

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2025/0024
Proposed Development:	Demolition works and construction of shop top housing including strata subdivision
Date:	02/04/2025
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 DP 34753 , 158 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

Officer comments

This development application involves the demolition of the existing structures to facilitate the construction of a shop-top housing development, comprising a retail tenancy (111 m²), restaurant (117 m²) and 9 residential apartments (5 x 3-bedroom units, 1 x 2-bedroom units, 1 x 2-bedroom Affordable Rental Housing (ARH) unit), and 2 x 1-bedroom ARH unit.

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared by pdc consultants (dated 22nd November 2024), with respect to access, parking, and traffic generation impacting the road network.

Access

The TIA indicates that vehicle access is off The Strand via a 6.1m wide combined access driveway (two-way roadway 5.5m wide with 0.3m kerbs). A mechanical car lift (minimum platform width 3.6m, length 6m, head clearance 2.2m) enables vehicle travel between basement levels. A roller door is located less than 6m from the property boundary which restricts the waiting and passing area for vehicles entering and exiting the development.

An Operational Management Plan (OMP) is required providing further details regarding the mechanical lift and access to the basement car park. It is not clear whether a Basement Traffic Signal System is also proposed but installation would help prevent conflict from entering and exiting vehicles.

The TIA includes a swept path analysis for a B99 Design Vehicle of the typical circulation movements within the basement levels and entering and exiting the car lift, with all vehicles able to enter and exit the site in a forward direction. Although swept paths have been provided using the B99, there are concerns with whether it is possible for the vehicle to pass the waiting vehicle in the passing area within the property boundary. Drawing No.001 - Ground Floor B99 Design Vehicle Swept Path analysis Site Entry and Exit Movement, shows the B85 waiting vehicle positioned with the tyres flush against the kerb of the entry driveway with the minimum 300mm clearance between the body of the exiting B99 vehicle. In reality the B85 is unlikely to be situated in the position but rather further away from the kerb. The exiting B99 would not be able to pass if the waiting B85 vehicle was positioned 0.3m from the kerb. It is high probably that the B99 would not be able to exit the site if a B99 was waiting within the property. The vehicle would then need to reverse onto the footpath to allow the oncoming B99 to exit onto The Strand. It therefore does not seem possible that a B99 vehicle could safely exit the property based on the existing driveway and access configuration without encroaching

onto the footpath and impacting pedestrian safety. The applicant therefore needs to provide some additional measure to address this issue.

A 2.5 metre by 2.0 metre visual splay is to be provided on the egress side of the driveway, at the property boundary, in accordance with Figure 3.3 of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004. Clear sight lines shall be provided at the property line to ensure adequate visibility between vehicles leaving the car park or domestic driveway and pedestrians on the frontage road footpath. The Ground Floor Plan shows an entrance to the retail bike storage area as well as toilets and cleaner room. From street level this area would also appear as part of the building rather than the driveway from the pedestrian and would obstruct visibility regardless of whether the entry was open. Additional measures are required to enhance safety for pedestrians along The Strand frontage, which should include convex mirrors, and LED warning signage (activated by a beam system as vehicles approach the exit). With respect to public domain works within Council's Road Reserve a minimum 1.5m footpath should be provided in Griffin Road and Pacific Parade and a 2.5m path in The Strand where possible. Any street planting should be appropriately located so as not to affect sightlines for vehicles.

Parking

The TIA states that the development will be served by a 2-level basement carpark containing a total of 16 car parking spaces, comprising 14 resident spaces and 2 visitor spaces. The development requires a total of 12 resident spaces and 2 visitor spaces for the residential component applying the relevant rates for WDCP and SEPP Housing 2021 for ARH.

The development proposes a retail tenancy (111 m²) and restaurant (117 m²) on the ground floor. The WDCP requires 7 spaces (1 space per 16.4m² GFA) for the retail. The parking requirement for a restaurant is the greater of 15 spaces per 100m² GFA, or 1 space per 3 seats. The proposal requires 20 car park spaces based on 60 patrons. A total of 27 spaces is therefore required for the non-residential component of the shop-top development.

The proposal does not provide any parking spaces for non-residential, indicating that no off-street parking has been provided for the existing 2 restaurants on the site and that a parking credit of 72 spaces should be applied for the existing usage. There is a high demand for on-street parking due to other nearby restaurants and cafes, proximity to recreational areas including Dee Why Rockpool, Dee Why Beach and playgrounds. The area is also zoned medium density residential with additional demand from the large number of units in the area. Although it is acknowledged that it's not possible to provide the required number of non-residential parking spaces on-site, the proposal does provide an additional 2 residential spaces above the WDCP requirements, and therefore 2 spaces should be reallocated for the retail and restaurant so that each tenancy is provided with at least 1 car park space.

There appears to be an error or discrepancy in the layout of the Architectural Drawings - Basement 1 Floor Plan, Drawing No. DA1001 Rev.DA1, where there is an additional wall/structure which extends into the circulation roadway which reduces the width from the 3880mm shown. The parking layout for Basement 1 and 2 are essentially the same however the wall/structure is not shown on the Basement 2 Floor Plan. The swept paths were provided using the Basement 2 Floor demonstrating access for the B99 vehicle, however this would not be possible if the wall shown on Basement 1 Floor Plan was part of the proposed basement layout. This appears to be a drawing error however further clarification is required to confirm whether this is the case.

The bicycle parking provisions are acceptable, and although there are no motorcycle parking requirements for Dee Why under the WDCP, provisions should be provided where possible due to the lack of on-site retail/restaurant parking and to support alternate traffic modes to the development.

Servicing and Loading

The proposal does not provide any facilities for service vehicles or waste collection. The TIA states that due to the configuration of the site, it would not be spatially feasible to accommodate a designated service bay on-site, and that this would be accommodated within the available parallel car parking spaces provided along The Strand and Pacific Parade site frontages. The TIA further adds that waste collection of the development be undertaken on-street along The Strand. Parking restrictions for Waste Collection days with Loading Zone restrictions applying 6am-2pm Mon-Fri, would be required in The Strand, south of the access driveway and near the bin storage area. The proposed restrictions would require approval by Council and reporting to the Northern Beaches Local Traffic Committee.

Traffic Generation

The future traffic generation has been assessed in accordance with Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) 'Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002' (GTTGD). The TPA states that the proposed development generates 10 vehicle trips during the am peak hours and 19 vehicle trips during the pm peak.

The TIA states that the most relevant use of the traffic generation is the net change in traffic from the new development. The TIA further states that the net increase of three vehicle trips/hour during the AM peak and a net decrease of one vehicle trip/hour during the PM peak once the traffic generation of the existing development is taken into consideration. This claim is illogical as the residential component from the required parking provided on site generates 6 vehicle trips/hour during the AM peak and 6 vehicle trips/hour during the PM peak, as a minimum. This is why full credit for parking or traffic generation is not acceptable. Regardless the anticipated increase from both residential and non-residential components of the shop-top housing development is unlikely to have a significant impact to the surrounding road network.

The proposal is not acceptable in its current form. The above suggestions and recommendations should be considered to address the issues raised, with further information and clarification provided where specified. The Architectural Plans and swept paths demonstrating safe access are to be updated accordingly prior to further review.

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.