

Office:
Suite 15/9 Hoyle Ave., Castle Hill NSW 2154

All Correspondence:
75 Gindarra Ave, Castle Hill NSW 2154

Telephone: (02) 8850 2788
Facsimile: (02) 8850 2799
E-mail: david@thompsonstanbury.com.au
morgan@thompsonstanbury.com.au
www.thompsonstanbury.com.au

MOBILE PHONES:

David Thompson: 0418 262 125

Morgan Stanbury: 0410 561 848

ABN: 79 943 737 368

24 October 2012

The General Manager
Fairfield City Council
PO Box 21
FAIRFIELD
NSW 2165

Attention: Nelson Mu, Senior Development Planner

Dear Sir,

TRAFFIC IMPACT STATEMENT
DUAL KEY APARTMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH
SECTION 96 APPLICATION
MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT
80, 82 & 84 TASMAN PARADE, FAIRFIELD WEST

Reference is made to your letter to Charlie Rizk of Dyldam Developments Pty. Ltd. dated 2 October 2012 with respect to the potential impacts of dual key apartments and requesting that an assessment of the traffic and parking impacts be undertaken.

INTRODUCTION

This Practice prepared a Traffic Impact Statement in May 2012 which did not take into consideration the potential parking and traffic impacts of dual key apartments. This Statement provided an assessment based on a development yield of 160 apartments in conjunction with a medical centre component providing a floor area of 182m².

This Practice has subsequently been furnished with a revised development schedule, comprising 159 apartments (94 of which are dual key) in conjunction with a medical centre component providing a floor area of 155m².

The impacts of the proposed dual key apartments with respect to parking demand have previously been addressed in a letter to Council prepared by Robert Fewster of Brown Consulting (NSW) Pty. Ltd. dated 19 September 2012. This letter stated the following with respect to parking generation:

Parking Generation

The likely future owners and/or tenants of the proposed dual key apartments would be a couple and an adult relative/friend in the bedsit part of the apartment. It is considered that the occupants of a dual key apartment would

not have a car ownership pattern substantially different than, for example, a 2 bedroom apartment in the same building that is shared between several adults. Therefore it is appropriate for the parking demand for dual key apartments to be assessed at the same rate as for the apartment if it was not dual key. That rate is 1 parking space per 1, 2 or 3 bedroom apartment and 1 visitor space per 4 apartments...

The traffic generation of a development is somewhat related to parking provision, particularly for residential development. In this regard, the potential of a residential dwelling to generate traffic is reduced when parking for that dwelling is reduced or eliminated. If the parking generation argument presented above by Robert Fewster of Brown Consulting (NSW) Pty. Ltd. (whereby all dual key apartments are considered to form a single apartment) is applied to the traffic generation of the residential component, the external impacts of the development with respect to traffic generation will also not alter from that previously assessed.

However, in order to generate an absolute worst case scenario based on what we consider to be Council's view with respect to the traffic impacts of the proposal, the traffic generation potential of the development has been reassessed whereby all dual key apartments form two dwellings. Under this scenario, the development yield alters from the 160 dwellings and a 182m² medical centre previously assessed to 253 dwellings a 155m² medical centre. This correspondence therefore provides an assessment of the impacts of this assumed altered development yield with respect to traffic generation and external road network impacts.

BACKGROUND

2010 Approval and Assessment

Development consent (DA166.1/2010) was issued by Fairfield City Council in 2010 for a mixed use development within Nos. 368 Hamilton Road and Nos. 80 - 82 Tasman Parade comprising the following:

- 140 residential apartments including 5 one bedroom, 88 two bedroom and 47 three bedroom dwellings;
- A single commercial tenancy providing a floor area of 385m²; and
- A small medical centre providing a floor area of 183m².

This Practice prepared a detailed traffic impact assessment report in support of this approved development in January 2010. The assessed commercial and medical centre development yield was consistent with that approved and described above. However a slightly increased residential yield was assessed (151 dwellings, being 11 dwellings over and above that approved).

Original 2012 Assessment

In May 2012, this Practice prepared a Traffic Impact Statement for a Section 96 Application (the current application), which at the time involved alterations to the approved 2010 mixed use development yield as follows:

- The approved residential yield of 140 dwellings was proposed to be increased to 160 dwellings;
- The deletion of the approved commercial component; and
- The approved medical centre was proposed to be largely retained, providing a floor area of 182m².

