



Queensland Treasury

SARA reference: 2008-18279 SRA
Council reference: A005505645

9 November 2020

CB (Qld) Pty Ltd ACN 639 514 060
C/- Sinclair Planning Pty Ltd
PO Box 130
LUTWYCHE QLD 4030
leisa.sinclair@sinclairplanning.com.au

Attention: Ms Leisa Sinclair

Dear Ms Sinclair,

SARA advice notice – 63, 65a, 67 and 69 Macgregor Terrace, Bardon

(Advice notice given under section 35 of the Development Assessment Rules)

The State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA) advises that your development application has not adequately demonstrated compliance with the State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP).

SARA has reviewed the information you provided in your response of 23 October 2020 to SARA's information request. As discussed, the following issues with the proposed development application have been identified:

Performance Outcome 16 – Access to a State-controlled road

1.	<p>Issue:</p> <p>The response to information request stated that the proposed driveway has been widened to a 9m wide (hybrid type B1/B2) standard driveway to allow for simultaneous traffic movements through the access. The submitted swept path diagrams, prepared by Cardno, do not demonstrate that a Heavy Reticulated Vehicle (HRV) can safely manoeuvre through the access whilst facilitating simultaneous traffic movements within the access. Furthermore, the swept path diagrams show that an HRV turning left out of the site to Macgregor Terrace would utilise the entire width of the 9m driveway, as well as crossing over the road centre line.</p> <p>It is required that the access driveway be redesigned to a suitable standard which provides safe, efficient and simultaneous traffic movements for all design vehicles, so as to comply with Performance Outcome (PO) 16 of State Code 1: Development in a State-controlled road environment (State Code 1) of SDAP.</p>
----	--

	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO16 of State Code 1, the following information should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> revised plans detailing a redesign of the proposed driveway that is suitable in providing simultaneous traffic movements for all expected vehicles (previous information request suggested a 12m wide Type C2 driveway be investigated). revised swept path diagrams detailing that an HRV can safely manoeuvre and exit the access when a vehicle is queued at the access waiting to exit (ensuing no hazard impact).
2.	<p><u>Issue:</u></p> <p>It is proposed that the vehicle access on Macgregor Terrace would utilise line marking and signage to limit access to the subject site via left-in / right-in / left-out operations, with restriction of right turn exiting movements. Line marking and signage alone has a low compliance level and a physical barrier would be required on Macgregor Terrace to enforce any restrictions to right turns.</p> <p>There is concern that due to the high vehicle frequency, historic and well documented crash history and limited sight distance along Macgregor Terrace, right turn movements into the subject site would be problematic for the safety and efficiency of the State-controlled road network. This is particularly the case when the proposed development for a shopping centre will intensify the use on the subject site with additional generated traffic.</p> <p>To comply with PO16 of State Code 1, further justification is required to explain how the proposed arrangement is the most suitable option to managing safety and efficiency impacts on the State-controlled road network. SARA maintains a strong position that right turns into and out of the proposed access should be avoided. Furthermore, the proposal should propose other suitable alternatives, such as a left-in/left out access arrangement or by creating a signalised intersection.</p> <p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO16 of State Code 1, the following information should be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further justification how the proposed access arrangement for left-in / right-in / left-out with linemarking and signage will not result in queuing, delay and safety impacts on the State-controlled road (with consideration to expected traffic generated by the proposed shopping centre). The arrangement should be updated to include physical barriers to enforce restrictions to right exit turns; and Update plans detailing the linemarking, location and design of signage and physical barriers proposed to support the access arrangement; or Revaluate the access arrangement to either of the following, as recommended by SARA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a signal-controlled vehicle access, which incorporates and replaces the existing mid-block pedestrian crossing facility; or a left-in / left-out access (with physical measures to prevent right turns).
Performance Outcome 20 – Safety and efficiency of the State-controlled road	

