

## Traffic Engineer Referral Response

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Application Number:</b>             | Mod2024/0104  |
| <b>Proposed Development:</b>           | Modification of Development Consent DA2023/0374 granted for Construction of a studio and car parking structure  |
| <b>Date:</b>                           | 02/05/2024  |
| <b>Responsible Officer</b>             |   |
| <b>Land to be developed (Address):</b> | Lot 4B DP 361236 , 18 The Serpentine BILGOLA BEACH NSW 2107<br>Lot 4A DP 361236 , 20 The Serpentine BILGOLA BEACH NSW 2107<br>Lot 5 DP 13497 , 20 The Serpentine BILGOLA BEACH NSW 2107 |

### Officer comments

**Proposal Description:** Modification to DA2023/0374 (Construction of a studio and car parking structure)

The traffic team has reviewed the following documents:

- Plans (Master Set) - Amended DA Project No. 2236, Revision D, designed by GartnerTrovato Architects, dated 22/01/2024,
- Parking Design Statement Report, prepared by PDC Consultants, dated 30/01/2024, and
- The *Statement of Environmental Effects* prepared by GartnerTrovato Architects, issue B, dated March 2024.

### Access and Parking Design

- The development proposes a combined entry/exit driveway with a width of 5.5 metres in accordance with table 3.1 of AS 2890.1. However, according to the Notice of Determination conditions of DA2023/0374, condition number 15 – Vehicle Crossing Application restricts the maximum width of the proposed driveway to be 4 metres in accordance with Northern Beaches Council Standard Drawing A4/3330/1 in accordance with Section 138 of the Roads Act 1993. Although this condition has been breached by the proposed 5.5metres wide driveway, the proposed driveway width is acceptable because the proposed driveway is two-way and is in accordance with AS2890.1:2004.
- The Parking Design Statement prepared by PDC Consultants, included a swept path analysis for the proposed driveway access using a B85 Design Vehicle, however swept paths for a B99 vehicle should be used in the design of access driveways. The swept path analysis on page 9 shows that the vehicle body hits the column on eastern side during both entry and exit movements. Moreover, the swept path on page 10 shows that the vehicle body will hit the stair handrail on western side during entry movement. The swept paths must be revised.
- The Traffic report mentions that at least one reverse manoeuvre into or out of the double garage car parking space is required. Hence, the swept path analysis for one reverse in movement must be provided.

### Sight Distance

- It is understood that this is a modification to the approved DA2023/0374. Hence, a reference is made to the original DA and notes from the pre-lodgement meeting. The driveway location in original application was considered to be in close proximity to the bend, hence a sight line analysis was requested. The proposed modification proposes to move the driveway further to the north, resulting in closer distance to the bend. Hence, high emphasis should be given to the sightline assessment. The submitted traffic letter provides a sight line assessment on page number 12, Drawing number S.001, done only for the far left vehicle, but not for the right vehicle which is closer to the bend. Council believes that the sight line assessment should be carried out for the most affected vehicle (right vehicle which is closer to the bend). Furthermore, given the exit movement will be reverse out as shown in the swept path analysis, the position of driver on the sightline assessment must be amended as the driver's position at the moment is for the vehicle exiting in a forward direction. This sight line assessment shows that a minimum of 35m Stopping Sight Distance is achievable on the eastern side of the driver's position. However, to achieve the unobstructed sightlines, Tree 12 and 15 will need to be removed. The recommendation of the Arborist Report only appears to consider the impacts the location of the driveway and structures have on the existing trees and not any consideration of their effects on sight distance. The Arborist report mentions no pruning required for tree 12 and minor crown pruning for vision up (street to the north) for tree 15. Furthermore, Council notes that the architectural plan used on Arborist Report (page 7) is not same as the latest architectural plans submitted as the driveway width and shape are different to the one shown on the traffic report. The Transport Network continues to have concerns regarding visibility exiting the driveway and restricted sight distance due to the existing trees and vegetation.

#### **Pedestrian sight distance at property boundary**

- A pedestrian sight triangle of 2 metres by 2.5 metres, in accordance with AS2890.1:2004 (figure 3.3) is to be provided and shown on the plans at the vehicular access to the property boundary. The sight triangle should be clear of obstructions or lower than 900mm height or 50% transparent if higher than 1 metre.

#### **Conclusion**

The application is not supported at this stage with further information as outlined above required prior to further consideration of the proposal.

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

#### **Recommended Traffic Engineer Conditions:**

Nil.