

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2024/0303
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing structures, removal of trees and subdivision of one lot into three lots.
Date:	28/05/2024
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 5 DP 222134 , 337 Lower Plateau Road BILGOLA PLATEAU NSW 2107

Officer comments

Proposal Description: Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and subdivision of one lot into three lots

The Traffic Team has reviewed the following documents:

- Plans (Master Set), prepared by Gartner Trovato Architects, dated 30/08/2022.
- Traffic Report (ref: 22070), prepared by Terrafric Pty Ltd, dated 12th March 2024.
- The Statement of Environmental Effects, prepared by BBF Townplanners, dated March 2024

Comments

- It is understood that the proposal is for demolition of the existing dwelling, removal of trees and subdivision of one lot into three lots.
- The existing vehicle access from Lower Plateau Road via a 3 metre wide Right of Way (RoW) is retained to provide access to the proposed 3 lots with some modifications including a widening of the driveway to 5.47 metres at the kerb, excluding wings in order to provide passing of B85 and B99 vehicles. The proposed passing bay has a width of 4.57m and length of approximately 5 metres with an additional length of taper of 7 metres. According to the Pittwater DCP clause B6.2, a passing bay should be minimum 5 metres wide and 10 metres long with suitable transitions to the adjacent narrow driveway. Due to site constraints, the passing bay is not fully compliant with the Pittwater DCP and the location of passing bay is in nature strip not within the site boundary contrary to AS2890.1 which requires such bays to be located inside the property boundary of 5.5m in width and extending for at least 6m (clause 3.2.2). Council could consider approval of a slightly non-compliant passing bay as the traffic volume using this access is low, however, the swept path should be amended to show an egressing B99 passing a B85 waiting internal to the property with its swept path shown. A swept path should also be plotted for an egressing B85 passing a B99 waiting internal to the property with its swept path shown. The swept path on page 16 of the traffic report shows a propped B85 vehicle external to the property without its entry movement path from the road. The currently proposed arrangements are inadequate to be considered acceptable.
- The proposed One Way Right of Way is longer than 40 metres and is supported with traffic signals in order to avoid vehicle to vehicle encounters on the 3m width of the Right of Way. Such provision is considered essential given the steep gradient and inadequate intervisibility on the ramp. The use of traffic signals is acceptable subject to relevant conditions of consent. The current location of the traffic signal and passing bays at the base of driveway access ramp is not ideal. While the light at the top of the driveway is located on the drivers side of the

vehicle for entering the ramp, the light at the base of the ramp is located on the passenger side, where it will be less obvious. Also, the locations where exiting vehicles would wait to Give Way to the entering vehicles must be shown on the plans, for subsequent marking on-site to ensure that waiting vehicles do not impede passing of an entering vehicle. Vehicles stopping to give way should be doing so from within the property not on the Council nature strip. Moreover, swept paths must be plotted for the situations where an entering vehicle would have to go around the propped exiting vehicle within the site.

- On page 12 of the architectural plans, the location of the passing bay is shown inappropriately on the exiting vehicle side and external to the property. The passing bay(s) for the egressing vehicle must be shown at the base of the access ramp and for the ingressing vehicle at the top of the ramp and internal to the property. This will require further driveway widening at the top of the ramp. These bays must be located clear of the swept path of a passing B99 vehicle.
- A sight line assessment must be provided to show that there is adequate sight distance for exiting vehicles in accordance with AS 2890.1:2003.
- It is noted that the top of the ramp is non compliant with the transition at the top of the ramp exceeding 5% across the property boundary. This means that sightlines for egressing traffic to pedestrians and traffic will be constrained however as this is existing and grades cannot realistically be further eased, it is acceptable subject to additional widening at the top to allow for a passing bay internal to the property.
- A ground clearance plot must be provided along all of the ramp long sections and cross sections of the accessway to demonstrate that scraping of the B85 vehicle does not occur.
- It is noted that traffic generation has been assessed in accordance with RMS Guide to Traffic Generating developments (2013), which estimates that the development will generate 3 vehicle trips per hour during the peak periods. This is an increase of 2vtph compared to the existing situation. The traffic generation of 2 vehicle trips per hour is considered minor however will increase movements to and from the driveway across the footpath area and, as such sightlines must be demonstrated to be adequate.
- The traffic report provides no information about the loading activities associated with the removalist vehicles and or how visitors will be accommodated. Given the steep gradients on the driveway ramp, its narrow width length and constrained turning ability at its base, coupled with the absence of any legal kerbside parking it is unclear how visitors, removalists and deliveries will be accommodated. Given the absence of kerbside parking appropriate parking/turning areas should be provided on site to cater for such activity.
- In addition, kerbside collection of waste would be occurring however there is concern about safety for residents wheeling bins up the steep single width driveway to the street frontage and the potential for encounters with entering vehicles. No information on how this safety concern will be addressed has been provided.
- **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.