Current Assessment

This assessment provides an assessment of the Section 96 application, providing the following development yield:

- 253 residential apartments; and
- A medical centre providing a floor area of 155m².

EXTERNAL CONSIDERATIONS

The May 2012 Traffic Impact Statement prepared by this Practice in support of the Section 96 application provided a summary of the traffic generating potential of the following based on traffic generation rates published by the Roads & Maritime Services:

- The development the subject of the 2010 Traffic Impact Statement prepared by this Practice comprising 151 dwellings, 385m² of commercial floor space and 183m² of medical centre floor space;
- The approved development yield comprising 140 dwellings, 385m² of commercial floor space and 183m² of medical centre floor space; and
- The originally proposed Section 96 application development yield the subject of the May 2012 Traffic Impact Statement prepared by this Practice comprising 160 dwellings and 182m² of medical centre floor space.

Table 1 overleaf provides an extension of the above previous assessment, including the amended development being the subject of this assessment, comprising 253 dwellings and 155m² of medical centre floor space.

| TABLE 1 APPROVED AND PROPOSED TRAFFIC GENERATION ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Land Use | Traffic Generation Rate | 2010 Assessed Development | Approved Development | May 2012 Assessed Development | Current Worst Case Scenario Assessment |
| Residential | 0.29 trips / dwelling | $151 \times 0.29 = 44$ trips | $140 \times 0.29 = 41$ trips | $160 \times 0.29 = 47$ trips | $253 \times 0.29 = 74$ trips |
| Medical Centre | 10.4 trips per 100m ² | $(183/100) \times 10.4 = 19$ trips | $(183/100) \times 10.4 = 19$ trips | $(182 / 100) \times 10.4 = 19$ trips | $(155 / 100) \times 10.4 = 17$ trips |
| Commercial | 2 trips per 100m ² | $(385/100) \times 2 = 8$ trips | $(385/100) \times 2 = 8$ trips | NA | NA |
| | TOTAL | 71 trips | 68 trips | 66 trips | 91 trips |

The worst case scenario assigns all dual key apartments as two dwellings therefore results in a total development traffic generation of 91 peak hour vehicle trips, being 23 additional peak hour trips over and above that previously approved under DA166.1/2010 or only 20 additional peak hour trips over and above that previously assessed within this Practice's January 2010 Traffic Impact Statement. Accordingly, the worst case scenario assumption results in an additional vehicle movement to or from the development site every three minutes during peak hours.

This following provides a summary of the trip assignment of the abovementioned additional vehicle trips over and above that previously assessed in 2010:

- 6 additional left turn ingress trips from Tasman Parade;
- 6 additional right turn ingress trips from Tasman Parade;
- 4 additional left turn egress trips to Tasman Parade; and
- 4 additional right turn egress trips to Tasman Parade.

This trip assignment is projected to result in the following additional movements at the previously surveyed and modelled key intersections:

- 10 additional peak hour vehicle movements at the intersection of Hamilton Road and Tasman Parade; and
- 5 additional peak hour vehicle movements at the intersection of Cumberland Highway and Hamilton Road.

The above additional traffic demands would generate an additional vehicle movement every 3 – 6 cycles at the signalised intersections of Hamilton Road with Tasman Parade and Cumberland Highway. Intersection analysis models are generally not sensitive to such low traffic volume differences on a signal cycle by cycle basis. Accordingly, the average vehicle delays, degree of saturation and level of service provided at the previously assessed nearby key signalised intersections are not projected to alter from that previously report upon and approved.

CONCLUSION

This correspondence provides an assessment of the likely traffic impacts of a Section 96 Application, whereby an absolute worst case scenario is applied which results in all proposed dual key apartments forming two dwellings from a traffic generation viewpoint. Having regard to the findings of this assessment, the following conclusion is provided:

- The assumption that all proposal dual key apartments comprise two dwellings results in the traffic generating ability of the proposal increasing by 20 and 23 peak hour vehicle trips over and above that previously assessed and approved respectively; and
- Such a minor level of additional traffic is not envisaged to invalidate the findings of previous assessments undertaken by this Practice; and
- Accordingly, the subject development is not anticipated to have any unreasonable external impacts over and above that previously assessed and approved.

Based on the contents of this assessment and the conclusions contained herein, we consider that there is external traffic related issues that should prevent approval of the subject application.

It would be appreciated if the information contained within this correspondence could be incorporated in Council's ongoing assessment of the subject Section 96 Application.

Yours faithfully,



David Thompson
Transport Planner