

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2021/0179
Date:	06/05/2021
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 8 DP 604034 , 255 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093

Officer comments

The development is for demolition of the existing building on the site and construction of a 39 room boarding house with no manager's room. The development also proposes offstreet parking for 7 cars (including 1 disabled space), 8 motorcycles and 8 bicycles in a ground floor carpark. 3 of the parking spaces are proposed to be designated as car share spaces with those car share vehicles also to be available to the general public. A new vehicle crossing on 5.5m in width will be constructed on the property's Condamine Street frontage.

Traffic:

In terms of traffic generation the traffic and parking assessment report has estimated the traffic generation of the development to be 3-4 vehicle trips per hour. The traffic generated by the development may differ slightly from this figure and is likely to be less than other potential development types on the site and as the site fronts Condamine Street a State Road, the traffic generation from the developed site is acceptable and considered unlikely to significantly impact on conditions in the surrounding road network.

Parking:

The development proposes offstreet parking for 7 cars.

The Warringah DCP does not nominate a parking rate for boarding house developments but advises that comparisons must be drawn with developments for a similar purpose.

The SEPP Affordable Rental Housing advises that a consent authority may not refuse a development if it provides parking in excess of 0.5 spaces per boarding room plus no more than 1 space for a manager that is resident on the site. In this instance, there is no resident manager so the SEPP requirement is 19.5 spaces (rounded up to 20)

The developer proposes that three of the parking spaces be designated as car share spaces with such spaces to be managed by the car share company GoGet. The traffic and parking assessment report proposes that each carshare space can be assessed as being equivalent to 10 car spaces. Using this figure the traffic consultant asserts that the 7 car spaces are equivalent to 34 car spaces. The traffic consultant also asserts that Council had agreed at the prelodgement meeting that a car share space could be considered equivalent to 5 car spaces.

The prelodgement advice actually was that although consideration would be given to a car space being equivalent to 5 spaces "Council's preference is to provide no more than 2% or 2 car share spaces, whichever is greater." If a maximum of 2 car share spaces were provided the 39 bed boarding room would therefore require a total of 12 parking spaces. It is also noted that the plans presented at the

Prelodgement meeting also proposed a service vehicle bay. This bay has been deleted from the plans now presented for consideration.

In addition, the car share spaces are also to be made available to the general public. While this is understandable in terms of GoGets business model this would render the spaces unsuitable for use by boarding house tenants for much of the time as the car would often be in use by the general community and not available for those they are supposed to be serving.

Given the above, the proposed car parking supply is considered inadequate to meet the needs of the development

The SEPP also requires one bicycle space for every 5 boarding rooms and one motorcycle space for every five boarding rooms. This equates to 8 motorcycle and 8 bicycle parking spaces. As the development provides parking for 8 bicycles and 8 motorcycles, these requirements, which are mandatory, are met.

In terms of the parking layout. Parking space No.19 is undersized with AS2890.1 section 2.4.1(b) requiring that a space adjacent to a wall or fence be no less than 2.7m in width

Swept path plots have not been provided with the traffic and parking assessment report to demonstrate that access for B85 vehicles to each of the spaces without encroachment on other spaces is possible.

Vehicular Access:

The development proposes to remove the existing vehicle crossing serving the site and construct a new vehicle crossing which is of 5.5m in width. Concurrent entry/exit to the driveway by B85 vehicle and B99 vehicle has not been demonstrated by way of turning path plots to/from the kerbside lane of Condamine. These should be provided to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of A2890. 1 and also to address concerns by TfNSW

The driveway continues at a width of 5.5m inside the property as required by AS2890.1 which allows for an entering vehicle to pass and exiting vehicle.

It is noted that the construction of the new driveway will require relocation of a power pole. That work will need to be completed to Ausgrid requirements and at no cost to Council or Transport for NSW.

Pedestrian access:

The development provides an appropriately graded accessible path of travel from the carpark although as outlined below. If the turning bay is being used by a service vehicle access to the lift and lobby area, particularly for those with a disability is blocked. Access from the street for those with a disability relies upon the use of a wheel chair which is unideal.

Servicing:

It is noted that the service bay that was proposed as part of the prelodgement plans has been deleted from the plans with servicing now intended to be conducted from within the turning bay in the basement carpark. This is considered unsuitable as use of the service bay by delivery drivers would a) impede access to the motorcycle cycle and bicycle parking bays b) prevent vehicles parked in parking bay No.s 18 and 19 from turning forcing such vehicles to reverse from the site onto a busy State Road to turn around which is unacceptable. c) impede pedestrian access to the Lift and foyer area.

It is considered that a service bay is necessary to cater for deliveries, small moving vans, property maintenance purposes etc however this should be catered for by a designated service bay capable of accommodating at least a small rigid vehicle.

The turning path plots provided with the traffic and parking assessment report are inadequate as they do not demonstrate that small rigid vehicles can enter and exit the site from the kerbside lane of Condamine Street. This has also been noted in TfNSW comments.

Finally, It is also noted that Council's Waste Services team have raised concerns about the waste servicing arrangements proposed and these concerns should also be addressed as part of a review of the design.

Summary

The development in its current form is considered inadequate in terms of its parking supply, parking layout, lack of service vehicle parking. additional information and some design review is required prior to further consideration of the proposal

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.