

## Traffic Engineer Referral Response

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2023/1869
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Demolition works and construction of a Residential Flat Building including the consolidation of 3 lots into 1
<b>Date:</b>	19/08/2024
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 5B DP 158658 , 58 Beaconsfield Street NEWPORT NSW 2106 Lot 6 DP 1096088 , 56 Beaconsfield Street NEWPORT NSW 2106 Lot 7B DP 162021 , 54 Beaconsfield Street NEWPORT NSW 2106

### Officer comments

#### Further comments - dated July 2024

- It is noted that an amended master set has been provided dated 12/06/2024, followed by a traffic letter dated 18 June 2024.
- The amended architectural plans show some of the parking spaces are changed into single garage and double garage. The traffic letter states that the proposed garages are in accordance with AS 2890.1:2004. A swept path analysis for either P15 or P26, P21 and P17 should be provided.
- There is a shortfall of 1 visitor space due to the changes in car parking layout. The traffic letter provides justification for the shortfall. Given the close proximity to public transportation and availability of on-street parking, this shortfall of 1 visitor space is acceptable.
- It is noted that the length of 5% ramp is now 6m, which is in accordance with AS 2890.1:2004. The ramp grades shown on the plans are 5% @ 6m, 12.5% @2m, 25% @ 11.16m and 12.5% @ 2m, with RL 16.49 at the boundary and RL 13 at the basement. Calculation shows that with RL 13 in the basement, the 12.5% @2m transition cannot be correct. The grade is 7.5% instead of 12.5% or the RL is 12.9 instead of 13. If the RL is to be 12.9, then this should be updated in the architectural plans. However, if the grade is to be 7.5% instead of 12.5% then a ground clearance check must be provided for a B99 vehicle as there is concern that the grade change may be too steep and lead to scraping or bottoming.
- The door clearance of Visitor Bay 2 is within the access aisle way. Although there is less traffic, it is considered unsafe to have door opening within a traffic aisle. Hence, there should be some hatching provided around the parking space to separate the car door opening clearance and the access aisleway.
- It is noted that there is storage provided next to car parking spaces P21 and P22. The door clearances of these car parking spaces encroach within the storage area. Hence, the architectural plans should be amended to show the door clearances of P21 and P22 to be clear of the storage or any other obstruction.

The DA remains unsupported until the above mentioned information is provided.

#### Further comments - dated June 2024

- It is noted that a response in a form of traffic letter responding to the original Traffic referral comments has been provided.
- It is noted that the location of intercom has been left on the egress side of the driveway. Council accepts this provision given the proposed development is only residential development and as per the response provided by the applicant, i.e that the intercom will be used by visitors only.
- It is noted that the architectural plans now show a reoriented location of the bicycle parking spaces, which is a safer option than originally proposed. However, attachment 2 of the provided response letter still shows the old bicycle parking layout in the base plans (pages 14, 16, 17, 18, 19). In addition, dimensions of the bicycle parking spaces must be annotated on the plans. This can be conditioned.
- It is noted that a sliding door has been provided at the lobby for ease of access by cyclists. This door width must be 1.5 metres minimum, and dimension must be shown on the plans. This can be conditioned.
- It is noted that sight triangles are annotated on both sides of the driveway in the updated plans. The sight triangle is required only on the exiting side (egress side) of the driveway and is to be clear of any obstructions as per AS 2890.1:2004. It appears that part of the hydrant booster encroaches within the sight triangle. While this is not fully compliant with AS 2890.1:2004, Council accepts this encroachment given it is very minor.
- It is noted that an updated swept path analysis has been provided on page 17 which shows the exiting vehicle waiting at the bottom of the ramp to give way to the entering vehicle. A convex mirror has been provided to assist the exiting vehicles. A stop holding line must be provided at the location where the vehicles would wait to give way to mark the location. This can be conditioned.
- It was previously requested to update the long section for ground clearance to start from the centre of the road and extend to the basement. The applicant has responded advising that this will be provided at CC stage when vehicle crossover details will be available. The Traffic team accepts this response.
- It is noted that the ramp from the property boundary with a maximum of 5% slope is provided for 5m length instead of the required 6m. Although, the grade has been reduced to 4%, Council is still unable to accept non-compliance in the required length of minimum 6 metres due to the high pedestrian activity in the area as the site is in close proximity to Newport Public school, Newport hotel, close to bus stops. Hence, a compliant grade as per AS2890.1:2004 must be provided.
- It is noted that a sight line assessment showing a full length of 45 metres of Safe Sight Distance (SSD) achieved for the egressing vehicle in accordance with AS25890.1:2004 is provided. This is acceptable.
- It is noted that one accessible parking space has been provided. It is recommended that the dedicated disabled parking space and shared zone be swapped so that the shared zone is next to the lift. This ensures wheelchairs can travelling to the lift without need to traverse along the circulation aisle.

