

Annexure to submission by Bonny Hills Progress Association (24/04/08)

**Analysis of staffing levels and traffic impact assessment in Development Application
for Bonny Hills Aged Care Facility**

Staffing levels

Currently these are stated to be 16 on site at once (morning shifts) in Table 2 Section 3.2 on P 11.

A comparative facility in this area that has 86 high care beds has the following staffing levels and people movements:

- Morning shift commencing from 7am to 8.30am finishing 3.30 to 5pm
 - 16 Nursing Staff
 - 3 Senior Nursing Staff : DON (Director of Nursing / Acting DON and a Clinical Nurse Specialist
 - 3 Cleaning Staff
 - 5 Kitchen
 - 1 Laundry
 - 2 Administration
 - 2 Maintenance / Garden
 - 2 Activity Staff
 - 1 to 2 Medical Staff Visiting on average
 - **Total of 35 staff :**

This is double the estimate in the DA

- This reduces for the **evening shift** by 50 % to **17** (3.30 to 11pm) and then down to **5 on the night shift** 11pm to 7am

- Additional to this there is
 - an average to 15 to 25 visitors per day in the morning and 10 to 15 in the evening
 - Tradespersons daily
 - Sales persons daily
 - Couriers daily
 - Taxi 5 times residents only:

So compared to an 86 bed facility there appears to be an underreporting of activity at this facility and traffic and parking will be a real issue.

Comments on the traffic data in the report:

While the general approach used seems reasonable there is reason for considerable concern about inconsistencies in and accuracy of the data used.

6.3.3 - Traffic report

- Access is off Ocean Drive just south of McGilvray Rd to 24 car parking spaces and one ambulance station plus the front entrance to the facility.
- Access is off the SW end of John Phillip Drive for service vehicles – via McGilvray Rd, Ngamba Place, and Bundarra Way

The impacts of the **Carnegie Cove** integrated retirement village is considered (p2):

- A total of 293 villas and town houses plus supporting facilities to be built over three stages (*Note: as proposed, but only Stage 1 approved to date*)
- Access for this facility will be off Ocean Drive into McGilvray Rd via a new roundabout on Ocean Drive (*Note: staff will need to confirm the current status of traffic planning in Bonny Hills*)
- An estimate of 4538 vehicles per day (vpd) utilising McGilvray Rd to access this development was reported by Masson Wilson and Twiney in a separate traffic report (p2).
- This equates to 190 vph if averaged over 24 hours or if you assume the majority will occur over a 12 hour period the average over this time could be more like 300vph, or 5vpm.
- If correct this dwarfs estimates for the aged care facility, but as noted there are questions about which data to believe.

Ocean Drive traffic counts:

- An RTA count 1.8 km south of the Houston Mitchell turnoff in 2004 averaged 6094 vpd
- On one day **only** – 16 August 2007 – the consultants made counts at am and pm peaks and from this estimated 5460 vpd [assuming that peak is 10% of total daily flow]. The raw data in the Table given on p14 are not easy to follow.
- Despite this figure being lower than the 2004 estimate, and being based on only a one day sample; and also given that [as they say from an examination of the RTA web site] they estimated average annual traffic growth rates have been about 6.9% over the previous 6 years, they use their lower figure as the basis for subsequent calculations.
- If the 2004 RTA figure is updated to 2007 using the 7% annual growth rate that the consultants consider to be conservative [given the area 14 development coming on stream as well] a figure of 7565 vpd is obtained – which is 38% higher than the consultants' estimate in 2007.
- In Table 2 on p6 they derive estimates of traffic flows on Ocean Drive in 2007, 2012 and 2017 based on the lower 5460 starting point, and using an average annual growth rate that seems to be about 6.2% [not sure why as earlier they

- conclude that 7% would be conservative]. To these they add the Carnegie Cove estimates [cannot verify the 2012 number but the 2017 figure used of 3438 is 1100 lower than to the figure quoted by the consultants for the ultimate Carnegie Cove development] to come up with totals of 5460, 9090 and 11955 respectively.
- If one uses the updated RTA number of 7565 [given above] as the starting point, and the 4538 number the consultants provided for Carnegie Cove, and the annual growth rate of 7% obtained from RTA data, then the 2017 number can be calculated to be 19420 – 62% higher, so a fair discrepancy.

