

Submission re TP440

I write to provide feedback regarding the proposed Development Plan.

The Plan describes the internal road network as “a shared space that prioritises pedestrian and cycling travel over vehicles” (p. 28). It is inconceivable that a narrow 5.5 metre tarmac can safely combine 570 resident vehicle trips per day plus visiting cars, trucks, waste removal services, delivery vehicles, pedestrians (including those who may be mobility impaired or parents pushing strollers or prams) and cyclists. It is incompatible with Clause 56 and clearly fails the Decision Guidelines 5.0 of DPO5, which require orderly traffic management and provision of pedestrian ways.

The Plan describes a “pedestrian and cycling network” linking to the surrounding neighbourhood. What parent would encourage their child to walk or cycle their way to school via a narrow roadway that is “shared” with cars and trucks? How can an Owner’s Corporation enforce the assumed “low speeds” on what is considered a private road? It is a recipe for tragedy.

The traffic report supplied by Traffix Group is inaccurate, and subjectively selective in determining when planning provisions should be observed or disregarded. It reaches conclusions unsupported by data or meaningful research as to the actual conditions in the surrounding road network. The report fails to identify and consider the realities of the traffic flow in the area.

Golf Rd, Cameron Ave, Delia Ave, Beryl Ave, Riley St and Bakers Rd are key thoroughfares for traffic carrying over 1500 students from South Oakleigh College and Oakleigh South Primary School. One parked car in Beryl Ave prevents safe passage for two-way traffic causing traffic bottlenecks and significant delays for hundreds of students and parents at peak times. It is imperative any development of the site eliminates the risk of overflow parking into the surrounding streets to enable unimpeded road access to these schools.

Excessive traffic volume on Golf Rd during morning peak periods causes vehicles to bank up from the North Rd traffic lights many hundreds of metres (usually to Alleford St). The estimated additional 174 future resident vehicles will further aggravate this condition. Vehicles attempting to safely enter Golf Rd from the proposed entry/exit point will encounter not only pedestrians and bicycles sharing their internal roadway, but will have to give way to over 750 vehicles using Golf Rd between 8.00 am and 9.00 am on a school morning (one every 5 seconds) and stationary traffic banking back from the school crossing just a few metres to the south.

As the site is not within reasonable walking distance to a shopping centre, high employment zone or railway station, it can be expected that vehicle ownership rates will exceed the statutory ratios prescribed by Clause 52. The 733 bus service that runs every half an hour, and not at all after 10.00 pm, will not be viewed as a viable alternative to car ownership for many residents.

The adjoining 3-storey walk-up dwellings in the centre of the site are characterised by a 4.5 metre lot width, lack of internal storage space and ground-floor levels dominated by tandem garages, which are smaller than the required size. Manoeuvring standard-size vehicles in and out of a single-car width garage via a 5.5 metre laneway with two-way traffic flow and garages both sides will be impractical.

The combination of high vehicle ownership rates, inadequately sized tandem garages and access lanes, lack of internal storage and negligible on-street parking will inevitably lead to demand for overflow parking that is incompatible with the surrounding road network.

In addition to traffic concerns, Clause 55 Standard B14 requires driveway crossovers not exceed 40 per cent of the street frontage for lots less than 20 metres in width and requires that not more than one single-width crossover should be provided for each dwelling fronting a street. The dwellings adjacent to Metropolitan Golf Course, fronting North Lane and some fronting South Lane do not meet the objectives of the standard.

We therefore submit the proposed Development Plan fails to meet the required standards of amenity or urban design envisaged by the DPO5 and the Planning Scheme, to the detriment of both existing and future residents of Oakleigh South.

Yours faithfully

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Address: