6 March 2018



Hills Shire Council Att: Jonathan Tolentino

Re: Planning Proposal for Additional Permitted Use

9/2018/PLP- 40 Solent Circuit, Baulkham Hills

As foreshadowed in our recent discussions this letter is to respond to matters raised by Hills Shire Council in correspondence dated 1 March 2018 in relation to an issue raised in relation to traffic and parking.

This letter responds to the issues raised in order to progress the planning proposal and enable reporting to Council.

Proposed Land Uses & Parking Generation

As outlined in the planning proposal the existing development consent applying to the site adopted a total of 400m² of 'neighbourhood shops', with a total of 22 commercial parking spaces proposed.

As indicated in the Planning Proposal the requested land uses by Mulpha Norwest are as follows

- 1. Business premises
- 2. Food and Drink Premises: Specifically a 'restaurant or café'.
- 3. Shops
- 4. Recreation facilities (indoor)

The concern raised in relation to traffic and parking relates to the potential difference between the traffic and parking impacts associated with the neighbourhood shops vs the additional permitted uses. Whilst this would ultimately be a consideration in the determination of a development application for future uses- i.e. the adequacy of parking would be assessed as part of a development application and considered on merit- a discussion is provided below.

The table over the page identifies the relevant parking implications of the approved and proposed uses.



Land Use	Parking Generation	Difference from Approved
Neighbourhood Shop	1 per 18.5m ² of GLFA	
Business Premises	1 per 25m ² of GLFA	35% less than approved.
Shop	1 per 18.5m ² of GLFA	Same as approved
Recreation facility (Indoor)	1 per 25m ² of GFA	35% less than approved.
Restaurant or Café	1 per 5 seats plus 12 spaces per 100m ² of GFA: i.e. 1 per 12m ² plus 1 per 5 seats	capacity. Per m ² rate is 35% higher than neighbourhood shop and then
	*Restaurant/café in shopping centre 1 space per 18.5m ² GLFA	

From the table above it can be seen that the parking generation is the same or less for any shop, business premises, or gymnasium- meaning the parking demand is no more than that considered as part of the original development application, and in some instances it will actually be less. In relation to traffic generation the intention of the proposed commercial space is to provide an offering for residents located in the Greens (East Precinct) meaning that there will be a higher patronage for persons already in the area- i.e. residents who may walk or cycle from elsewhere within the broader masterplan area to utilise the small scale commercial offering. Therefore the traffic generation remains comparable to that considered as part of the 4 x neighbourhood shops assessed and approved under the original development application.





The proposed restaurant café will be approximately 100-200m², with the remainder likely being a shop and business premises- however the final mix has not been locked in as no commitment can be made until there is certainty on this planning proposal.

In relation to the restaurant or café use the technical parking demand will be approximately 24 spaces plus the required parking provided for the seating areas for a facility of 200m². This is compared to the 11 spaces located in the building allocated to this space. This is shortfall as compared to the approved plans however the intent of the restaurant/café needs to be considered. It is intended to provide an offering for residents located in the Greens (East Precinct) meaning that there will be a higher patronage for persons already in the area- i.e. residents who may walk or cycle from elsewhere within the broader masterplan area to utilise the small scale commercial offering. Therefore actual parking requirements would be less than anticipated in the DCP for a typical restaurant/café which is a 'destination' style land use.

In relation to the restaurant/café and the intended offering anticipated (being for residents within the broader Masterplan area) it would be most suitable to give weight to the provisions for a restaurant or café within a shopping complex parking rate as the café/restaurant would be comparable in terms of parking generation as there is an assumption of combined trips or co-located services and higher patronage who will walk/cycle and therefore a lower overall parking demand. If using that rate of 1 space per 18.5m² of GLFA the parking generation matches that of a neighbourhood shop.

Further it is noted that as part of the 'Greens Planning Proposal' the Traffic and Parking Assessment nominated a parking rate of 1 space per 25m² as being suitable and also noted that the likely peak hours associated with a restaurant/café use would differ from a business premises or shop which would enable the sharing of parking spaces across the peak demand periods- i.e. evenings which is the busiest time for a restaurant/café when a business premises and traditional retail shop would be closed.

Land Use	Parking Generation	Required
Neighbourhood Shop	1 per 18.5m ² of GLFA	22

Finally it is noted that the actual parking requirements for the approved development was as per the below table, noting 178 spaces were provided.





From the above there is a significant allocation of resident visitor parking spaces and there may also be scope for consideration to the sharing of a number of these visitor parking spaces with a restaurant/café component should the need arise as part of consideration of a development application. This is particularly the case given the reduced parking rate for resident visitor parking that will apply to development in the East Precinct upon adoption of the Planning Proposal as a 1 per 5 visitor parking rate will mean that an additional 15.5 parking spaces could potential be shared with the commercial tenancies and in particular any restaurant/café use which would enable in the order of 26 spaces available to a 200m² restaurant/café which would be more than sufficient to cater for parking demand.

Conclusion

As addressed above the consideration of parking requirements will ultimately be a consideration in the assessment of any development application and the adequacy of parking, or otherwise, would determine the suitability of any future land use. However as outlined in this letter the extent of parking available is sufficient to cater for the anticipated uses and it is requested that no further specific allocation of floor area to each of the APU's sought be provided in order to ensure a degree of flexibility over the life of the building.

Please contact us if you wish to discuss any of the above details and we are happy to meet to discuss the above. Otherwise, we look forward to the planning proposal progressing and being reported to Council.

Jonathon Wood **Think Planners Pty Ltd** PO BOX 121 WAHROONGA NSW 2076

Response Letter Planning Proposal 40 Solent Circuit, Baulkham Hills **PAGE 4**

