



**Cardno
Eppell Olsen**

PLANS AND DOCUMENTS
referred to in the ULDA
APPROVAL dated 23/12/11

Cardno (Qld) Pty Ltd
Trading as Cardno Eppell Olsen
ABN 57 051 074 992

Transportation and Traffic Specialists

Level 11 Green Square North Tower
515 St Paul's Terrace, Fortitude Valley QLD 4006
Locked Bag 4006, Fortitude Valley QLD 4006

Phone: 07 3310 2401

Fax: 07 3369 9722

transportqld@cardno.com.au

www.cardno.com.au/eo

Our Ref: CEB06200:BAM/JJM

Date: 30 June 2011

DESIGN NOTE

STOCKLAND ULDA APPLICATION NO. (DEV2010/94), TRAFFIC RESPONSE TO ULDA RFI

Introduction

This Design Note has been prepared to provide a response to the Request for Further Information (RFI) issued by the Urban Land Development Authority (ULDA) via its letters dated 18 January 2011 and 20 December 2010. Whilst those letters deal with matters covering a number of disciplines, only the traffic and transport related matters are addressed herein.

Since the issuing of the ULDA letters a number of modifications to the proposed development plan have been made, in order to address some of those items. The latest development plan is plan reference 104527-55, revision C, dated 17 June 2011, prepared by RPS.

The development which is the subject of this application is the initial stage of future development within the land holding of Stockland in this location. Given the low existing base traffic volumes (less than 2,000vpd on Grampian Drive near the subject site) combined with the relatively low traffic generation expected from this initial development stage (less than 2,000vpd) it is expected that the proposed development will not have any significant impact on the external road network. For that reason a detailed traffic capacity/operational assessment is not considered necessary.

It is important to recognise that longer term planning proposes a Neighbourhood Centre on Lot 9999 (Stage 5). The indicative traffic estimate above makes consideration for this to the extent that the Neighbourhood Centre is not expected to generate any significant traffic volumes from outside the immediate local area. On the basis of the latter, only a nominal traffic generation (approximately 500vpd) is considered appropriate for the Neighbourhood Centre.

In addition, it is understood that the Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR) is in the process of undertaking detailed traffic modelling for the Ripley Valley Master Plan area. This modelling would be the appropriate tool from which to base any traffic capacity assessment of the road network adjacent to this development.

For the reasons outlined above, the assessment documented herein does not address external traffic issues, but does address the internal traffic and transport issues as raised by ULDA.

For ease of reference, the various item numbers used by ULDA under the heading of "Traffic" in the ULDA letter dated 20 December 2010 are also used below.

Item (a) – Roundabout on South Deebling Creek Road (now Grampian Drive)

The initial plan of development showed two proposed roundabouts adjacent to lots 38, 75, 98 and 9999 (northern intersection) and lots 134 and 9999 (southern intersection). Note that some lot numbers have changed in the revised plan.

Lot 9999 is being considered as a future mixed use Neighbourhood Centre. On this basis, it is agreed that one of the previously proposed roundabouts (the southern intersection) should instead be a signalised intersection, primarily to facilitate a high standard pedestrian crossing between the Neighbourhood Centre and the adjacent residential catchment.

In the interim (before the Neighbourhood Centre occurs), this intersection may suffice as an unsignalised T-junction. In its ultimate signalised form, this intersection will need to provide a U-turn facility and appropriate phasing to ensure safe access to local streets which will be operating with left-in/left-out configurations. During initial stages of construction, a temporary turnaround will be constructed immediately south east of this intersection. This will enable buses and refuse collection vehicles (RCVs) to turn around at this location. Future stages will have to ensure appropriate mobility for buses and refuse collection vehicles is maintained.

Summary: Agreed. Will ultimately be a signalised intersection to service future development/uses to be undertaken over Proposed Lot 9999.

Item (b) – Left In/Left Out Intersections on South Deebling Creek Road (now Grampian Drive)

The spacing of the left-in/left-out intersections is considered reasonable and does not create an issue with the Suburban Link. As these intersections only represent low volumes of local residential traffic which is flowing in one direction, potential conflicts are low. The approximate spacing of 70m gives adequate sight distance and is appropriate for the volume of traffic expected on both roads. Keeping these accesses open is also consistent with the Ripley Valley objective of having a connected and permeable network of streets.

