

23rd March 2026

Opal HealthCare, c/o
Ben Carmody
Midson Group Pty Ltd
Suite 7,
33 Alexandra Street,
Hunters Hill NSW 2110

Dear Ben,

ptc. are of the understanding that a number of submissions came in during the public exhibition of the S4.55 scheme proposed for the site known as Opal St Ives, located at 285, 287, 287A, 289, 293, 295 Mona Vale Road and 1 Flinders Avenue, St Ives (herein known as “the site”).

These have been responded to below.

1. Public Submission 15

“Opal has continued to mislead with traffic reports and ‘cherry picking’ information for example referring to ‘peak hour traffic movements’ knowing full well that the busy morning shift changeover of this facility will occur primarily before 7am morning peak hour. This facility will operate 24/7 and will have three overlapping shifts resulting in constant driveway traffic when this is added to visitors to site and all service providers.”

The Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared for the development provides details relating to the peak periods on the public road network. These were identified as 07:15-08:15 and 16:00-17:00 on a weekday.

The information provided to **ptc.** which outlined the staff movements throughout the day (which form the bulk of the trip generation of the site), indicates that there are only a limited portion of the staff who would arrive and depart from the site during the network peak periods. It is the network peak periods in which the site is likely to have the most impact, if any, to the road network.

Shift handover period is expected to take place over a period of approximately one hour, which, if occurring three times throughout the day, would equate to 12.5% of the total hours in said day. This does not equate to “constant” vehicle movements. Furthermore, the nature of the three daily shifts could be expected to result in a lessened site traffic impact to the surrounding road network, as traffic would likely travel outside of network peak hours. Visitor and service vehicle traffic is a lower proportion when compared to staff, and as such is not anticipated to be of significant concern.

2. Public Submission 16

“Opal now also claims that with the extra proposed parking spaces it will encourage its staff to park under the building instead of parking on local streets and then claims that they anticipate only half of the parking spaces will be used in peak periods. How do they know this? And why add more spaces if this is so? I assume there is potential for each car space to be used by more than 1 user over a 24hr period as shifts change. Each would generate two car trips each. It is interesting how Opal is trying to imply that this won't affect the number of driveway trips when the facility operates 24/7 and will have three overlapping shifts with anticipated 60 staff + during each of the peak day shifts alone - before visitors and deliveries to site. A bit of simple maths can tell you the potential total 'in & out' driveway trips will be closer to 300+ per day with staff, visitors and services to site if not more, 7 days per week.”

Information provided by Opal HealthCare states that a shift handover between staff is expected to occur. During this short period of time (circa one hour), there would be an increased number of staff on the site (those finishing a shift, and those commencing). The intent of the parking provision is to allow for as many staff as possible to park within the basement car park.

When those staff at the beginning of their shift arrive to the site, those staff at the end of their shift will be occupying car parking spaces. The vacant spaces, which are there as a result of the proposed extra parking provision, are available for the arriving staff to use. The staff at the end of their shift would then leave, likely over a period of time within the handover period, rather than all at once instance, and those parking spaces would then remain vacant until such time as the next shift staff arrive to site.

Without the proposed additional parking spaces to achieve the above, it is likely that more staff would make use of street parking.

Our traffic assessment for both the approved SSDA and the S4.55 focuses on the vehicle movements to and from the road network during the network peak hours, and are based on the proposed development yield. In contrast to the high volume of traffic along Mona Vale Road, the development traffic is not expected to be significant and not anticipated to create any detriment to the operation of the road network.

3. Public Submission 26

“The traffic volume estimation used in the original proposal was flawed and has been extended to the modification. Opal itself claims it will encourage its staff to park in the building (as a benefit instead of parking on the street). It then claims that only half of the parking spaces will be used in peak. This is an artificial and completely misleading measure. This facility operates 24/7 and will have three shifts. The morning shift will fill the car park with little doubt, entailing 63 inbound vehicles. The shift change is at 7am. The PM shift, which is smaller will also be exiting at this time. This is the equivalent of a local road being placed on the boundary of 283 MVR where none previously existed. 2-3 movements per day used to occur on the existing boundary driveway. This driveway will also carry a mini-bus operating regularly plus multiple daily waste vehicle movements (14 tonnes per week) – all up an incline from the subterranean car park. The sleight of hand is to consider the additional movement along the existing street (+1.3 per cent), not to consider the actual change, which is to create a new corridor into the carpark, with a new corner into and out of the carpark. The increase from the existing use of the driveway on the boundary to 0 movements in the peak and up to 3 a day, to a minimum a likely 63 movements at shift change at 7am is substantial. 7 days a week. This is a disingenuous misdirect that the Commissioner should consider egregious. It is also estimated at peak hours which are after the staff will arrive and before they will leave. This too is disingenuous and totally misleading.”

The on-site parking provision exceeds the minimum requirement under the planning controls. It is also not a guarantee that each staff member would drive a car to the site, as there are public transport options available, or the option to car pool, cycle or ride a motorcycle.

Traffic generation of the site during the network peak hours is considered, as this is the time period when the development is likely to have the most significant impact to the road network capacity and operation. The movement of staff vehicles in and out of the driveway during handover periods is likely to occur primarily outside of the network peak hours (based on information provided by Opal HealthCare) and given the driveway design can accommodate two-way traffic flow, is anticipated to occur efficiently and succinctly.

4. Public Submission 27

“There is no discussion of the impact on the high-use footpath from the new high-volume crossing. This is a footpath used by people accessing the bus-stop (it is an express service stop and is therefore highly used), a pedestrian route for multiple primary and secondary school children and a very well used dog-walking route used by many (predominantly) older people. Seasonal conditions change use. During Summer, however, the 7-7.30am usage (conflicting with Opal shift changes) is high with recreational walkers. This is also a high-frequency bus passenger time.”

The concern regarding the potential interaction between vehicle entry/exit at the site driveway and pedestrians walking along the Mona Vale Road footpath are acknowledged. To minimise risk, the driveway has been designed following AS2890. This includes provision being made for pedestrian sight splays to allow sufficient safe visibility, in combination with a down-grade ramp towards the street, which further promotes visibility between pedestrians and vehicles.

It is also noted that the development proposed a reduction in the overall quantity of driveways along the street (from 7 to 2), therefore reducing the number of potential conflict points.

5. Conclusion

Should there be any questions on the above matters, please contact the **ptc.** office.

Yours faithfully



Jake Jansen

Senior Traffic Engineer

Document Control: Prepared by JJ on 23 March 2026. Reviewed by SW on 23 March 2026.
