

Addendum Report to the Transport

Management and Accessibility (TMAP) Study
for a Concept Plan Application for a Residential Development
at 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, Ryde

Prepared on behalf of EGC Custodian Services by **TRAFFIX** traffic & transport planners ref: 10 183 March 2012

**traffix** traffic & transport planners

po box 1061
potts point nsw 1335
t: +61 2 8324 8700
f: +61 2 9380 4481
w: www.traffix.com.au
abn: 66065132961



# **Contents**

1. Introduction			1
2. Discussion of Issues			2
	2.1	Overview of Development Generation and Impacts	2
	2.2	Vehicular Access Based On RMS 'In Principle' Approval	2
	2.3	Future Access to Epping Road	4
	2.4	Vehicular Access on Local Road Network	6
	2.5	Local Area Management Study	6
	2.6	RMS Owned Land	7
	2.7	RMS Requirements for Detailed Plans for Works On The Site	7
	2.8	Site Access	7
	2.9	Construction	7
	2.10	Setbacks	7
	2.11	Acoustics	7
	2.12	Conclusions	7



# 1. Introduction

TRAFFIX was previously commissioned by EGC Custodian Services to prepare a Transport Management and Accessibility (TMAP) Study relating to a proposed Concept Plan Application on lands located at 5 Whiteside Street and 14-16 David Avenue, at North Ryde.

This report is an Addendum Report which has been prepared in support of the Preferred Project Application and deals with the matters raised in the letter from the DoPI dated 21 December 2011 (including Schedule 1 – Key Issues) and subsequent discussions with Departmental officers. This Addendum Report is based on amended plans which are intended to address these issues, which encompass those raised separately by the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) in the letter from the SRDAC dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

The following summarises how the Preferred Project Application responds to these issues, based on the amended plans and their implications for the issues as identified.



# 2. Discussion of Issues

## 2.1 Overview of Development Generation and Impacts

The TMAP was prepared on the basis of a development yield of 213 units, which gave rise to a generation of 85 veh/hr (combined entries and exits) with 85% of this traffic being in the direction of peak flow. This assumed a trip rate of 0.40 trips/unit/hr.

The amended plans now propose 182 units and the traffic generation associated with these units will reduce commensurately, from 85 veh/hr to 74 veh/hr. That is, in the AM peak there will be 14 veh/hr in and 60 veh/hr out, with these flows reversed in the PM peak. This is, by any estimation, a low level of traffic activity as a consequence of the fact that the proposed land use is a low intensity land use, close to excellent public transport services. By way of example, it is comparable to a retail development with 25 parking spaces, which typically generate 3.0 trips/space/hr.

These trips will also be split onto all available accesses and we note that the Department has sought a response in relation to several access scenarios and these are discussed below. It is emphasised that all of these scenarios assume (as shown on the amended plans) that there will be a controlled (resident only) exit driveway onto David Road, which is an outcome that was preferred by RMS in order to share the traffic burden.

It is also emphasised that the assessment was based on a worst case scenario using 0.4 trips/unit/hr, whereas the RMS Guideline would permit adoption of a rate of 0.29 veh/unit/hr. It is likely therefore that the generation will be less in practice, approaching 53 veh/hr. This is a low level of traffic activity that arguably does not warrant any changes to the existing road network. In this context, the improvements that are being pursued in relation to this application represent an optimal outcome that is an over-engineered solution that has a clear potential to improve conditions, even with the traffic generation associated with the proposed development taken into account.

# 2.2 Vehicular Access Based On RMS 'In Principle' Approval

The RMS has provided 'in principle approval based on provision of a left-in/left-out arrangement onto Epping Road from Whiteside Road, subject to the following matters being addressed. These matters, together with our response, are outlined below:

 Design of the treatment at the site access onto Whiteside Street to minimise rat-running through the site to access Epping Road.



#### Response:

The design of the access onto Whiteside Street has been further refined and is shown in Figure TX-01 in **Attachment 1**. This arrangement prohibits through traffic movement northbound along Whiteside Street beyond the site access and accordingly this overcomes this concern. The main elements associated with this arrangement include the construction of an (approx) 30 metre long section of one-way raised threshold over a portion of Whiteside Street. This raised treatment is also proposed on the opposing carriageway to serve the private access driveways opposite the site, which would retain the same level of accessibility as presently occurs, but will improved safety and amenity. The entire precinct in the vicinity of the site access would thus be improved, calmed and landscaped, while the current cul-de-sac opposite the site would effectively be retained.

The construction of a median within Whiteside Street north of the proposed site access will eliminate any possibility of traffic exiting the site and turning left into Whiteside Street. This movement is unlikely in any case as it is proposed to permit vehicles to exit the site onto David Avenue via minor exit controlled by a boom gate and for use by residents only.

 Design shall aim to address and minimise safety issues arising from the existing merge lane across Whiteside Street at Epping Road.

#### Response:

It is noted that Drawing TX-01 in Attachment 1 shows the Option 1 access arrangement from Whiteside Street onto Epping Road, comprising a merge with a single lane that is separated from through traffic on the elevated section of Epping Road by a median. This overcomes the problem of traffic using this high-level road attempting to enter Whiteside Street. An alternative arrangement, which includes a deceleration lane, is shown in Drawing TX\_02 in **Attachment 2** and is referred to as Option 2. Both options 1 and 2 are available for implementation, at the discretion of the RMS, and both overcome this concern.

It is emphasised that these options are concepts only and will need to be conditioned to require detailed design and specifications to RMS requirements, based on the RMS's preferred option (or a variation thereof).

 Design shall not preclude any current vehicle movements on Whiteside Street including garbage collection.



#### Response:

As discussed above, all access to developments on Whiteside are retained, with the added benefit of a traffic-calmed and landscaped treatment as shown in Attachments 1 and 2.

It is understood from discussions with Council's waste contractor that garbage trucks are able to traverse along Whiteside Street in a one-way southbound arrangement and that the mid-block turning area is not required for garbage collection purposes.

## 2.3 Future Access to Epping Road

It is acknowledged that the possibility exists that Epping Road may become a freeway and that this may result in the denial of all access from Epping Road at Whiteside Street, including the existing entry movement. While this is considered a low probability scenario based on discussions with RMS to date, such a proposal raises significant strategic planning issues that go well beyond the modest impacts of the subject development proposal. That is, the planning process would be the same whether or not the subject development proceeds.

Specifically, any such freeway would be the subject of exhaustive investigations and any Review of Environmental Factors (REF) prepared under the EP&A Act will require numerous options to be considered and evaluated. Such options would also be the subject of extensive community consultation. The subject development does not fundamentally alter the scope and extent of investigations that would be needed under the REF process.

It is considered unreasonable that the subject development, or indeed any modest traffic-generating development that might be proposed along the freeway corridor, should be required to consider the implications of a strategic planning initiative that has no status, no certainty and potentially far-reaching implications. For example, the removal of the existing left turn from Epping Road into Whiteside Street can be expected to result in traffic diverting onto Lane Cove Road and this is likely to significantly alter traffic patterns in the locality, which would need to be the subject of detailed investigations. It will however result in no traffic infiltration into Whiteside (in or out of Epping Road) so that conditions within the local residential precinct that includes the subject site would probably improve, even with the proposed development. However, conditions along Lane Cove Road may deteriorate. This would need to be assessed in the context of the geometry of any freeway and the connectivity of Lane Cove Road to this freeway more generally. The subject development cannot and should not be required to deal with such broad, strategic infrastructure projects, other than on a broad first-principles' approach. Notwithstanding, in our view the local road network would not be unduly disadvantaged in the event that all access to Epping Road were



to be denied, as the 53 veh/hr (RMS) or 74 veh/hr (worst case) generated by the development is likely to be offset by a broad regime of improvements that are likely to flow from a major REF that would be designed to improve arterial road capacity and hence reduce pressure on the local road network.

