

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2023/1841
Proposed Development:	Use of Premises as a hardware and building supplies facility and associated internal alterations
Date:	03/05/2024
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 88028 , 77 Bassett Street MONA VALE NSW 2103 Lot 4 DP 707291 , 77 Bassett Street MONA VALE NSW 2103

Officer comments

Further comments - dated 3/05/2024

- It is noted that an updated continuous swept path has been provided as requested. The swept path analysis shows an encroachment onto the disabled parking space during entry movement. The same traffic letter mentions that the disabled parking space will be vacant during loading activities which would occur between 5:30pm and 8:00pm. This is acceptable subject to conditions.
- It is noted that the updated traffic letter provides a new calculation for required parking spaces with the parking occupancy of 16 spaces as observed by the Council's Traffic Engineer. The new calculation shows a requirement of minimum 16 spaces, and the traffic letter mentions a requirement of minimum 22 spaces including 6 staff spaces for the proposed development. Although the traffic letter claims this to be a worst-case scenario and a pessimistic approach, 4 new visitor spaces have been provided resulting in a total of 22 spaces.
- The traffic letter states, "To address the above issue, the Client has reviewed the parking provision and managed to provide a total of 22 parking spaces (16 visitor and 6 staff spaces). A map of updated parking provision of 22 spaces can easily fulfil the parking demand of the proposed development". However, further information confirming ownership of those spaces and whether they can be viewed as being exclusively available to visitors to the Mitre 10 trade store is required. If the space are currently used by other tenancies this use needs to be outlined and the impact on the parking provisions for those developments reviewed. The traffic letter must be updated to provide further information about the newly added 4 visitor spaces. A site visit by Council staff reveals the majority of the spaces within the overall site are signposted and used by the customers and staff of other tenancies.

Conclusion

The application can be acceptable from a traffic perspective subject to conditions if further information regarding newly introduced 4 visitor spaces as requested above is provided to Council's satisfaction.

Further comments - dated February 2024

- It is noted that the applicant's traffic consultant has provided amended plans which show motorcycle and bicycle parking spaces. These details are also reflected on page 21 of the amended architectural plans entitled Parking Plan revision F dated 24/1/2024.
- It is noted that a set of swept paths for SRV and MRV trucks have been provided with the traffic consultants response dated 6 February 2024 in Appendix B of that document. However, a closer look on the swept paths reveal that the positions of vehicles are changed in exit swept path from the entry swept path. Hence, an updated continuous swept path must be provided to demonstrate that forwards ingress and egress is achievable by the MRV.
- It is noted that all movements by MRVs are proposed to occur after hours i.e between 5:30pm and 8:00pm. There are no traffic engineering concerns with this arrangement which will be conditioned.
- It is noted that in amended plans (page 8 of Traffic Responses Letter) 4 bicycle parking spaces and 1 motorcycle parking space are provided in accordance with the requirements of the Pittwater DCP. This is acceptable subject to conditions.
- The Traffic Consultants response to the traffic engineers referral claims that Council has only considered data presented in the RMS guidelines, and has given no weight to the data presented by the applicant relating to the Total Tools trade store at Brookvale. Hence, Council's Traffic Engineer has undertaken their own assessment of the parking situation at that site on Friday 9th February 2024 at 2pm. During the site visit, it was observed that there was a total of 27 car parking spaces on-site with accesses from Pittwater Road and Roger Street. The occupancy rate was found to be 59% with a total of 16 cars parked. Moreover, it was also observed that the upper level tenancy at that address was vacant, resulting in all the car parking spaces on the site being available for use by Total Tools. The current parking circumstances at Total Tools where a greater number of spaces are currently available than would be the case if the upstairs tenancy where occupied is considered unrepresentative. Council believes that a more representative data set is available by referencing an average rate from RMS verified surveys done at a range of different locations as presented on Roads and Maritime Services Guide to Traffic Generating Developments. Comments made in the original referral comments regarding the inadequate level of parking remain largely unaddressed
- It is noted that page 22 of the Amended Master Set now shows two additional parking spaces along the western boundary of the bigger site which was missing on the originally submitted Master Set. One of those spaces is denoted pallet parking which cannot be counted as car parking.
- It is noted that the provided Traffic Responses Letter has now provided a comparison of traffic generation from the existing development when compared with proposed future traffic generation. the anticipated change in traffic generation is minor and should not impact negatively on surrounding road network performance.

