



Pedestrian Bridge Responses to Authority Correspondance

TfNSW



| Comments register Pedestrian Bridge REF | | |
|---|--|---|
| Reference | Comments (in reference to the bolt-on option) | Response (latest design - standalone) - 30/9/2022 |
| 1) Walkaway | TfNSW does not approve the walkway attachment as it relies upon the integrity of the existing structure, for which TfNSW is responsible for maintaining. TfNSW cannot warrant the integrity of the existing structure as assumed by the designer. | In response to TfNSW comments, the pedestrian bridge has been redesigned as a stand alone structure, detached from the existing vehicle bridge. |
| 2) Walkaway | The proposed walkway if constructed would form part of the overbridge structure. Under the attached agreement this would result in an additional maintenance liability for TfNSW. | The maintenance of the structure, once the asset is handed over to Council, will fall under the care of Council. |
| 3) B1849 | No comment | Noted |
| 4) B1849 | No comment | Noted |
| 5) B1849 | No comment | Noted |
| 6) B1849-D-01 | No comment | Noted |
| 7) B1849-D-02 | No comment | Noted |
| 8) B1849-D-04 | No comment | Noted |
| 9) B1849-D-05 | No comment | Noted |
| 10) B1849-D-05 | No comment | Noted |
| 11) B1849-D-05 | No comment | Noted |
| 12) B1849-D-05 | No comment | Noted |
| 13) B1849 | No comment | Noted |
| 14) B1849 | No comment | Noted |
| 15) B1849-D-06 | No comment | Noted |

| Comments register Pedestrian Bridge REF | | |
|---|---|--|
| Reference | Comments (in reference to the bolt-on option) | Response (latest design - standalone) - 30/9/2022 |
| 1) Walkaway | No comment | Noted |
| 2) Walkaway | No comment | Noted |
| 3) B1849 | The designer and the checker are the same person. They need to be different people. | The Structural Designers comments regarding this indicate - the checked initials refer to the drawing checker, who is usually the designer under our QA. |
| 4) B1849 | Independent verification of the design to be completed. | The Structural Designers comments regarding this indicate - Independent verification to be undertaken prior to issuance of For Construction drawing package. Internal review of the structural drawings has been undertaken by Bridge Design P/L. |
| 5) B1849 | The existing traffic barrier does not satisfy current standard. Appreciate that the upgrade of the traffic barrier to current standards is not part of the design. Transport should be made aware that this will mean that the performance level on this traffic barrier will not be able to be increased. | Any works to the existing traffic barriers to the existing bridge are outside the scope of this proposal |
| 6) B1849-D-01 | Has earthquake loading been assessed? | The Structural Designers comments regarding this indicate - Yes, confirming earthquake load has been assessed. |
| 7) B1849-D-02 | FRP mini fresh proposed. Mesh is not approved for use on footbridges. This must be a solid surface. | The Structural Designers comments regarding this indicate - Confirming the mesh product proposed in the structural detail has a solid surface. |
| 8) B1849-D-04 | The use of two piles at the abutments seems excessive | The Structural Design of the bridge has been amended to a standalone option. Comment no longer relevant. |
| 9) B1849-D-05 | Reference on this sheet to solid top FRP contradicts B1849-D-02 | Structural drawings have been updated. |
| 10) B1849-D-05 | 168 OD galvanised pipe is being provided for a service. Suggest to relocate on the vertical leg of the frames to reduce loading on the structure. Is this an existing service or a new service, is there an agreement for this service? | Structural drawings have been updated. Service conduits are for any future services that may be required. Upon construction completion of the pedestrian bridge, the conduits will be handed over to the respective Service Authorities. |
| 11) B1849-D-05 | The design relies heavily on the integrity of the existing concrete upstand. Has the condition of this concrete been assessed? How has this connection detail been modelled/assessed? Has the amount of reinforcement in the upstand been reviewed to ensure that there is sufficient reinforcement? | The pedestrian bridge is now designed to be a free-standing bridge approximately 2m north of the existing road bridge. |
| 12) B1849-D-05 | With the proposed deck being higher than the existing kerb height, are the existing handrails between the proposed footbridge and road compliant? | The pedestrian bridge is now designed to be a free-standing bridge approximately 2m north of the existing road bridge, with the height designed to clear the minimum required height clearance above the railway corridor. All handrails have been designed in accordance with relevant standards. |
| 13) B1849 | Where is the cabling for the lighting going? How is it attached to the structure? | The electrical cabling will be fed through electrical conduits that are to be installed on the underside of the pedestrian bridge, which will extend the length of the pedestrian bridge/ ramps. The cables will then connect to a new MSB, where it will be supplied by an Endeavour Energy pillar on the eastern side of the railway. Refer to Electrical plans prepared by Egdewater Connections for details. |
| 14) B1849 | Confirm serviceability requirements are met. | The Structural Designers comments regarding this indicate - Confirming serviceability has been met. 1 in 600 under full live load on joists and 1 in 2000 on supports. Static deflection of road bridge under T44 loading has been checked. |
| 15) B1849-D-06 | Surface treatment shown as to be confirmed. To be galvanised. | Structural drawings have been updated to show galvanised steel. |



Pedestrian Bridge Responses to Authority Correspondance

Council



| Comments register Pedestrian Bridge REF | | |
|---|---|--|
| No. | Comments (in reference to the bolt-on option) | Response (latest design - standalone) - 30/9/2022 |
| 1 | Council Environmental | |
| 1.1 | No issues raised to the proposed Pedestrian Bridge from a contamination perspective. The Preliminary Site Investigation prepared by Geotechnique dated 30 June 2021 adequately determines the location to be suitable and does not pose an unacceptable risk to site users or the environment. | Noted |
| 2 | Council Engineering | |
| 2.1 | Conditions to be provided. | After numerous requests by Mirvac, Council have yet to provide since July 2021 |
| 3 | Council Tree Management Officer | |
| 3.1 | Regarding the use of Euc Melliodora along Stevens Road, the proposal is using this species as it ties in with the existing trees along the rest of the street. The species could be changed to Brachychiton discolor to create a feature at the start of the pedestrian path. | Landscaping plans have been amended to be in accordance with Council specifications. Council to provide clear direction on their requirements. |
| 3.2 | A tree of sufficient height should be located along the western end of the pedestrian bridge - a tree that has a clear trunk of at least 4m is required to allow for the slope of the bank and head clearance along the walkway. Although a nice tree it was concluded that the Calodendron capense would have a tall enough clear trunk and that the canopy would interrupt pedestrian movement along the pedestrian bridge. Therefore, it is suggested to retain the Angophora floridunda or maybe use Lophostemon confertus. | Landscaping plans have been amended to accommodate the standalone option which moves the Pedestrian Bridge 2m north. |
| 3.3 | At the eastern end of the pedestrian bridge it is proposed to change the tree species so that they tie in with the surround street tree species proposed for Stage 2 and 4. | Noted, Landscaping plans amended accordingly. |
| 3.4 | Regarding the hedge planting along the edge of the pedestrian walkway some species options have been provided on the attached for Councils consideration. Ideally the proposal will specify a shrub that grows to 1.5-2m high to screen the underside of the walkway and the handrails and to ensure that ongoing pruning is not required by Council. | Landscaping plans have been amended to accommodate. |