

Traffic Engineer Referral Response

Application Number:	DA2023/0987
Proposed Development:	Demolition and construction of a shop top housing development with basement parking
Date:	20/12/2023
Responsible Officer	
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 1 SP 14133 , 39 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 2 SP 14133 , 38 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 3 SP 14133 , 36 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 4 SP 14133 , 35 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 5 SP 14133 , 1 / 37 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 6 SP 14133 , 2 / 37 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 7 SP 14133 , 3 / 37 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 1 DP 100633 , 40 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 1 DP 104766 , 41 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 1 DP 34395 , 42 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot 1 DP 719821 , 43 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095 Lot CP SP 14133 , 35 - 39 Belgrave Street MANLY NSW 2095

Officer comments

Proposal description: Demolition and construction of a shop top housing development with basement parking

The proposed development is for the demolition of the existing structures and construction of a shop top housing comprising 25 residential apartments (15 x two-bedroom, 10 x three-bedroom apartments), 447m² retail premises and basement carpark for 45 vehicles (35 residential, 6 visitor and 4 retail spaces). Vehicle access is provided at Whistler Street.

The traffic team has reviewed the following documents:

- Plans (Master Set) – Job No. 6693, designed by Time & Place, dated 28/06/2022,
- Transport Impact Assessment report, Project Number 2317, prepared by JMT Consulting dated 03 July 2023,
- Statement of Environmental Effects prepared by BBF Town Planners dated July 2023, and
- Pre-Lodgement Advice (PLM2023/0054) dated 13 June 2023.

Parking requirement and design:

- The land is zoned E1 Local Centre under Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (LEP).

- Manly DCP applies to the subject site. The parking requirements for the development comprising 25 units (15 two-bedroom units and 10 three-bedroom units) and 447m² retail/commercial premises are 35 resident spaces, 4 visitor spaces, 11.2 retail/commercial users (round up to 12) = 51 spaces. In response, 45 parking spaces have been proposed (35 residential parking spaces, 4 visitor parking spaces and 6 retail parking spaces). There is therefore a shortfall of six (6) retail/commercial parking spaces.
- The shortfall of 6 retail/ commercial parking spaces is not considered acceptable given that:
 - o While some relaxation of DCP requirements in this location could be considered to reduce traffic levels and given the proximity of the site to good public transport, shops and recreational uses and the high level of walking and cycling activity in the vicinity, such arguments would be more appropriately applied to the residential parking component and is not accepted as a justification for a reduced commercial/retail parking supply.
 - o Section 4.2.5.4 of Manly DCP gives some exceptions to parking rates/ requirements in Manly Town Centre (including commercial/retail premises) where the constraints of the site preclude the provision of some or all of the required parking spaces and where the movement of vehicles to/from the site would cause unacceptable conflict with pedestrian movements. This is not applicable to this site as the site is not constrained in terms of its ability to provide parking. As outlined in the PLM referral comments, the removal of some of the residential units would reduce the parking requirements associated with the development.
 - o In accordance with the PLM referral comments, a shortfall in retail parking requirements is not considered acceptable i.e retail parking for 12 vehicles is required however consideration could be given to some shortfall in residential parking given the proximity of the development to good public transport, shops and services. It should be noted that any approval for a development in this location will be subject to a condition of consent that parking permits will not be available for residents/tenants of this property to reduce reliance on car travel and promote use of active travel and public transport.
 - o There is no longer any capacity to levy contributions for parking from the Manly Section 94 Contributions plan, therefore each DA must now be considered on its merits in terms of the adequacy of parking.
 - o Any increased parking demand on-street as a result of parking shortfall for this development will exacerbate existing high levels of parking congestion in the Manly Town Centre.
- The plans show eight (8) accessible parking spaces which is acceptable. The design of the accessible parking spaces appears to be compliant with the Australian Standard AS2890.6:2009 Parking Facilities-Off Street Parking for People with Disability. Bollards have been provided on the plans for the disabled shared areas as shown in Figure 2.2 of the Australian Standard AS2890.6:2009.
- The Manly DCP 2013 requires the provision of one (1) bicycle stand for every three (3) car parking spaces with a minimum provision of one stand for each premises, i.e. 15 spaces required. Bicycle parking spaces are not presented in the architectural plans. This should be confirmed on the amended plans.
- The basement carpark layout and car spaces appear to be compliant with Australian Standards AS2890.1:2004 Off-Street Parking requirements. However, parking spaces

width and ramp width have not been dimensioned and although scaled dimensions suggest they are adequate, this needs to be confirmed on dimensioned plans.

- The proposed driveway is 6m in width for the first 8m into the property which assists ease of access. Swept path plots have shown that it is appropriately sized to permit a B99 vehicle to pass a B85 vehicle entering or exiting the site as required by AS2890.1 clause 3.2.2. The driveway width reduces to 3.6m on the ramp.
- The ramp is single-width and will be no capacity for vehicles to pass on it. To overcome this, a waiting bay inside the carpark and a signal system are required to be included in the plans.
- The driveway and ramp gradients appear satisfactory however a vertical clearance assessment on the driveway ramp should be undertaken, using traffic engineering software such as Autotrack/Autoturn, for a B99 car entering and accessing the carpark to demonstrate that there is adequate overhead clearance and that show any scraping and bottoming does not occur.
- As reported in the Traffic report, garbage collection for the proposed development is expected to be undertaken by Council's waste contractor with bins to be stored on-site and brought out to the kerbside on Whistler Street on collection days.
- It is also reported in the traffic report that there is an existing loading zone on Belgrave Street that operates between 6am-9am Monday to Friday. This loading zone is currently utilised by the existing retail/commercial tenancies and would continue to be used for the purpose of servicing the retail component of the proposed development. Some information regarding future deliveries/loading arrangements, together with details of the delivery arrangements for the proposed retail component of the development, an analysis of future delivery frequency and the suitability of the proposed loading bay to cater for such deliveries should be included in the report.
- It is noted that a pedestrian sightline triangle of 2.0 metres by 2.5 metres, in accordance with AS2890.1:2004 are provided at the vehicular access for pedestrian visibility for exiting vehicles.
- A queueing assessment was included in the traffic report based on the anticipated peak traffic volumes for the development. The analysis confirmed that the 98th percentile inbound queue expected at the access was less than 1 vehicle based on an average service rate of 167 vehicles per hour. The calculated chance of a conflict/queue of the development was 0.21%. Therefore, the likelihood of vehicular conflict in the driveway is considered negligible.

Traffic generation

- The proposal will generate minimal traffic during peak periods; therefore, it will not have any unacceptable implications in terms of road network capacity performance.

Conclusion

The plans and the traffic report in their current form are unacceptable due to the inadequacy of the provided information as outlined above.

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.