COUNCIL RFI RESPONSE

346-350 Macaulay Road, North Melbourne (TP-2019-526)

REF: V169391

DATE: 4 December 2019

UAG Group
c/- SJB Planning
Level 1, 80 Dorcas Street
SOUTHBANK VIC 3006

Attention: Ms Kate Foldi (Associate)

Dear Kate

RE: 346-350 MACAULAY ROAD, NORTH MELBOURNE

Introduction

A Planning Application (TP-2019-526) was submitted to Melbourne City Council for a proposed mixed-use development comprising 426 residential apartments and 376sqm of food and drink / shop tenancies on the ground floor level, located at 346-350 Macaulay Road in Kensington.

Upon review of the abovementioned planning submission, Council issued a Request for Further Information (RFI) letter, including comments specifically from Council's Traffic Department (email dated 7 October 2019), to seek further information and clarify a number of preliminary concerns.

The following document has been prepared in response to the comments from Council's traffic engineering department and should be read in conjunction with GTA's Transport Impact Assessment Report (dated 28 June 2019), as well as the updated development plans that have been prepared by Hayball (Revision 18, dated 07/11/19)

Each of the relevant Council comments/concerns have been reproduced below with GTA's comments/responses provided thereafter.

Council's Traffic Engineering Team Comments (dated 7 October 2019)

- *"No details are shown on the plans of boom gates/other security measures at the main driveway. Any security (boom gates, intercom, roller door etc) should be included on the plans. This must be located so that entry movements are not delayed, resulting in queue back onto Stubbs St. To ensure entering vehicles don't stop in the street & obstruct pedestrians/bicycles/traffic while waiting for the carpark entry door to open, the door should either be offset by 6m from the site boundary or be left open during peak periods & closed off-peak."*

It is acknowledged that the specific location of the security gate was not been clearly shown on the plans submitted to Council.

This detail has subsequently been included in the revised set of plans and is sufficiently set back from the footpath and carriageway to avoid any queuing that may occur during peak periods. The security gate location also allows vehicles to stop and prop on level ground while waiting for the gate to open, both entering and exiting the site.

- *"The 2x2.5m pedestrian visibility splay has an obstruction within the triangle area (corner of Building D). This corner should be redesigned to remove obstruction from the splay**, as the driveway will have frequent exit movements, conflicting with pedestrians."*

VIC | NSW | QLD | SA | WA
Level 25, 55 Collins Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000
PO Box 24055
t// +613 9851 9600
ABN 34 137 610 381
www.gta.com.au

The pedestrian visibility splay is partially obstructed by the building, however is considered to be acceptable in this instance. The splay is unobstructed for the full 2.0m along the site frontage and approximately the first 1m into the site, which adheres to the Planning Scheme requirement for 50% of the splay area to be visually unobstructed.

Importantly, at 6.5m wall-to-wall width, the accessway is oversized above the standard required minimum driveway width, which means that users existing the site will have an improved sightline angle to pedestrians on the footpath when compared to a regular 6.1m wide accessway that the visibility splay is typically applied to.

Furthermore, due to the flood level requirements, the access ramp is required to firstly travel upwards on entry to the site, then down into the basement. Therefore, exiting vehicles are on a gentle downgrade towards the site access point, which also helps to improve sightlines when compared to a ramp sloping upwards towards the exit point.

On the basis of the above, the pedestrian visibility splay is considered to be acceptable.

- *"One accessible space is provided for retail uses. The location of the space off the main access aisle to the carpark is inappropriate. The space should be relocated closer to Building A lifts, with appropriate signage. The car space in the north-east corner of BL3 (P4x) should be removed as the aisle extension is too small to allow for vehicle manoeuvring (page 14 of TIA)."*

The parking space for people with disabilities has been relocated closer to the Building A lift area, as requested by Council.

Contrary to the comments contained within our original TIA report, upon further review the space in the north-east corner of basement level 3 is in fact not a dead-end aisle and therefore does not require an aisle extension. The approach area to the ramp is available for manoeuvring, which is oversized at 8.5m wide.

The above amendments are considered to be sufficient for access to this space.

- *"To ensure right turning vehicles entering/exiting the site don't delay traffic/bicycles, a permit condition should specify that access into & egress from the site must be restricted to a left in/left out arrangement. This may require the installation of No Right Turn signs, double white lines & other measures**, to be fully funded by the developer."*

Any impacts from delays associated with a right turn exit will be contained internal to the site and not likely to affect vehicle, cyclist or pedestrian movements on Stubbs Street.