## Conclusion

There are minor non compliances that remain with minor adjustments to the plans required to ensure the plans can be supported.

## Original Comments - dated April 2024

**Proposal description:** Proposed Residential Flat Building at 54-58 Beaconsfield Street, Newport

The traffic team has reviewed the following documents:

- Plans (Master set) – Revision A, designed by PBD Architects, dated 28/11/2023.
- Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Genesis Traffic, dated 13 November 2023 (Reference No. GT23082)
- The *Statement of Environmental Effects* prepared by Boston Blyth Fleming Town Planners, dated November 2023

### Parking requirements and design

- The Pittwater DCP applies to the subject site. According to the DCP, car parking spaces should be provided at a rate of 2 spaces for each 3-bedroom units, visitor parking at a rate of 1 for each 3 dwellings, a wash bay and min 3% accessible parking spaces.
- The proposed development provides a total of 32 car parking spaces consisting of 27 residential spaces and 5 visitors spaces, including 1 wash bay and 1 accessible parking spaces. The provided number of car parking spaces meet the minimum requirements of the DCP.
- However, the submitted traffic report shows 4 disabled parking spaces on pages 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31. The total number of disabled spaces must be clarified, and consistent reports and plans must be provided. In addition, bollard should be placed in the shared zone as per AS2890.6 to ensure the shared zone remains available for loading/unloading of persons in a wheelchair. Furthermore, a height clearance of minimum 2.5m must be provided over the disabled space as required by AS2890.6 clause 2.4 This must be confirmed on the plans.
- The intercom is provided along the wall on the eastern side of the driveway. This means the entering vehicles would be driving on the right to access the intercom. The intercom must be moved to the middle where it can be accessed from the drivers side without impeding egress from the carpark . The driveway width shall be increased to accommodate a median with intercom.
- It is noted that 5 bicycle parking spaces are provided. This number satisfies the DCP requirement. However, the location of bicycle parking next to the accessway without any line of sight for the drivers would be considered as unsafe location. Hence, the bicycle parking spaces should be relocated in a safer place. All the bicycle parking spaces should be in accordance with AS2890.3:2015.
- It is understood that cyclists will use the 1:20 ramp at the lobby entry and lift B to access bicycle parking spaces, because the 1:4 ramp to basement is too steep for cyclists. The hinged door providing access to lobby B must be widened to minimum 1.5 metres to accommodate cyclists access into the lift while accessing the bicycle parking spaces. Consideration should be given to a sliding door instead of hinged door for ease of access for cyclists.
- It is noted that sight triangles are shown on the architectural plans. The dimensions of these sight triangles must be annotated. In addition, the sight triangles must be clear of any obstruction and in accordance with AS 2890.1: 2004.
- It is noted that there are four tandem parking spaces provided. These tandem spaces should be allocated to the same unit. This can be conditioned.
- It is noted that there is a car wash bay provided which complies with the DCP requirement. This car wash bay should be provided with bunding and a floor waste. This should be shown on the plans.
- It is noted that the Traffic Report mentions loading and deliveries activities to be carried out on on-street using the kerbside parking. Given the small size of proposed development and the development being only residential development, this provision is acceptable.
- In page 28 of the Traffic Report, swept path for B85 passing B99 at the bottom of the ramp are overlapping each other. This means there is no passing achieved. Passing should either be

achieved or if not possible, a stop holding line must be provided for vehicles exiting the basement, giving way to the entering vehicles. Swept paths must be amended and provided to Council's satisfaction.

- In page 29 of the Traffic Report, a simultaneous passing of B85 and B99 is shown. However, the bodies of two vehicles are overlapping each other. This means there is no simultaneous passing achieved. This page should be amended for compliance with AS2890.1.
- It is noted that there is a long section showing ground clearance provided on page 32 of the Traffic Report. An updated long section with ground clearance using B85 starting from the centre of the road and extending into the basement must be provided to demonstrate suitable access without scraping.
- It is noted that the first ramp from the property boundary with a maximum of 5% slope is provided for 4m length instead of the required 6m. The required 6m should be available in accordance with AS 2890.1:2004, given the high pedestrian activity in the area and to allow a margin for driver error. Also, grade changes across a footpath and within the property, designed in accordance with AS2890.1 must be shown on the plans.
- It is noted that table 5-1 on page 12 of the traffic report mentions that there is adequate sight distance, but no diagram of the sight distance has been provided with the report. Although the sight distance is expected to be compliant, Council requires a diagram of the sight distance assessment to demonstrate compliance.

### **Conclusion**

Given the concerns outlined above, the development cannot be supported at this time.

The proposal is therefore unsupported.

Note: Should you have any concerns with the referral comments above, please discuss these with the Responsible Officer.

### **Recommended Traffic Engineer Conditions:**

Nil.