

28 November 2017

Metier Planning

Our ref: TBC -PL  
Your ref:

Attn: Claire Gregg

Dear Claire

### **Proposed Container Coffee Shop (108-112 High Street) – Parking/Traffic Comments**

I have reviewed the proposal and details as requested for the above proposed development, and noted City of Launceston (CoL) technical and planning officer comments for further information from a traffic perspective

Briefly I note the following points which are probably of relevance to this development:

1. The proposal is not a “drive-through” establishment, with the definition of drive-through being a facility where customers are served without leaving their vehicle. This is not the case here, where the step up to service area and related offset means that people would be unable to be physically served from their vehicle. Current models for similar businesses at other sites including those by same developer/operator (Riverside, Scamander) have been personally inspected and are not drive-through establishments according to the definition. The RTA document “Guide to Traffic Generating Developments” notes “Drive-through establishments” being designated specifically as McDonalds and KFC restaurants where customers are served from their vehicles, and in which case queuing of vehicles is needed to be provided for. This development does not compare to this type of establishment, and is clearly not offering a drive-through service.
2. In terms of parking numbers, with brief reference to the revised plans and your notes relating to the current and proposed uses of the site, I conclude that on the above basis for a café/coffee shop which is not drive-through and has a net floor area of 14m<sup>2</sup>, only one dedicated parking space appears required for the development itself to meet the Acceptable Solution. I also concur that 6 spaces appear warranted under the planning scheme for the greater site (based on the floor areas and current/proposed uses per planning scheme which you have noted).
3. In terms of traffic safety, I note the following general comments:
  - a. Current site uses appear anecdotally to operate satisfactorily (crash statistics have been requested from DSG to check any specifics)
  - b. Based on brief review of sight distances for both accesses as per plan, these appear to comply with planning scheme requirements for SISD, exceeding requirements.
  - c. Perceived issues noted from Council/Representors/Others about parking on footpath in this area, vehicle speeds, and signage on footpath, are all existing issues for the area around the site and which are not specifically related to this development. Any illegal parking, speeding etc. simply requires enforcement (Tas Police and others). Delineation of footpath area/bollards/fencing/signage etc. may also assist with any parking issues on footpath.

- d. There may be a perceived local issue noted with the nearby junction of Wentworth St and Lawrence vale Road with regard to traffic safety, noting that this is a separate issue from the development based on existing Council infrastructure and the development proposed is unlikely to impact significantly on this junction and safety based on the small traffic volumes generated in comparison to the overall vehicle numbers likely to be using High Street (*it is noted that the Coffee Shop itself is likely to capture passing traffic trade rather than be a destination in its own right, due to the competition from coffee shops across the Launceston area. In this sense traffic generation arising from the development specifically is predicted to be at the low end*). Issues at this Lawrence Vale-Wentworth junction are a wider issue which may require Council attention in future based on Council priorities, and suggestions for possible improvement if required may include limiting certain turning movements (i.e. removing right turn options from side streets). This is a separate issue for CoL and is not considered specifically related to this development, which is likely to have limited impact on the current junction operation or traffic safety.

The above advice is provided in general terms and is not a formal TIA. I could undertake further works as required to look at any further specifics Council may require at this time, please let me know if any outstanding items are noted by CoL

Yours faithfully  
IPD Consulting Pty Ltd

**Andrew Howell**  
**Civil Engineer**