The only alternative access scenario to that considered in the original application that can be reasonably considered at this time is if the road network remains unchanged, with no exits from Epping Road either from Whiteside Street of the proposed development itself. Under this scenario, with the amended proposal that is now contemplated, the traffic volumes generated by the development (a maximum of 74 veh/hr) will be generally as follows:

AM Peak (14 in, 60 out)

- 14 veh/hr in via Whiteside
- 15 veh/hr out via David Avenue; and
- 45 veh/hr out via Parklands Road

PM Peak (60 in, 14 out)

- 60 veh/hr in via Whiteside
- 4 veh/hr out via David Avenue: and
- 10 veh/hr out via Parklands Road

It is evident that the main issue relates to the AM peak, with the majority of 60 veh/hr that exit the site accessing Lane Cove Road from Paul Street, Napier Crescent, Trevitt Road and Napier Road. These impacts are moderate and when distributed onto all these available routes, the additional 15 veh/hr that would occur on any one route will not significantly impact on traffic conditions at their respective intersections with Lane Cove Road. Indeed, it equates to only one additional vehicle movement every 3-4 minutes. Accordingly, the performance of intersections in the future would be similar to the analysis provided in the original TMAP report relating to existing traffic conditions.

Conditions in the PM peak would be negligible as the vast majority of traffic will enter from Epping Road. The 14 veh/hr that exit onto David Avenue and Parklands Road are clearly negligible and once again, can make use of multiple routes.



## 2.4 Vehicular Access on Local Road Network

It is noted that the RMS supports the use of David Avenue to allow access to Lane Cove Road and this was originally proposed by the applicant and deleted following community consultation. Nevertheless, the limited reliance on this access (as a controlled exits for residents under boom gate control) is considered desirable, particularly in view of the reduced development yield and associated traffic generation now proposed. Accordingly, the amended proposal reinstates this access and this is the optimal access arrangement for the site.

### 2.5 Local Area Management Study

A local area traffic management (LATM) study has been offered by the applicant in the context of the access arrangements as now proposed, with entry and exit onto Epping Road and a minor exit onto David Avenue. This is a more limited study than any strategic study that would be required in the event of a major freeway being constructed, as discussed above.

It is considered that the traffic generation associated with the amended development proposal is very moderate and only occurs in the AM peak. If there is no egress onto Epping Road, then the residential precinct to the south of the site will need to accommodate all 60 veh/hr that access the site as discussed above. If the exit is permitted as proposed and approved in principle by RMS, then this will reduce to about 40 veh/hr, with the remaining 20 veh/hr using Epping Road to access herring Road (north and south of Epping Road).

These are moderate volumes which in our view can be accommodated without improvements and in addition, do not create unacceptable environmental amenity impacts on existing residential streets. However, we are aware that there is currently northbound 'rat-running' through the residential precinct, more notably associated with vehicles using available routes to move between Lane Cove Road and Epping Road, mainly via Paul Street. There is also potentially some ratrunning between Kent Street and Lane Cove Road.

It is considered that a LATM study would be capable of recommending measures to remove or reduce these through traffic infiltration movements, to the extent that there is likely to be a net improvement in local traffic conditions within the LATM study precinct as previously defined, which is generally the area bounded by Epping Road, Lane Cove Road, Kent Road and Herring Road. Indeed, such an improvement is likely even with the traffic generated by the subject site taken into account, particularly is the exit onto Epping Road is pursued as intended.



#### 2.6 RMS Owned Land

The bus bay on Epping Road has been removed from the proposal.

## 2.7 RMS Requirements for Detailed Plans for Works On The Site

This requirement is noted and can be accommodated.

#### 2.8 Site Access

A condition requiring compliance with AS2890.1 and AS2890.2 is reasonable and is invited.

### 2.9 Construction

A condition requiring the preparation of a construction traffic management plan is reasonable and is invited. It is emphasised that this cannot be dealt with until such times as the access principles for the site generally have been established and a builder appointed.

#### 2.10 Setbacks

This is outside our area of expertise.

#### 2.11 Acoustics

This is outside our area of expertise.

#### 2.12 Conclusions

The amended Preferred Project Application plans are considered supportable on traffic planning grounds.



# Attachment 1





# Attachment 2