Based on the anticipated traffic generation and distributions, up to 24 right turn entry movements are expected in the PM peak hour. On average, this equates to approximately 1 vehicle movement every 2.5 minutes. When considering the site access location approximately 75m from the signalised intersection with Macaulay Road, there will be a significant amount of bunching/platooning in the traffic flows travelling northbound. As such, it is expected that there should be ample opportunities for a vehicle to turn right into the site, while the signals are running an east-west green phase for Macaulay Road, therefore unlikely to create any significant blocking of southbound traffic on Stubbs Street.

Additionally, given the alignment of Stubbs Street, there are no sight distance concerns for approaching vehicles/cyclists/pedestrians in either direction.

With consideration to the above, the proposed arrangement with full turning movements at the site access is considered to be acceptable in this instance for both capacity and safety reasons.

- *"To ensure entering/exiting vehicles give way to bicycles, a standard green bicycle treatment must be installed within the bicycle lane in Stubbs St in the vicinity of the access point, at the developer's expense**."*

This can be incorporated as part of the site access works by way of an appropriately worded condition of permit.

- *"While TIA states there are 20 publicly accessible spaces within the pedestrian links at ground level (GL), the plans should show where the spaces are located. As visitors are unlikely to park in the secure areas in the basement, the number of conveniently located publicly available spaces at GL should be increased**."*

There are 20 spaces shown on the plans at ground level, spread across three different locations within the internal pedestrian links. These spaces are in the form of 10 bicycle hoops and are located to the south-western corner of the site.

These spaces are considered to be appropriately accessible for visitors to the precinct.

- *"TIA states that bicycle spaces can be accessed via the vehicle ramp & any users not comfortable riding on a 1:5 grade ramp can use the lifts to move between GL & BL1. However, access to some buildings includes steps & it is inconvenient to use platform lifts at these entries. More convenient access for cyclists should be provided between the GL & BL1**. The design/dimensions of bicycle parking should comply with the relevant Australian Standards or Bicycle Network guidelines."*

The majority of cyclists are expected to be able to negotiate the 1:5 driveway grade to access the secure basement bicycle parking areas.

However, as noted in the TIA, there are lifts that can be used by any cyclists that are unable to negotiate the vehicle ramp. It is critical to note that there are indeed access route options to all of these lift lobbies at ground level that do not require the use of stairs, as per standard DDA access arrangements to a building lobby.

- *"As 545 car spaces are proposed, at least 11 motorcycle spaces should be provided."*

This has been accommodated within the amended design with 11 motorcycle parking spaces added as requested by Council. These have been designed 1.2m wide x 2.5m long, in accordance with the Australian Standard.

- *"The design of the loading area, including all space dimensions, grades & height clearances, should comply with relevant standards for Commercial Vehicles (AS2890.2-2002)**. Pedestrian site triangles of 2x2.5m should be provided at the exit from the loading bay. A Loading Management Plan (LMP) should be prepared, specifying how the access/egress of loading vehicles is to be managed. The loading bay should be designed as per Clause 52.07."*

The height clearances and grades of the loading area comply with AS2890.2:2018, as noted in the TIA report.

Pedestrian visibility splays at the loading dock are not considered to be necessary in this instance. The loading bay is set back into the building away from the main alignment of the shared laneway area (due to the required manoeuvring space). Therefore, pedestrians are expected to be walking further to the east in line with the steps and pathway along the western boundary line. Visibility splays are only necessary where pedestrians are walking along hard up against the walls adjacent to the loading dock, similar to the site boundary adjacent to a driveway.

A loading management plan can be prepared as a condition of permit.

Clause 52.07 of the Melbourne Planning Scheme is obsolete and no longer exists. However, the loading bay area is intended to be flexible in terms of the vehicle parking location, given that there are two adjacent compactors to be collected. Therefore, no specific service bay has been delineated. However, an 8.8m Medium Rigid Vehicle is able to be mostly contained within the service area and will not impede activities outside the loading area (as shown in the swept path assessment).

- *"Retail loading & move-in/out activities will occur from the loading area at the south-west corner of the site, accessed from Macaulay Rd. Such activities associated with 426 apartments will be frequent. While Sec 4.1 of TIA states such activities will be "relatively infrequent", Sec 5.2 states "there will be a relatively high demand for resident move-in/move-out loading requirements". Trucks accessing this area will have to manoeuvre across the north-south pedestrian link along the western site boundary. The mixing of pedestrians/trucks at the south-west corner of the site is unacceptable, particularly as many residents are visually impaired. A separated pedestrian path must be provided (i.e. not through the truck manoeuvring area) connecting to Macaulay Rd."*

It is acknowledged that the wording within the TIA may not have been clear. The Section 4.1 text was suggesting that loading activities will be relatively infrequent when compared to typical loading demands at other facilities, such as a supermarket or retail outlet. Whereas Section 5.2 was referring to the residential move-in/move-out activities being relatively frequent when compared to other smaller sized residential developments. Notwithstanding, move-in/move-out activities for a development of this size is commonly managed through bookings with an Owners Corporation to ensure that the area is operated appropriately and in an orderly manner.

