

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2024/0190
Proposed Development:	Demolition works and construction of a residential flat building
Date:	27/05/2024
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 2 SP 57603 , 2 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 2 SP 57603 , 2 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 4 SP 57603 , 4 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 4 SP 57603 , 4 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 1 SP 57603 , 1 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 1 SP 57603 , 1 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 3 SP 57603 , 3 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 3 SP 57603 , 3 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot CP SP 57603 , 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103

Officer comments

Proposal description: Proposed demolition works and construction of Residential Flat Building at 32 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale

- The traffic team has reviewed the following documents:
- Plans (Master set) – Revision A, designed by Walsh Architects, dated 19/01/2024.
- Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Genesis Traffic, dated 23 February 2024 (Reference No. GT24001)
- The *Statement of Environmental Effects* prepared by Boston Blyth Fleming Town Planners, dated February 2024

Comments

- It is noted that the proposed development is for a Residential Flat Building consisting of 6 x 3-bedroom dwellings served by 14 parking spaces.
- Vehicular access is provided off Golf Avenue, via a new double width driveway.
- The development is required to provide 12 residential parking spaces (2 per dwelling) and 2 visitor spaces (one for each 3 units). Accessible parking is not required as only 3 of spaces are required to be accessible (0.42 of a space) and there is no requirement for adaptable parking spaces to be provided for the proposed silver level development.
- The traffic report states that the access driveway width is 5.8 metres and has 300mm kerb on both sides. However, these dimensions are not annotated on the plans. Furthermore, a two-

way crossover is minimum 5.5metres wide between kerbs as per AS 2890.1:2004 clause 2.5.2 i.e. the total width of the driveway is 6.1metres (5.5m + 2x300mm) if the ramp is bordered by kerbs on either side in excess of 150m in height. The above is to be clarified and the relevant dimensions must be shown on the plans.

- On the ground floor, RL, ramp widths, lengths and grades must be shown.
- It is noted that driveway longitudinal sections have been provided along with ground clearances checked for B85 and B99 vehicles. The longitudinal section 1 shows transition grade of 14% at 1.929 metres from the boundary and transition of 15% at the bottom of 25% ramp. Similarly, the longitudinal section 2 shows transition grade of 17.5% at 1.758 metres from the boundary and transition of 15% at the bottom of 25% ramp. Although no scraping is apparent on the ground clearance checks, these ramp transitions are not compliant with AS2890.1 Clause 2.5.3 and should be amended for compliance.
- Traffic report on page 16 states, "the proposed ramp is substandard as the grade of first 6m of the ramp exceeds 5% (12.5%)". The applicant's traffic consultant then justifies this steeper grade by saying that the the footpath gradient is flat so the driver will have adequate sight lines. The Australian Standard only allows a gradient steeper than 5% within the property where the driveway slopes down to street level. In this case the driveway slopes up to street level and, as the Golf Avenue footpath is well used by pedestrians carries high volumes of traffic and having high levels of parking activity, it is considered that there a significant reasons to require compliance with the standard. The driveway grades approaching the property boundary should be designed for compliance with the standard i.e sloping at no more than 5% for the first 6m inside the property.
- It is noted that there are RLs and grades provided in the basement level, although no RL is provided on ground floor. There is a note on the ground floor driveway that states, "driveway to basement as per Civil Engineer's drawing". However, it is noted that some RLs do not match on the Civil and Architectural plans. Consistent plans showing the same RLs must be provided.
- It is noted that a sight triangle is shown on the exit side of the driveway in the architectural plan. The dimensions of this sight triangle must be annotated on the plans. The sight triangle must be clear of any visibility obstructions in accordance with AS2890.1: 2004. Furthermore, the location of sight triangle in the driveway as shown in the architectural plan is not correct. The sight triangle should be placed along the edge of the driveway wall/kerb.
- It is noted that the Traffic report mentions loading and deliveries activities are to be carried out on on-street using the kerbside parking. Given the small size of proposed development and the development being only residential development, this provision is acceptable.
- It is noted that the traffic report states that a minimum of 45m of SSD is achieved for sight distance. A sight distance diagram is also provided in Attachment 2, page 29. However, the distance of 45m is not shown in the diagram. Hence, a complete diagram must be presented.
- The passing swept paths at the entry must be updated to show B99 entering and B85 exiting. Furthermore, the proposed driveway width and wings must be shown in order to see if the vehicle manoeuvres are accommodated within the driveway.
- It is noted that swept paths are provided for some of the parking spaces. It is required that a swept path plot be provided for a B85 vehicle entering and exiting the first parking space east of the ramp, as this is a critically located space.
- A car turntable is provided in the northeast corner to assist with access to/from the four residential parking spaces located in the northeast corner. Swept paths are shown to demonstrate forwards entry and exit. The swept path plots for the vehicle entering the space in the north eastern corner should be replotted to show a continuous path of travel avoiding the break in the manoeuvre and avoiding encroachment into the adjacent parking space.
- the plans do not show any bicycle parking spaces. The Pittwater DCP requires one secure bicycle rack for each 3 dwellings. The development therefore requires at least 2 bicycle parking spaces. These should be shown on the plans

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.