



2 March 2015
Ref 14365

Department of Planning and Infrastructure
23-33 Bridge Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Attn: Mr Simon Truong

Dear Simon,

**PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT
23-37 LINDFIELD AVENUE, LINDFIELD
TRAFFIC AND PARKING MATTERS**

I refer to your letter dated 14 January 2015 and to Council's submission dated 19 December 2014 concerning the abovementioned development proposal. The following advice is provided in response to the traffic and parking-related matters raised in Schedule 1 of your letter and by Council's submission.

Schedule 1

As you are probably aware, No's 39 and 41 Lindfield Avenue have recently been acquired by *Aqualand*. Consideration is therefore being given to increasing the area occupied by the lower ground floor level which would allow an increased number of retail parking spaces to be provided within the development.

The acquisition of the additional properties has allowed the vehicular access arrangements to be simplified, thereby enabling all of the retail parking spaces to be incorporated within the area controlled by boomgates to prevent all day commuter parking. This arrangement has also allowed the number of *small* car parking spaces to be reduced.

It is confirmed that the revised basement car parking layout is fully compliant with the geometric design layout requirements specified in the Standards Australia publication *Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-Street Car Parking AS2890.1 – 2004*.

Council's Submission

It is agreed that the bicycle parking located adjacent to the wall on Basement 3 should be relocated to reduce the potential for being impacted by manoeuvring vehicles. This is reflected on the revised plans.

Council's reference to *Clause 2.5.2(c)* of *AS2890.1 - 2004* seems to be suggesting that provision should be made for two large vehicles to pass each other at ramp junctions whilst travelling in opposite directions.

However, the ramp width and aisle width dimensions provided at grid reference F2 on Basement 1 and a grid reference F2 and G6 on Basement Level 2 are consistent with the dimensions provided on the previously approved plans.

Those dimensions comply with (and exceed) the ramp width and aisle width dimensions specified in AS2890.1 – 2004.

Whilst provision of for two vehicles to pass at ramp junctions is considered to be appropriate in busy *public* car parking areas such as shopping centres where delays may cause intolerable congestion, it is *not* necessary in *private* car parking areas. This is consistent with *Clause 2.5.2(c)* of AS2890.1 – 2004 which states the following:

“(c) Intersections - Intersections between circulation roadways and ramps, and with parking aisles shall be designed so that both the approach roadways and the intersection area are wide enough to accommodate turning vehicles and there is adequate intersection sight distance.

Intersection areas designed for use by one vehicle at a time shall be designed for use by the B99 vehicle. Areas in which it is necessary for two vehicles to pass one another shall be designed for a B85 vehicle to pass a B99 vehicle.”

In this instance, access to the *private* car park will be restricted to retail staff, residents and their visitors, and traffic activity will be minimal.

It is noted in this regard that the *private* basement car parking area is expected to generate approximately 35 vph, whereas the *public* car parking area located on the lower ground floor level is expected to generate in the order of 90 vph.

It is noted also that Council did not raise this issue in its previous submissions when considering the original plans which were subsequently approved by the Department.

In the circumstances, it is considered that the previously approved ramp width and aisle width dimensions should be retained unchanged.

As noted in Council’s comments, the increased traffic generation potential of the MOD2 development is minimal when compared with the previously approved development, and equates to only 1 additional vehicle movement every two to three minutes during peak hours.

Whilst the recommendations of Council’s area-wide traffic study of the Lindfield Town Centre have merit, the additional traffic flows expected to be generated by the MOD2 development do not warrant implementation of any special traffic management measures other than those already included in Council’s *Section 94 Contribution Scheme*.

In addition, the applicant is *opposed* to any proposal which would result in removal of the pedestrian activated traffic signals away from the station entrance in Lindfield Avenue. Relocation of the pedestrian signals to Tryon Road would disrupt the major pedestrian desire line for pedestrians accessing the eastern side of Lindfield Railway Station, and would most likely result in pedestrians crossing Lindfield Avenue in an uncontrolled manner in between buses stop at the bus zone opposite Kochia Lane.

Please do not hesitate to contact me on telephone 9904 3224 should you have any enquiries.

Yours sincerely



Robert Varga
Director
Varga Traffic Planning Pty Ltd