3.	<p><u>Issue:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate that the development will comply with PO20 of State Code 1, all potential impacts to the State-controlled road network should be adequately identified.</p> <p>The predicted traffic generation of the existing uses (as identified in the submitted Traffic Assessment Response, prepared by Cardno) is not accepted. The existing buildings comprise a series of separate tenancies ranging in size from 30m² GFA to 600m² Gross Floor Area (GFA). The tenancies accommodate a mix of uses including food and drink, shop, indoor sport and recreation, health care services and office uses, typical of the subject site's neighborhood centre zoning. The existing use is not considered representative of a shopping centre. Therefore, the existing traffic conditions on site is not accurately represented.</p> <p>Despite having a lower GFA, the proposed supermarket is expected to result in a significant intensification of turn movements at the site access on Macgregor Terrace. Accordingly, the traffic generation of the existing use should be estimated by either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • undertaking weekday and weekend peak hour traffic surveys at the existing site accesses and adjusting the results for any un-tenanted use; and • applying industry standard trip rates to each of the occupied component uses. <p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO20 of State Code 1 the TIA prepared by Cardno should be revised to include a SIDRA intersection analysis. The SIDRA analysis should be undertaken for the weekday morning, weekday evening and weekend peak hours for the design year peak hour (10 years after opening year). The SIDRA analysis should also determine that the form and design of the proposed access to Macgregor Terrace will operate with sufficient capacity, to avoid impacting the safety and efficiency of the State-controlled road network.</p>
4.	<p><u>Issue:</u></p> <p>As explained in the previous information request, a Road Safety Assessment (RSA) in accordance with the Department of Transport and Main Roads' Guide to Traffic Impact Assessment (GTIA) is necessary. The RSA will facilitate an understanding of the safety and efficiency impacts the development could potentially impose on the State-controlled road network, so as to enable assessment of the application against PO20 of State Code 1.</p> <p>It has not been effectively demonstrated that the proposed development would reduce traffic impacts on the State-controlled road network over existing conditions. Conversely, the development proposal has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on the safety of the state-controlled road given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the traffic volumes on this section of Macgregor Terrace, which are about 2,000vph during the network peak hours • the expected traffic generation of the proposed development (i.e. approximately 250 vehicles per hour based on industry standard rates for supermarket use) • the crash history on this section of Macgregor Terrace, with a significant number of crashes in close proximity to the subject site (with a number related to the operation of the existing access driveways) • the currently proposed form and design of the site access • the lack of any existing (or currently proposed) turn treatments at the site access, particularly for vehicles turning right into the subject site.

	<p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO20 of State Code 1, the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), prepared by Cardno should be revised to include a safety impact assessment. The TIA, completed by a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ) and in accordance with the GTIA. The safety impact assessment should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the design of the driveway and the ability to safely accommodate vehicles simultaneously entering and exiting the subject development • the potential for angle and rear-end crashes associated with vehicles turning into and out of the subject development • the requirement to ban any turn movements at the site access • the need for any turn treatments on Macgregor Terrace at the site access.
5.	<p><u>Issue:</u></p> <p>Further information is required to demonstrate compliance with PO20 of State Code 1 and to explain how the proposed development will not adversely impact the safety and efficiency of the State-controlled road network.</p> <p>Whilst the development would generate a proportion of undiverted drop-in trips (i.e. trips that already form part of the existing flows on the road network), the new trips generated by the development would be expected to result in a significant (i.e. greater than 5%) number of additional turn volumes at other intersections on the State-controlled road network including the Macgregor Road / Simpsons Road signal-controlled intersection.</p> <p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO20 of State Code 1, the TIA prepared by Cardno should include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An intersection delay assessment at all intersections where the development traffic exceeds 5% of base traffic movements in the weekday peak periods; and • Details of any mitigation measures proposed to address traffic impacts on the State-controlled road network by the proposed development. Any mitigation measures must be prepared in accordance with the Department of Transport and Main Roads' Road Planning and Design Manual.

