

## Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2019/0645
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot CP SP 15752 , 26 Whistler Street MANLY NSW 2095

### Officer comments

It is proposed to demolish the existing buildings and excavate the site to provide for basement parking and a level building platform. New 7-level building will be constructed comprising:

- 3 x One-Bed Apartments
  - 26 x Two-Bed Apartments
  - 12 x Three-Bed Apartments
- Total 41 Apartments

A total of 57 parking spaces will be provided in ground and basement levels accessed by a new driveway on the Whistler Street frontage. All of these spaces are to be allocated for residential use. The existing development on the site provides 24 parking spaces all allocated for residential use.

Traffic:

Proposed 41 apartments @ 0.29 vtpm - 12 vtpm

The existing building on the site with 24 units would generate some 7 vtpm

Thus, the projected peak traffic generation will only be some 5 vtpm additional

No objections are raised in this regard.

### Referral Body Recommendation

### Refusal comments

Amended comments 15/10/19

After reviewing the amended plans and responses to the traffic sections earlier comments the following concerns remain:

Parking:

The 2 parking space shortfall is no longer opposed having considered existing use rights. It is noted that no visitor parking spaces are proposed with all of the spaces being allocated for residential use and the applicant relying on existing use rights whereby the existing development on the site provided no visitor parking. The number of residential spaces would therefore be in excess of the 52 space requirement. Given other concerns I have with regard to the layout of the parking area and the proximity of the location to good public transport at Manly Wharf and on Belgrave Street my preference would be to slightly reduce the number of parking spaces to allow for improved manoeuvring within the carpark.

#### Access:

The dimensions of adaptable spaces No.s 1,6 & 15 are no longer opposed being consistent with the requirements of AS4299 section 3.7.1.

The disabled parking space (basement level space No.12) is unacceptable. Despite the applicant's assertion that the space is appropriately sized this is not considered to be the case. The space is a parallel parking space and its dimensions are inconsistent with those stipulated in AS2890.6 Section 2.2.2(b) which require it to be 7.8m in length and at least 3.2m wide with a 1600mm on the non trafficked side of the space. Where the space is currently sited, a disabled driver will have no choice but to unload in a parking aisle. Being disabled, this may mean they take longer than another driver to alight from the vehicle and potentially load into a wheelchair. The space is very exposed and the disabled person unprotected. This is unacceptable and the disabled space should be relocated or redesigned

the amended bicycle parking arrangements are not opposed.

ground floor space 12 and basement space 11 are considered to be poorly sited with turning path plots showing vehicles parked in these spaces are likely to be clipped by vehicles circulating through the carpark or exiting from spaces. Consideration should be given to resiting or removing these spaces.

access to and from parking spaces 7,8, 9,10,15 & 16 using the turntable has been demonstrated as acceptable.

swept path plots of vehicles circulating through the carpark and entering and exiting a number of the parking spaces have been provided. Although these plots have shown that the relevant design vehicles can circulate, the plots have also highlighted that vehicles parked in some spaces, columns and walls are within the 300mm swept path clearance area and, as such, that the carpark is very tight. Space 12 on the ground floor and space 11 in the basement level are considered poorly sighted and removal of, or redesign to relocate these spaces is required.

adjustments to the garbage room have provided some improvement to sightlines between vehicles exiting the carpark and pedestrians on the footpath. The presence of a convex mirror will also improve sightlines to the south. The addition of STOP linemarking at the exit point is supported and a speed hump just east of the STOP markings would also assist by ensuring vehicles exit at slow speeds.

The applicants traffic consultant has demonstrated that the risk of conflict on the ramp connecting the basement and ground floor parking levels is low and the use of traffic light control systems and convex mirrors minimises the risk of vehicle to vehicle conflict. The fact that the carpark is solely for residential use is noted and drivers will therefore be familiar with the ramp access protocol and a single lane ramp is no longer opposed in this instance.

The applicant should address my concerns with regard to the ground floor space 12, basement space 11 and the basement space 12 disabled parking space and add a speed hump east of the exit point from the carpark prior to further consideration of the DA

#### Original Comments

##### Parking:

3 x One Bed apartments = 1.8 spaces

26 x Two Bed apartments = 26 spaces

12 x Three Bed apartments = 24 spaces

Subtotal: 52 spaces

Visitors (41 apartments) = 7 spaces

Total: 59 spaces

The applicant is providing 57 parking spaces and 29 bicycle spaces. This comprises a shortfall of 2 vehicle spaces. All parking provisions are to be accommodated onsite. The shortfall of 2 spaces is unacceptable as the parking demand in the area is high and will not support the shortfall.

Visitor parking spaces must be denoted on the plans

Access:

Concern is raised that the Accessible parking spaces are not designed to AS2890.1. They should be 2.4m wide and have a 2.4m shared space adjoining them. The plans indicate a shared space of less than 2.4m. The shared spaces should also be protected with a bollard as required by AS2890.6 section 2.2.1(e)

The Shared Area adjacent to basement level space 12 is sited in a parking aisle. This is unacceptable and will expose disabled drivers to potential injury from circulating/reversing traffic. AS 2890.6 Fig 2.4 requires the shared area to be sited on the side of the space that is furthest from the parking aisle.

2 of the bike racks are located alongside the driving aisle (adjacent to space 7) and are deemed exposed to safety risk of a car hitting the user and/or parked bikes.

space 12 is deemed unsafe and completely exposed, further impacting on available widths within the basement carpark aisles.

There is no waiting bay for vehicles waiting to access the turntable on the basement level. Vehicles must be able to wait in a location which does not obstruct use of other spaces or access along the parking aisle. The turntable must be designed for safe forward in and forward out access using AS 2890.1:2004 (Off-street car parking) B99 vehicle. Plans showing the swept path of a B99 vehicle entering and exiting parking spaces 7,8 15,16 from the turntable in a forward direction using the waiting bay, and exiting the parking spaces in a forward direction using the turntable (and passing the occupied waiting bay) shall be provided. Independent egress from spaces 9 & 10 using the turntable and passing the occupied waiting bay shall also be demonstrated.

Swept path plots showing a B99 vehicle circulating up and down throughout the carpark aisles and ramps shall be provided.

Whistler Street is in a high pedestrian activity area and it is therefore important that there is good sight distance to pedestrians using the footpath. The plans do not provide for this and the use of a traffic safety mirror to overcome this shortcoming is considered substandard. Sight line triangles consistent with the requirements of AS2890.1 section 3.2.4 and Fig 3.3 shall be provided.

The Traffic impact assessment report has sought to justify the use of a single lane two way ramp between the ground floor and basement level parking spaces by reference to section 3.2.2 of AS2890.1. That part of the standard relates to widths of access driveways where they connect to a public road. The width of the ramp linking the two carpark levels should be determined by reference to table 2.2 which would require the ramp to be no less than 5.5m in width for two way operation. The provision of a single lane ramp with convex mirrors as indicated on the plans is considered substandard.

Other issues

The parking areas on the ground floor and basement level are poorly dimensioned. All aisles widths and parking bay widths and lengths must be shown including for small car and stabled parking bays.

Space 7 (ground floor) and space 12 (basement) are too short. As these spaces are obstructed at both ends they must be no less than 6.5m in length (AS 2890.1 Fig 2.3 note 3)

Stacked parking spaces are to be allocated to a single unit.

Given the above issues approval of the plans in their form is not recommended

**Recommended Traffic Engineer Conditions:**

Nil.