

Reference: 13.160 I03v01

traffix transport planners

suite 3.08 level 3 46a macleay street potts point nsw 2011 po box 1061 potts point nsw 1335 t: +61 2 8324 8700 f: +61 2 9380 4481 w: www.traffix.com.au director graham pindar acn: 065132961 abn: 66065132961

25th May 2014

Urbis Level 23 Darling Park Tower 2 201 Sussex Street Sydney NSW 2000

Attention: Stephen White, Director

Re: Response to Matters raised by JRPP, Grove Street, Dulwich Hill

Dear Stephen,

We refer to the subject development and in particular the issue of the provision of two car share spaces for the development. We have discussed this matter with Council's planner (Mr Jamie Erken) and in response, we now provide the following advice concerning the available options.

Option 1: On-Site Provision

It is understood that site constraints and the need to provide the requisite parking for the proposed uses preclude the opportunity of providing parking within the secure basement area. The use of the at-grade internal one-way roadway (South Street) is also not feasible due to manoeuvrability requirements of service vehicles as well as impacts on the amenity of the urban space. Therefore, we have reviewed the available on-site options and these are as follows:

1a. Base of Ramp external to car park security door

We have previously reviewed the concept arrangement prepared by Smart Design which we note has not been subject to a detailed design. Accordingly, we provide our TRAFFIX plan showing the design parameters in **Attachment 1**. This shows that these two spaces are both conveniently accessed in a forward direction, with reverse exits that are assisted by the 1m aisle extension (clear of the roller door) as would be required at the end of any 'blind aisle' under AS2890.1.

It will be noted that the exiting car needs to undertake a 4 point turn, which is a reverse out followed by a forward and backward shuffle, to then exit in a forward direction. In our view this is a viable option noting that visibility is good between a driver undertaking these manoeuvres and an entering driver, while the turnover of the two car share spaces will be moderate. Approach speeds of entering traffic will also be low.

This arrangement will require the general public (i.e. external to the site) walking down the ramp to access these car share spaces. While there are apparently many examples of this throughout Sydney, this aspect of this option renders is less favourable than an at-grade solution. It also makes no provision for GoGet cleaning vehicles to park adjacent.

1



1b. Within North Street

While North Street will operate as a public roadway, it is presently within the site and is an available option. In this regard, North Street is two-way onto Grove Street, but with entry only movement via Hill Street. Therefore, with two-way traffic flow along its length, the car share spaces could potentially be located on the southern (entry) side of the street; or on the northern (exit) side of the street. The former is not favoured as exiting drivers would need to undertake a three point turn to leave, which would occur in the vicinity of the main ramp access. The latter arrangement is thus favoured and would effectively involve a one-way anti-clockwise loop for car share customers, with entry via Hill Street and exit via Grove Street.

North Street is 7m wide (kerb to kerb) and we note that this is sufficient to accommodate two way flow with on-street parking generally based on Amcord Guidelines. In circumstances where only these two car share spaces would be permitted (with some loading also possible) and where traffic volumes are moderate, this would be a feasible option. It would also provide adjacent kerbspace for cleaning of share cars by Go Get vehicles.

Option 2: On-Street Provision

It is noted that the vast majority of Go Get (car share) spaces are provided on-street throughout Sydney, because this provides maximum exposure and promotes use of car share spaces by the general public. It is also more convenient for cleaning, whereby GoGet crews generally park adjacent to the spaces to clean the shared cars in-situ.

It is considered that the allocation of two car share spaces in Grove Street, close to the Light Rail Station and on the same side (i.e. within the confines of the site frontage), would be a viable option. It is also noted that the provision of car share spaces close to the station and the ratail floor area would be convenient for most people.

The allocation of these spaces is not expected to have any impact on existing residents, noting the on-street parking demands are moderate and in addition, the development provides sufficient on-site parking to meet its demands. Existing residents also generally have on site parking along Grove Street. Finally, it is considered that any reduction in parking for the general public would be more than offset by the fact that a single GoGet space is equivalent to about 7 'normal' cars based on turnover and usage. In this context, while it is a private facility, it is in effect a contributor to public transport in the same way that taxis are an acknowledged for of public transport.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we refer these options to Council for consideration in the first instance, noting that in our view Option 2 (Grove Street) is the preferred option, followed by Option 1b (North Street), then Option 1a (base of ramp). Please contact the undersigned should you have any queries or require any further information regarding the above.

Yours faithfully,

traffix

Graham Pindar Director Encl: Attachment 1



Attachment 1

traffic impact studies | expert witness | local govt. liaison | traffic calming | development advice | parking studies pedestrian studies | traffic control plans | traffic management studies | intersection design | transport studies

3

