

Ref: 0818r02v01

8/05/2025

Harrington Dee Why Pty Ltd c/-Platform Architects 2/40 East Esplanade Manly NSW 2095

Attention: Julia Stockwell

RE: 154 – 158 PACIFIC PARADE, DEE WHY (DA 2025 / 0024)

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHOP TOP HOUSING

INCLUDING STRATA SUBDIVISION LETTER OF RESPONSE TO COUNCIL

Dear Julia,

We refer to recent correspondence regarding the abovementioned development (the Proposal) and the Development Application, DA 2025 / 0024, which is currently under assessment by Northern Beaches Council (Council).

A Request for Information (RFI) has been issued by Council with a number of traffic and parking comments to be clarified within the following documents:

- RFI Letter issued by Council's Principal Planner (Development Assessment) dated 11 April 2025. Refer to Attachment 1.
- Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report (Panel Report) dated 27 February 2025. Refer to Attachment 2.

Given the comprehensiveness of Council's comments, the entirety of the comment has not been reproduced below. Rather, a response has been provided underneath each relevant sub-heading (highlighted) where a response is considered to be required. Reference should be made to the abovementioned attachments for context.

TRAFFIC & PARKING COMMENTS WITHIN THE COUNCIL RFI LETTER

Access

The following design amendments to the architectural drawings, included as **Attachment 3**, have been undertaken:

- The proposed roller door is now set back six metres from the property boundary, into the site.
- Commercially available car lifts now include traffic signals to manage entering and exiting vehicles. The architectural drawings now indicate traffic signals on Ground Floor, at the access, and within the basement levels. It is noted that the location of the traffic signals would be subject to change once a car lift supplier is appointed (during the Construction Certificate stage) to provide further input into the design.



- The width of the vehicle access, at the property boundary, has been widened by 0.3 metres to the north, to ensure there is sufficient clearance between a waiting inbound vehicle and adjacent kerb. Revised swept path analysis has been undertaken with the results included as **Attachment 4** confirming satisfactory entry and exit movements and vehicle passing.
- The visual splay triangle on the egress side of the driveway, at the property boundary, does not provide the entire unobstructed clearance noting a slender column will be located within it. And so, filtered sightlines will be provided that an exiting driver and pedestrian would still see each other along the footpath. Nevertheless, to improve sightlines at the access, a convex mirror as shown in the architectural drawings.

With regard to the preparation of an Operational Management Plan (OMP) of the proposed car lift, at this stage, the car lift supplier has not been appointed and accordingly, the exact details of its operation, induction process, maintenance etc is not known. It is considered more appropriate that such a document would be prepared post-DA approval and imposed as a condition to be satisfied prior to Construction Certificate (CC) or Occupation Certificate (OC).

We invite Council to impose a suitable condition of consent for the OMP of the car lift to be prepared prior to the issue of any relevant CC or OC and approved by either Council or Private Certifying Authority (PCA).

Parking

It is considered that due to the requirement for the use of a car lift to travel between basement levels, that the basement be wholly utilised by residents only. Residents would be provided with an induction on how to operate the car lift by the supplier.

Allocation of car parking to any persons related to the non-residential component of the development may cause issues as they would not know how to operate the car lift system. This may cause conflict on The Strand as motorists not knowing how to operate the car lift and unable to proceed into the basement, would now have to reverse back out onto the road.

The reasons above, it is considered acceptable that the basement car parking be wholly designated for the residential component of the development and all non-residential car parking demand be accommodated on-street.

Regarding the Basement 1 layout, there was indeed a drawing error, and this has now been rectified by the architect.

Service and Loading

The project team acknowledges the requirements for a Loading Zone to be installed along The Strand and between the hours of 6 am - 2 pm, Monday to Friday. We invite Council to impose a suitable condition of consent for a Signage Plan to be prepared prior to CC and issued to Council for approval by the Northern Beaches Local Traffic Committee.



TRAFFIC & PARKING COMMENTS WITHIN THE PANEL REPORT

Access, Vehicular Movement and Car Parking

A two-lane, two-way vehicle access driveway is proposed to ensure that a waiting bay can be accommodated on-site. This is to ensure that in the event that an inbound vehicle arrives to the site and at the same time an outbound vehicle is operating the car lift to leave the basement, the inbound vehicle is capable of wholly standing within the site until the car lift is clear for use. These arrangements would allow for the exiting vehicle to pass an inbound vehicle (waiting at the access) as demonstrated by the swept path analysis with the results included in **Attachment 4**. If the above scenario were to occur without an on-site waiting bay, at the access, the inbound vehicle would have to wait on-street and affect the traffic flow along The Strand. Such traffic impacts on The Strand would not be acceptable to Council.

Additionally, with reference to the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021* (TISEPP), the following is noted:

2.119 Development with frontage to classified road

- (1) The objectives of this section are—
 - (a) to ensure that new development does not compromise the effective and ongoing operation and function of classified roads, and
 - (b) to prevent or reduce the potential impact of traffic noise and vehicle emission on development adjacent to classified roads.
- (2) The consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that—
 - (a) where practicable and safe, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road, and
 - (b) the safety, efficiency and ongoing operation of the classified road will not be adversely affected by the development as a result of—
 - (i) the design of the vehicular access to the land, or
 - (ii) the emission of smoke or dust from the development, or
 - (iii) the nature, volume or frequency of vehicles using the classified road to gain access to the land, and
- (c) the development is of a type that is not sensitive to traffic noise or vehicle emissions, or is appropriately located and designed, or includes measures, to ameliorate potential traffic noise or vehicle emissions within the site of the development arising from the adjacent classified road.

Griffin Road is a classified regional road (Secondary Road 2102) and accordingly, Clause 2.119(2)(a) of the TISEPP requires the vehicle access of the proposed development to be provided on the lower-order road, being The Strand (a local road). By providing access onto The Strand, the proposed development achieves the objectives outlined in Clause 2.119(1) of the TISEPP.



We trust the above satisfactorily addresses the traffic and parking comments outlined in the Council RFI Letter dated 11 April 2025 and the Panel Report dated 27 February 2025.

Please contact the undersigned should you have any queries or require anything further.

Yours sincerely,

Julius Boncato

Senior Traffic Engineer, PDC Consultants

Email: jboncato@pdcconsultants.com.au

- 1) Council RFI Letter dated 11 April 2025
- 2) Panel Report dated 27 February 2025
- 3) Amended Architectural Drawings
- 4) Swept Path Analysis Drawings







