

## Traffic Engineer Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	Mod2020/0374
<b>Date:</b>	23/09/2020
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 1 DP 550328 , 7 Mona Street MONA VALE NSW 2103

### Officer comments

The proposal is unacceptable as it does not meet the minimum sight lines for pedestrian safety. AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking facilities - Off-street car parking, requires that the visibility from a point on the driveway 2.5m from the property boundary to pedestrians 2m from the edge of the driveway along the frontage footpath, be clear of obstructions.

The access driveway to No.7 Mona Street is located approximately 30m south of the marked pedestrian crossing which provides a safe crossing point between the eastern side of Mona Street and Pittwater High School. Winnererremy Bay is located to the east of Pittwater High School, with facilities including picnic and barbecue area, café, playground, public toilets and parking area. Pedestrian volumes along Mona Street are high due to its proximity to the School and recreational areas, especially during the peak morning and afternoon periods before and after School hours.

It should be noted that Development Engineering also raised concerns regarding the amendment of the front fence to a solid 1.8 metre wall, which impedes the sight distance from vehicles exiting the parking spaces on the site.

The original approved DA2019/1209 - Additions of Fencing and Carport to Existing Dwelling, proposed a front fencing at 1.65m high with 50% of fencing to be timber painted slat screen allowing for partial visibility through front fence. There does not appear to be any referral of this DA to the Traffic section for comment, and no objections were raised from Development Engineering at that time regarding safety or sight lines. This DA would also not have met the minimum sight lines for pedestrian safety in accordance with AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Parking facilities - Off-street car parking.

The original Statement of Environmental Effects attempts to address the non-compliances to Section D9.12 Fences - General of the Pittwater21 DCP, however my opinion is that the proposed variations permitted under the DCP were not satisfied and should not be approved. Front and side fences (within the front building setback) shall otherwise not exceed a maximum height of 1m above existing ground level, and are to be constructed of open, see-through, dark-coloured materials.

Firstly it is debatable whether the main private open space is in front of the dwelling, or the site is located on a main road with high traffic noise. However, it is clear that at least half of the other criteria are not met, in particular:

- setback a minimum of one metre for any fence higher than one metre (in the case of corner lots or lots with more than one frontage this setback may be varied based on merits); and
- provide a 45 degree splay (or equivalent) either side of any vehicular entrance, minimum dimensions of 2.5 metres by 2 metres; and
- 50% or more of the fence is transparent.

The existing access driveway fronting Mona Street is a standard 3.5m wide and widens to approximately 4.5m at the property boundary which provides off-street parking for 2 vehicles. Vehicles must enter and exit the property in opposite directions as there is insufficient room for a turning area on the property. The driveway at the kerb should in fact be widened to 4.5m due to the parking arrangement.

The modification to the original approved consent further compromises the sight lines for pedestrian safety with the increased in fence height to 1.8m, and any measures previously provided for consideration of a variation have been removed by providing a solid wall.

The proposal is therefore unacceptable, however taking into account that the existing footpath is setback from the property boundary, existing concerns regarding sightlines could be addressed by increasing the sight triangle so that no permanent structure is a minimum 1m from the edge of the driveway at the property boundary. It is also recommended that the driveway be widened to 4.5m at the kerb to improve access to the off-street parking area.

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.