Note that so far none of this relates directly to the Aged Care facility itself, but what it does set up is the background traffic flow projections upon which this development will impact.

- The consultants calculate that the Aged Care facility will generate an additional 140 vehicle trips per day [using 1 to 2 trips per dwelling per day and 70?! [their number] dwellings as the basis for this calculation]. In the conclusions on p13 they use a figure of 4 vph in one direction and compare this to current flows on Ocean Drive of 270 vph in one direction. They also quote forecasts for Carnegie Cove of 9 vph in one direction.
- It is unclear how these vph numbers were derived but they seem very low relative to the previously presented data, and to more realistic estimates of staff and people movements as above. And it can be expected that there will be peaks in these flows and there is no discussion of the likely coincidence of these peaks with the peak flows currently on Ocean Drive.

Assessment of traffic impacts (p7):

- Ocean Drive is currently described as operating at a “LOS” (level of service) A – described as – ‘Free flow whereby drivers are virtually unaffected by others in the traffic stream and can choose their own travel speeds’ – there would be commuters who would question this now.
- Even with the addition of the Carnegie Cove development the consultants maintain that LOS A will hold. It is difficult to see how given the numbers they provide for the various LOS categories in Table 3, p7. Using the most conservative number they provide of 760 for peak hourly flow for LOS A: if current peak is 546 as they estimated on p4 in 2007 and the Carnegie Cove peak is estimated at 10% of total [their stated assumption on p4] equating to 453 or 344 depending on which estimate you choose [see above] – then the peak derived is 890 or 999 taking it up to LOS B or C respectively. In which case additional traffic flows from any other development will have relatively greater impacts. [LOS C is described as ‘Stable flow with drivers restricted to select desired speed and ability to maneuver’].
- As or more importantly could be impediments to traffic flows immediately adjacent to the facility and the possible impacts of additional parking in the vicinity on Ocean Drive. The consultants express some concerns about the former and the need to talk further to council, particularly in relation to the length of the splitter islands that will come off the roundabout and the possibility that they will

restrict direct access to the facility off Ocean Road. Council staff are requested by BHPA to check this aspect of planning very carefully.

- Sight distances are stated to be good in both directions [this could be impacted by the proposed roundabout]
- Note that there is additional comment on access in section 2.4 p 9 and 5.4 p17. Here there is mention of a possible need to modify the end of John Phillip Drive and that council has it on its plans to eventually extend it to join up with Ngamba Place. In this event it would go right across the current development and the consultants recommend that discussions be held with council to dissuade them from this course of action.

Parking facilities:

- Parking is dealt with in separate sections viz 4.2 on p13, 4.11 on p16.
- There are to be 24 places for small vehicles and an ambulance station at the front of the facility adjacent to Ocean Drive.
- Turn around space for service vehicles at the rear of the facility is stated to be adequate
- There is no mention of where a proposed minibus is to be stationed.
- According to the consultants the number of parking spaces is well provided for relative to the number 'required' in the relevant state planning guidelines.
- 1 space is provided per 2 employees on duty at any one time and
- 1 space per 10 [or 15 if only patients with dementia] dwellings.
- The estimate of a total of 16 staff seems incredibly low as indicated above
- Underestimation here is probably the biggest single cause for concern. If these figures are closer to the reality then there is cause to believe that there will be considerable overflow of parking into adjacent streets particularly during visiting hours and at peak times.

Conclusion: There is a definite need to clarify which numbers to believe.

**Bonny Hills Progress Association
24/04/08**