

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2020/1167
Date:	14/10/2020
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 9 Francis Street DEE WHY NSW 2099 Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 28 Fisher Road DEE WHY NSW 2099 Part Lot 28 DP 7413 , 28 Fisher Road DEE WHY NSW 2099

Officer comments

Proposal:

The proposal is for demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed use development comprising a café, a church and conference centre and 80 boarding house rooms and associates communal facilities. A total of 53 rooms (65%) will be set up for full physical accessibility to the highest level of NDIS and to AS 1428.1 and platinum level liveable housing design guidelines. The remaining 28 rooms (35%) will be set up with ambulant bathroom facilities.

The proposal includes the following:

- Provision of a two level car parking comprising 40 car spaces.
- Provision of 19 motorcycle spaces and 20 bicycle spaces.
- Access to the basement level car park will be provided via a driveway on Francis Street.
- A service bay accommodating small trucks SRVs for servicing and garbage collection:

Traffic Impact:

The traffic report has not provided any information on the expected traffic generation from the proposal and its implication on the road network.

Parking:

There are the total of 40 parking spaces provided within two level car parking. This includes 22 parking spaces for the boarding room component (16 spaces for boarding rooms, 1 spaces for manager's room, and 5 spaces for the boarding room's employees), 15 spaces for the church staff and attendees and conference centre, and 3 spaces for the café use.

Given the location of the site within the Dee Why Town Centre, the proposed parking provision is

considered acceptable. However the parking spaces provided for the accessible rooms are to be accessible and to be designed in compliance with AS2890.6 - Parking for people with disabilities.

Vehicular Access and car park design:

The following concern are raised on the proposed car park design:

- Location of vehicular access:

The vehicular access proposed down the hill and about 20m from the bend on the northern side raises the concerns regarding inadequate site distance for the vehicles exiting the driveway to the vehicles approaching the site from the northern side, as well as inadequate Stopping Site Distance for approaching vehicle from the bend to exiting vehicles. The proposal being for people with disabilities exacerbates the concern.

- Carpark ramp ways:

There is a safety concern raised on the conflict point within the car park where the two two-way single width ramps leading to two levels of car parking are located. The grade difference between the two parallel ramps restricting the visibility between the two ramps exacerbates the concern. This is not a safe arrangements particularly given the car park will be utilised by people with disabilities and patrons.

- stacked car parking spaces:

The stacked spaces can only be acceptable if they are allocated to the same residential unit or business units (for their staff). Given the nature of the proposal, the stacked parking arrangements could be acceptable only for a limited number for staff parking.

- Motorcycle spaces:

The motorcycle parking spaces are to be provided with a convenient access by provision of adequate aisle width.

- Vehicular access:

The gradient of the first 6m of the driveway from the property boundary shall be 1:20 or less.

- Service vehicle:

The proposal includes the provision of a service bay accommodating small trucks SRVs for servicing

and garbage collection. However, the proposed carpark and loading bay is not capable of accommodating the access of a small truck.

- Pedestrian sight distance at property boundary

It shall be demonstrated that a pedestrian sight triangle of 2.0 metres by 2.5m metres, in accordance with AS2890.1:2004 is provided at the vehicular access to the property.

Conclusion:

In view of the above the proposal is not considered acceptable on traffic grounds.

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.