Performance Outcome 18 – Impacts to Public Passenger Transport

6.	<p><u>Issue:</u></p> <p>Further information is required to demonstrate compliance with Performance Outcome (PO) 18 of State Code 1 of SDAP, ensuring that Public Passenger Transport Services are not adversely impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>The TIA (prepared by Cardno in response to SARA's information request) does not adequately demonstrate that the relocated bus stop 'MacGregor Terrace at Bardon, stop 15, Bardon (Hastus ID: 001357) will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be adequately separated from the signalised pedestrian crossing in accordance with the <i>Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Road Rules) Regulation 2009</i> • be designed in accordance with the Public Transport Infrastructure Manual and Brisbane City Council requirements • avoid conflicts with constraints such as power poles, street trees, drainage, on-street car parking and the like • conflict with the on-street car parking on a curve to the immediate west of the bus
----	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> zone when buses queue and manoeuvre into the bus stop provide adequate sightlines for bus drivers to enter and exit the stop. <p>Action:</p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with PO18 of State Code 1, provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An RPEQ certified safety assessment demonstrating that bus drivers will have adequate sightlines to safely enter and exit the relocated bus stop. If the sightlines are not adequate, the applicant will need to revise the location of the relocated bus stop to ensure it is safe or propose necessary changes or safety controls to the roadway to overcome the issues. A layout plan for the relocated bus stop clearly demonstrating the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provision for the set down of a single unit rigid bus of 14.5m in length (27m bus bay and 10m departure length) in accordance with Section 5.6.3.1 – ‘Bus stop length requirements’ and ‘Table 5.7: Minimum bus stop length requirements’ of Chapter 5 – ‘Bus stop infrastructure’ of the <i>Public Transport Infrastructure Manual 2015</i>; the relocated bus bay setback a minimum of 10m from the stop line at the signalised pedestrian crossing in MacGregor Terrace in accordance with the <i>Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Road Rules) Regulation 2009</i>. In this instance, the 10m departure length of the bus zone could comprise the 10m separation; access and hardstand in accordance with ‘Intermediate Stop – Site Layout – Without Indented Bus Bay’ - DRG 5-0021 in Appendix 5B of the <i>Public Transport Infrastructure Manual 2015</i>; all bus stop components shown (seats under awning, J-pole, blade sign, tactiles) for an Intermediate Stop in accordance with Section 5.7 – ‘Bus stop components’ of Chapter 5 – ‘Bus stop infrastructure’ of the <i>Public Transport Infrastructure Manual 2015</i> and relevant Brisbane City Council standards; the rear and front doors of a parked bus in the bus zone will be clear of obstructions including landscaping, drainage, power poles, street furniture and the like. This should be demonstrated for single unit rigid buses of 12.5 m in length and 14.5m in length in accordance with ‘Table 5.6: Estimated Door Positions’ of Chapter 5 – ‘Bus stop infrastructure’ of the <i>Public Transport Infrastructure Manual 2015</i>; and remove the on-street carparking between the bus zone and the driveway at 81 Macgregor Terrace to ensure the safety and efficiency of the relocated bus stop. No standing line marking and signage should be provided. <p><i>Note:</i> The Department of Transport and Main Roads’ TransLink <i>Public Transport Infrastructure Manual 2015</i> is available at: http://translink.com.au/about-translink/reports-and-publications.</p>
--	---

Please note that unlike an information request, **assessment timeframes do not stop** when advice is provided by SARA.

How to respond

It is recommended that you address these issues promptly and provide a response to SARA. If you decide not to respond, your application will be assessed and decided based on the information provided to date.

Under the [Development Assessment Rules](#) (DA Rules), the issuing of advice does not stop the assessment timeframes. If you intend to provide additional information, it should be provided in a timely manner to allow sufficient time for the information to be considered. As such, you are strongly encouraged to consider using the 'stop the clock' provisions under s32 of the DA rules, to allow sufficient time for you to consider and respond to SARA's advice; and for SARA to consider any new or changed material provided.

If you wish to utilise the 'stop the clock' provisions, you should give notice to the assessing authority (assessment manager or referral agency) whose current period you wish to stop. This can be done through MyDAS2 or via correspondence.

You are requested to upload your response and complete the relevant tasks in [MyDAS2](#).

If you require further information or have any questions about the above, please contact Tyler Josephson, Planning Officer, on (07) 3452 6814 or via email BrisbaneSARA@dsdmip.qld.gov.au who will be pleased to assist.

Yours sincerely,



Darren Brewer
Planning Manager - SARA Brisbane Region

cc Brisbane City Council, dalodgement@brisbane.qld.gov.au

Development details	
Description:	Development permit Material Change of Use for centre activities (shopping centre)
SARA role:	referral agency
SARA trigger:	Schedule 10, Part 9, Division 4, Subdivision 2, Table 4, Item 1 (Planning Regulation 2017) Material Change of Use on premises within 25 metres of a State-controlled road.
SARA reference:	2008-18279 SRA
Assessment criteria:	State Code 1 of SDAP, version 2.6.