

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2022/0145
Date:	25/05/2022
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot CP SP 32072 , 812 Pittwater Road DEE WHY NSW 2099 Lot CP SP 32071 , 4 Delmar Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

Officer comments

The development is for demolition of the existing office/commercial buildings on the site and construction of a mixed use development comprising:

230 residential apartments and 439m² of GFA for 3 commercial units

The development will provide parking for 340 vehicles including 275 residential spaces, 46 visitor spaces and 19 commercial/retail spaces

The development site lies at the southern end of the B4 Mixed Use zone of the Dee Why Town Centre

Parking

Required:

In terms of the DCP, as the development lies within the Dee Why Town Centre, the following parking rates apply:

Residential component

0.6 parking spaces for each 1 bedroom apartment

0.9 parking spaces for each 2 bedroom apartment

1.4 parking spaces for each 3 bedroom apartment

1 visitor parking space for each 5 units

Commercial/retail component

1 space per 40 sqm (commercial) or 4.2 spaces per 100 m² (retail)

Bicycle Parking

1 space per dwelling

1 space per 12 dwellings (for visitors)

1 space per 200m² for Commercial/Retail

Car Share

In the Dee Why Town centre developments with more than 25 dwellings are required to provide 1 car share space for each 25 dwellings with that car share space to replace one regular car space.

The above rates result in a residential parking requirement of 194 residential spaces (including 7 car share spaces), 46 visitor spaces and 18 retail parking spaces (if the higher retail parking rate is used rather than the lower commercial rate). A total of 258 spaces in total together with 232 resident/employee bicycle parking spaces and 19 visitor bicycle parking spaces

Proposed:

The developer proposes to provide 340 parking spaces comprised of 275 residential spaces, 46 visitor spaces and 19 commercial spaces. None of the spaces are proposed to be for car share use. Bicycle parking for residents is proposed to be accommodated within residential storage cages while 22 visitor bicycle parking spaces are proposed. The quantum of parking is 82 spaces in excess of DCP requirements with most of that excess associated with residential parking.

The DCP notes as an objective for the Dee Why Town Centre that developments should “encourage walking, cycling, public transport and car sharing”

By providing residential parking well in excess of DCP requirements the developer is encouraging higher levels of car ownership and is not encouraging travel by public transport. The absence of car share spaces also does not support reduced levels of private car ownership.

Parking space provision should be reduced to levels nearer to the DCP requirement with the required car share spaces provided and sited in locations consistent with the requirements outlined in Part G1 clause 8 of the Warringah DCP.

Traffic Generation

Traffic generation rates quoted in the applicants traffic report are from the TfNSW document Guide to Traffic Generation updated surveys 2013. The rates quoted are sourced from data for high density residential adjacent to public transport – each site surveyed in that data is in a location adjacent to a rail line. As there is no rail line through Dee Why residents will rely upon bus transport. Although the B-Line bus service is a high frequency bus service, the nearest B-Line bus stop is sited over 500m from the development site and does not provide the same level of service as a rail line adjacent to a development would do. Buses still need to negotiate traffic signals, are subject to traffic congestion and the B-Line does not benefit from full time bus lanes on all of its route to/from the Sydney CBD. Bus routes serving other destinations also exist but offer a lower standard of service than the B-Line. Residents of this development will therefore tend to have a higher reliance on private motor vehicle travel than residents of high density developments adjacent to a rail line and a higher level of traffic generation than the 0.19 trips/unit used in the traffic impact assessment is considered appropriate, particularly if parking rates which are well above DCP requirements are proposed.

The revised surveys provide a range of values for the Sydney Region, if we consider the rates per car space, a range of values for the am peak of 0.09 to 0.29 trips per car space is quoted with a range of 0.05 to 0.28 trips per car space in the pm peak. Using the upper level of that range (given the use of bus rather than train as public transport option, noting the travel time distance to the Sydney CBD and the high level of proposed parking provision), the residential component of the development might generate $0.29 \times 321 = 93$ AM peak hour trips and $0.28 \times 321 = 90$ PM peak hour trips. Total traffic generation (adding the commercial traffic quoted in the traffic report) might therefore be as high as 103 trips per hour in the AM peak and 110 trips per hour in the PM peak.

It is noted that TfNSW has requested intersection modelling of the Pittwater Road/Delmar Pde intersection. That modelling should be undertaken on the basis of the generated traffic quoted above. In addition, the modelling should take account of the fact that traffic movements associated with the residential use will be largely outbound in the AM peak and inbound in the PM peak which will differ to

the demands associated with the previous office uses which would primarily have been inbound in the AM peak and outbound in the PM peak. It is also noted that the PM peak traffic generated by the high number of residential apartments will generate a high PM peak right turn movement into Delmar Pde which may result in road safety issues associated with that movement at that time. The developer's traffic consultants do not appear to have undertaken any traffic modelling at this stage which is unacceptable for a development of this size.

Property access and traffic circulation

For a development providing access to 340 parking spaces Table 3.1 of AS2890.1 advises that the carpark driveway should be category 3 with a 6m wide entry driveway and a 4m to 6m wide exit driveway. The driveways should be separated by 1 to 3 metres. The plans are uncompliant as they only make provision for a single driveway of approximately 8.5m in width. The access driveway should be redesigned as a category 3 driveway to provide for suitable separation of entry and exit movements, and more adequate provision for pedestrian safety.

Separate driveways for cars and service vehicles are also required as outlined in Clause 6.4.2 of the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Development.

Swept path plots provided in the traffic report reveal that there are a number of locations within both the basement 1 and basement 2 parking levels where the circulation area has not been designed to allow for passing of B85 & B99 vehicle as required by AS2890.1 clause 2.5.2(c). Given that there is a significant over supply of parking in terms of DCP requirements deletion of some parking spaces and/or widening of circulation aisles to facilitate adequate passing opportunities are required.

Pedestrian Sight Lines

The traffic report has plotted the pedestrian sight line triangle and it appears that a pedestrian sight line triangle that complies with the ASAS2890.1 Clause 3.2.4(b) is not available at the point where the carpark driveway meets the Delmar Pde property boundary. This shall be amended.

Loading Bays and Servicing

There is only one loading dock to service the whole development and only one point for waste collection to occur.

The single bin room to service the entire development is questioned particularly when it is insufficiently sized and reliant upon bins being placed along the side of the bin room where they would be inaccessible for rear loading. A truck manoeuvring into the bin room will also block entry and exit to/from carpark ramps resulting in potential queuing/reversing issues back onto the road or across the footpath

The commercial units facing Pittwater Rd have no access to a Loading Dock and no ability for deliveries to be achieved on-street given the presence of on street No Parking restrictions and an AM peak Bus Lane. It is therefore unclear how deliveries to these units will be achieved noting that the adjacent Council carpark is not designed for and inappropriate for truck parking.

Clause 6.4.2 of RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Development suggests that there should be separate truck and carpark driveways the plans should be amended to comply.

Points of clarification

- It is unclear if the commercial carparking is accessible without having to activate a security gate. It is noted that there is an intercom at the top of carpark ramp which may result in these spaces being difficult to access for commercial customers. All commercial spaces and visitor parking spaces should be located where they can be accessed without needing to activate a security gate

- It is unclear if the Pittwater Rd & Delmar Pde commercial units are accessible from the basement 1 commercial parking spaces. It is noted that there is a lift and stairs which could provide access and it should be confirmed that access for non-residents from the carpark via both the lift and stairs to the street will be available.

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.