          | Road network and land use already planned  | 3          |
| 6  | Improve legibility of transport   | Improved and proposed crossings in key<br>locations to improve walking network<br>legibility.   | 4          | Proposed network infrastructure<br>and wayfinding would improve<br>legibility  | 5          | Maintain existing legibility.   | 3          | Maintains same level of<br>connectivity  | 3          |
| 7  | Minimise vehicular through traffic in local areas                             | Walking network will not impact existing level of vehicle through movement.   | 3          | Bicycle network to provide advantage over vehicle routes.  | 4          | Road network already designed to reduce through movements.  | 3          | No additional through routes proposed.   | 3          |
| 8  | Optimise use of station supporting facilities                                 | Proposed development on the north side of<br>the railway line would make use of the<br>existing station bridge to facilitate cross rail<br>corridor pedestrian movements.   | 4          | Supports proposed bicycle parking investment and station pedestrian bridge investment.   | 4          | Local bus services continue to serve station as of present  | 3          | Negligible impact on station facilities.   | 3          |
| 9  | Support and facilitate efficient movement of freight throughout the corridor. | Minimal impact if any.  | 3          | Any method to reduce the<br>number of private vehicle trips<br>assists the efficient movement of<br>freight.   | 4          | Any method to reduce the number of private vehicle trips assists the efficient movement of freight.                                     | 4          | Maintains existing support for<br>freight movement   | 3          |
| 10 | Improve connections to regionally significant areas                           | Maintains existing levels of connectivity.  | 3          | Proposed regional network along<br>key transport corridors provides<br>access to regionally significant<br>areas   | 5          | Improves regional connectivity at<br>Macarthur  | 5          | Maintains same connections to regional areas   | 3          |
| 11 | Improve road safety around key transport hubs                                 | Crossing improvements would improve road safety.  | 4          | Proposed to provide facilities<br>other than bicycle lanes between<br>traffic lanes and parking lanes.   | 5          | Bus services assist in reducing other<br>vehicular traffic near station thereby<br>improving safety at station as per current<br>levels | 3          | Proposed crossings to improve road safety in precinct.   | 4          |
| 12 | Improve personal security around key transport hubs                           | Maintains same level of personal security.  | 3          | More people on the street moving<br>at slower speeds to observe<br>more and provide more passive<br>surveillance.  | 4          | Local bus services effectively provide<br>escorted trips closer to people's<br>destinations. No change anticipated.                     | 3          | Additional crossings and<br>improvements at street level<br>would provide more active<br>street frontage | 4          |
| 13 | Maximise integration with land use and other transport modes                  | Existing level of integration   | 3          | Integrates with existing land use<br>and road and reserve layout<br>utilising opportunistic links.   | 4          | Maintains existing local connections from train station to town centre.   | 3          | Road network supports land<br>use, bus, walking and cycling<br>networks                                  | 3          |
| 14 | Support positive provision for accessibility and active transport             | Crossing improvements are a positive provision.   | 4          | Very supportive  | 4          | Bus services are generally require<br>customers to walk to in and surrounding<br>the precinct as per current.                           | 3          | Maintains existing.  | 3          |
| 15 | vehicle   | Maintains similar level of private vehicle reliance.  | 3          | Assists to reduce private motor vehicle reliance over a greater catchment.   | 4          | Bus services assist the reliance on private vehicle.  | 3          | Unlikely to reduce reliance on<br>private vehicle use without<br>other measures.                         | 3          |
|    | Total   |   | 52         |  | 64         |   | 50         |  | 48         |
|    | Recommendation  | Proceed   |            | Proceed  |            | Proceed   |            | Proceed  |            |