In addition, creating culs-de-sac at these locations contradicts the ULDA's "Residential 30 Guidelines to deliver diversity in new neighbourhood development" which recommends minimising culs-de-sac.

Summary: Not agreed. Existing layout is appropriate.

Item (c) – Stub Road to East

The Ipswich Planning Scheme, Figure 15-10 Thoroughfare Hierarchy Plan shows the east-west stub road as a Suburban Link (see extract). According to Appendix B of Council's draft 'Traditional Neighbourhood Design Code' this can be provided with or without a median, requiring a reserve width of 24.5 to 29.5m. Whilst the initial plan proposed a 31.5m wide road reserve at this location, this is proposed to be changed to a 24.5m wide road reserve on the basis that there will be no property access (or frontage properties) along this section (100 – 200m) where the road crosses the creek.

Summary: Not agreed. Proposed road reserve is consistent with Planning Scheme.



Item (d) – Bus Stops on South Deebling Creek Road (now Grampian Drive)

The provision of bus stops is proposed to the immediate south east of the southern (signalised) intersection. In the interim, if bus services are provided, the buses will use the temporary turnaround at this location.

In the later development stages when this roadway is fully constructed, it is not proposed that the bus bays be indented bays. The proposed street cross section is to provide on road parking lanes that can be converted to bus bays in the necessary locations. This is supported by principles outlined in Complete Streets. Complete Streets states, "It is acknowledged however that bus bays are not often preferred for operational reasons, as they remove buses from general traffic flow and may result in delays to buses trying to re-enter moving traffic" and "generally indented bays are only suitable for mixed and main streets, but would not be essential in any street".

Summary: Not agreed. Bus stops will be provided in an alternative location and bus bays will be in kerbside lane, not as indented bays.

Item (e) – Local Road Link to the North

It is understood that cultural heritage matters constrain the land to the north, such that a road link as suggested by the ULDA would be difficult to achieve. In traffic terms, such a road link is not considered to be essential and therefore no such link is proposed.

Summary: Not agreed, this is not an essential traffic element and is constrained by other matters.

Item (f) – Local Street Adjacent to Lots 85 and 115 (now lots 77 and 104)

Connection of the local streets adjacent to Lots 85 and 115 (now shown as lots 77 and 104) at this location would create a long straight street that may encourage higher speeds. This route would also have the potential to act as a rat-run route, affecting the proposed hierarchy of streets and increasing traffic on the local streets. It is believed that providing a pedestrian link in this location satisfies connectivity requirements whilst not prioritising vehicle movements.

Summary: Not agreed. Existing layout achieves connectivity without compromising amenity and safety.

Item (h) – T-Joint Adjacent to Lots 1 and 2

Summary: Accepted, the T-joint will be reconfigured into a cul-de-sac arrangement.

Item (i) – Deflected T-Intersections Adjacent to Lots 64 and 65 (now lots 58 and 59)

It is recognised that the deflected T-intersection is not necessary therefore it has been removed. It is noted that if a local street connection was provided as per Item (f) above, traffic calming possibly in the form of a deflected T-intersection would be required along this stretch of street.

Summary: Accepted, the deflected T-intersection has been removed.

Item (j) – Conceptual Design Drawings of South Deebling Creek Road (now Grampian Drive)

This issue is to be addressed by the Civil Design consultants.

Item (k) – Traffic Impact Assessment

This issue is discussed in the Introduction section above.

Translink Matters

Our response to the various matters raised under the heading of Translink are as follows:

- bus indent bays – it is not intended to provide indented bus bays as the proposed street sections for bus routes will provide kerbside parking lanes that can accommodate bus bays;
- bus turnarounds – it is accepted that throughout the various stages of development, bus turnarounds will need to be provided. The location identified by Translink is considered appropriate when development reaches that stage;
- indent bay and intersection closure – at the location marked X in the Translink correspondence, a left in/left out arrangement is proposed and recommended (as per Item (b) above). Indented bus bays and closure of this intersection are not recommended as discussed elsewhere herein. Pedestrian access will be provided at this intersection in any case;
- it is agreed that discussions need to occur between Translink, ULDA and the applicant regarding how to operate initial public transport services in this area.