Given the concerns that remain unaddressed by the revised plans and traffic reporting the development remains unsupported by the traffic team

Original comments - dated January 2024

Proposal description: Alterations & additions for proposed change of use at Units 1 & 2/ 77-79 Basett Street, Mona Vale

The traffic team has reviewed the following documents:

- Plans (Master Set) – Job No. 1182/23, Revision E, designed by JJ Drafting, dated 31/10/2023,
- Transport Impact Assessment, prepared by Traffic and Transport Planning Solutions (TTPS), dated 12/12/2023,
- The *Statement of Environmental Effects* prepared by Vaughan Miligan Development Consulting Pty Ltd, dated December 2023

Parking requirement and design:

- The Pittwater DCP applies to the subject site. The DCP does not provide a parking rate for this type of land use, requiring developers to provide parking based upon RMS guidelines or by comparison with developments of a similar nature
- The traffic report suggests the car parking is provided that exceeds rates calculated from parking surveys of similar sites conducted for TfNSW as referenced in their technical direction TDT 2013/04a. A closer review of this data suggest that the quantum of parking available to this development will be inadequate. The development proposes only 11 customer spaces. Sites surveys by TfNSW included a number of sites of a similar size to his one and averaging the data from those sites would seem the most appropriate means of selecting an appropriate level of parking.
- Mitre 10 Windsor with GFA of 1800m² has 44 customer spaces & no staff spaces, Mitre 10 Picton has a GFA of 1600m² and has 75 customer and no staff spaces, Mitre 10 Orange has a GFA of 1800m² and 28 staff spaces, 2 disabled and 10 staff spaces. Mitre 10 Morisset has a GFA of 2000m², 29 customer spaces, 1 disabled and no staff spaces. Averaging these parking rates yields a parking requirement of 1 space per 38m² of GFA i.e 33 spaces for this site.
- If we look at the peak parking demands of the 4 sites, parking demands range from 0.78/100m² for the Mitre 10 at Windsor on weekdays up to 2.81/100m² for the Mitre 10 at Picton weekends. As this type of use attracts highest usage levels on weekends, parking rates derived from weekend data are the most relevant. An average of the weekend peak parking demands at all 4 sites reveals a peak parking demand of 1.86spaces/100m² or 23 spaces for this site. Based upon this analysis the development should be providing parking for no less than 23 cars. The bulk of this parking should be allocated for customer parking with it noted that clause c5.5 of the Pittwater DCP requires that carparking be provided for people with disabilities so at least one parking spaces should be designed and located appropriately for disabled use. The developer must review their proposal and seek additional parking for customers, to support their development. The additional parking should be buried in a tandem arrangement.
- It is noted that the traffic report shows 2 car parking spaces along the western boundary of the bigger site (figure 4.1 on page 9). These spaces are not shown on the architectural plans. The two documents should be consistent with the location and dimensions of all parking spaces shown on the plans.
- The traffic report mentions that a maximum of 5 staff will be present at any given time however 7 staff parking spaces are proposed. This is both unnecessary and reduces the level of parking available for customers. It is suspected that the reason that 7 spaces have been allocated for staff use is there are seven spaces buried in tandem parking arrangements. Such spaces would therefore be inappropriate for use by customers however simply reallocating those spaces for unnecessary staff parking is not acceptable. If anything, the quantum of staff parking could be reduced below 5 which would encourage staff to use public transport, walk or cycle or motorcycle to work and increase the level of customer parking .
- No motorcycle or bicycle parking has been provided. The Pittwater DCP requires at least one motorcycle space and 4 bicycle parking spaces. These could be sited at the front end of parking spaces 77 & 78 which are of extended length without impacting on the ability of vehicles to park in or access these spaces. The provision of such spaces would encourage travel by alternate means, particularly by staff.

Loading/Serviceing

- The traffic report mentions that some customer spaces will be closed off while MRVs ingress/egress the loading bay. The traffic report advises that swept paths showing this are

attached in Appendix E. The traffic report is missing Appendix E containing the swept path, these should be provided. Furthermore, a Loading Dock Management Plan will be required to ensure that deliveries are appropriately scheduled and timed so as not to result in congestion either within the loading dock or in the carparking area. Ideally physical separation of loading/unloading activity from customer areas should be achieved but if that is not feasible time of day separation will be considered to ensure that loading activities occur outside hours when customers will be accessing the site.

Traffic Generation Impact

- The traffic generation section of the traffic report should show a comparison of existing and proposed traffic generation in order to support the proposed change of use in terms of traffic generation and its impact in the surrounding road network and confirm that it will not have unacceptable implications in terms of road network performance.

Conclusion

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

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.