Noting the above, it is not considered necessary to create a separated pedestrian walkway and vehicle accessway is this location. Waste collection is understood to only occur approximately 2 times per week for both the residential and commercial/retail components (total of 4 collections per week).

Any deliveries associated with the small retail tenancies are not expected to create a significant demand for use of the loading dock area and residential move-in/move-out will be managed through a booking process which generally has up to two bookings per day if necessary. With this minimal level of activity, the amount of waste collection and loading vehicle movements in this area per day is considered to be acceptable.

Furthermore, the area is proposed to operate as a shared laneway area where pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles (loading vehicles only) will mix together in a low speed environment. This is similar operation to a number of laneways within the City of Melbourne which are activated for pedestrians and also provide an access route for deliveries to restaurants, waste collection, etc. Should Council continue to have any concerns in respect to the design, then signage (advising approaching pedestrians of the loading area) and linemarking/pavement treatments could be implemented as a condition of permit.

Having regard to the above, the current shared use arrangement is considered to be acceptable and a separated pedestrian path is not considered to be a better outcome in this instance.

- *"It appears move-in/out activities will involve trucks accessing the loading area, goods then being moved to BL1 via goods lift, moved through BL1 to the appropriate building lift & then moved to appropriate floor. The applicant should confirm that this is the proposal & that this is feasible (moving goods through BL1, including across main accessway of the building). If a different route for such activities is proposed, an appropriate route between moving vans & entry to each building without stairs must be provided to each building**."*

The route outlined in Council's above comments is the intended arrangement for residents to move furniture in/out of the building to/from the provided loading area. This arrangement does not require the use of any stairs to access the lift cores of each building and allows residents to move furniture through the basement level 1 car park, which is considered to be a low vehicle movement area, particularly outside of peak periods. Should residents prefer to move furniture through the site at ground level instead of taking it down through the basement, they have the option to also use the outdoor stairs along the pedestrian laneway on the western boundary to access the internal walkways to all other building lobbies.

These arrangements are considered to be sufficient for residential move-in/move-out activities, noting that all activities can be contained on-site.

- *"In order to meet the likely demand, at least 1 car share & electric charging space should be provided on-site."*

The Applicant is not seeking to provide a car share space within the development itself. However, it is considered more appropriate to convert one of the existing kerbside parking spaces along the site frontage to Stubbs Street to a car share space, where it can be utilised by the residents of the development as well as the surrounding neighbourhood. This would be subject to a car share provider expressing interest in placing a car in this location.

Additionally, the updated plans include electric vehicle charging capabilities for two of the visitor spaces within the basement parking level, so that the EV charging isn't allocated to a specific resident who may not necessarily own an electric car. It is also understood that at this stage electrical infrastructure is intended to be run to a number of the resident car parking spaces to allow conversion of these spaces to EV charging should it become necessary in the future.

- *"The TIA estimate of 0.15 veh/dwelling/hour in the AM/PM peaks is too low. A rate of 0.3 veh/space should be used, equating to 164 veh/hr. While the volume of generated traffic is relatively high, the impact on the surrounding road network is likely to be acceptable at most times."*

The adopted traffic generation rate has been based on surveyed traffic generation rates from recently constructed developments in locations such as Abbotsford, Southbank, South Yarra, Caulfield and Clayton. In all of these cases, the adopted traffic generation rates for the original TIA reports were in the order of 0.3-0.4 vph/dwelling, while the actual realised traffic generation rates once operational were an average of 0.15 vph/dwelling following post development surveys being undertaken.

This indicates that to adopt a traffic generation rate of 0.3 vph/dwelling as suggested by Council would be an overly conservative approach having regard to actual data from comparable locations (and not anticipated demand) and therefore the proposed rate of 0.15 vph/dwelling is considered to be appropriate.

GTA can provide further information in respect to the surveyed traffic generation rates in similar locations to Council if required.

- *"A formal independent desktop Road Safety Audit of the proposed development should be undertaken prior to construction, at the developer's expense, which should include the vehicular/bicycle/pedestrian access arrangements, loading arrangements & internal circulation/layout. The findings of the Audit should be incorporated into the detailed design, at the developer's expense"*

A road safety audit can be completed as a condition of permit.

Conclusion

I trust the responses contained within this letter provide sufficient clarification on the items that have been raised by Council's traffic team. Naturally, should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact Andy Harmer or me on (03) 9851 9600.

Yours sincerely
GTA CONSULTANTS

Chris Greenland
Associate Director