Our Ref: 20003

24 January 2020

JQZ Pły L†d
Retail 24 \& 25, 1 Nipper Stree $\dagger$
HOMEBUSH NSW 2140

## Attention: Mr Jeremy Hung

Dear Jeremy,

## RE: DA 6/2018 82-90 CHRISTIE ST, 84A CHRISTIE ST, 71-79 LITHGOW ST, 546-564

PACIFIC HWY, ST LEONARDS - $\$ 4.55$ TRAFFIC AND PARKING REVIEW

As requested, please herein Michael Lee \& Associates Transport Planning (MLA) traffic and parking assessment for the above proposed development to accompany a S4.55 application to amend the original approval in DA 6/2018.

## Background

In May 2015, the Sydney North Planning Panel granted development approval (DA 6/2018) for a proposed mixed use development at the above site.

The approval includes demolition of all existing buildings on the site and construction of two towers ( 26 and 47 storeys to accommodate a total of 654 units and retail uses and a public library, and a 14 -storey commercial tower. The approval also includes the construction of a 10 -level basement. In addition, a new laneway to the south of the site was also approved.

A $\$ 4.55$ application is being prepared for submission seeking approval to amend certain elements of the originally approved development.

This letter addresses the traffic and parking implications arising from the proposed $\$ 4.55$ modifications. The findings are contained herein.

## Proposed S4.55 Modifications

In relation to traffic and parking, this $\$ 4.55$ application seeks approval to reduce the number of approved residential apartments from 654 to 637 and changing the floor areas of the non-residential uses as shown in Table 1. Table 1 also provides details on the approved development.

Table 1: Proposed Modifications to Approved Land Uses

| Land Use | Approved Development <br> (DA 6/2018) (Apariments/Foor Area) |  |  | Current Proposed Modifications (Apartments/Floor Area) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Stie A | Site B | Total | Stie A | Site B | Total |
| Residential Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Studio | 2 | - | 2 | 0 | - | 0 |
| - 1-Bedroom | 197 | - | 197 | 181 | - | 181 |
| -2-Bedroom | 395 | - | 395 | 381 | - | 381 |
| - 3-Bedroom | 56 | - | 56 | 71 | - | 71 |
| - 4-Bedroom | 3 | - | 3 | 4 | - | 4 |
| - 5-Bedroom | 1 | - | 1 | 0 | - | 0 |
| - Total | 654 | - | 654 | 637 | - | 637 |
| Non-Residential Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Supermarket | $\begin{aligned} & 2,972 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 2,675 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,211 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 1,090 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GLA } \end{aligned}$ | 4,183m² GFA <br> $3,765 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GLA | $\begin{aligned} & 2,920 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 2,920 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GLA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 669 m^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 669 m^{2} \text { GLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,589 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 3,589 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GLA} \end{aligned}$ |
| - Specialty | $\begin{aligned} & 3,361 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 3,025 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GLA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,913 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 2,622 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GLA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,274 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 5,647 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GLA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,461 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA} \\ & 2,949 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GLA} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,751 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GFA } \\ & 1,484 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \text { GLA } \end{aligned}$ | $6,212 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA <br> $4,433 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GLA |
| - Commercial | - | 19,322m² GFA | 19,322m² GFA | $159 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA | $19,376 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA | 19,535 m² GFA |
| - Communal | 1,000m² GFA | - | 1,000 m² GFA | $759 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA | $318 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA | 1,077 m² GFA |

GFA/GLA - gross floor area/gross leasable area
As can be seen from the above, the overall apartment number reduces by 17 apartments from 654 to 637 . It is also noted that the revised apartment mix is generally consistent with that approved.

Similarly, the revised overall proposed retail area will decrease from $10,457 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA (or $9,412 m^{2}$ GLA) to $9,801 m^{2}$ GFA (or 8,022 $m^{2}$ GLA), while the revised commercial floor area will increase fractionally from $19,322 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (GFA) to $19,535 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (GFA). The communal area will increase from $1,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to $1,077 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

The proposed car parking provision is proposed to decrease in line with the revised proposed development. The revised overall proposed car parking provision is for a total of 1,037 car parking spaces comprising:

- residents - 542 car parking spaces
- residential visitors - provided as part of the VPA required parking provision (316 spaces in total)
- $\quad$ Site A retail uses - 316 car parking spaces as part of the VPA
- Site B retail uses - 58 car parking spaces, and
- commercial use - 121 car parking spaces.

In addition, minor design modifications to the basement car park and loading areas are also proposed. However, it is noted that the overall layout of the car park and loading dock remains generally consistent with the approved plans.

It is also noted that the number of proposed loading bays remains consistent with that shown in the approved plans.

## Traffic Effects of Proposed S4.55 Modifications

The (original DA and amended DA) traffic assessment reports' prepared by The Transport Planning Partnership (TTPP) indicated that the approved development would generate a total of 525 vehicles per hour (vph) during the busiest period.

The estimated development traffic extracted from the original DA traffic report is presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Estimated Development Traffic - Approved Development

| Land Use | Apariments/ Floor Area | Trip Rate (per unit/per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) |  | Total Trips (vph) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Morning Period | Evening Period | Morning Period | Evening Period |
| Residential | 654 units | 0.14 | 0.07 | 92 | 46 |
| Supermarket (GLA) | $3,578 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 2.63 | 7.50 | 94 | 268 |
| Specialty Retail (GLA) | $5,750 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 0.88 | 2.50 | 50 | 144 |
| Commercial | 19,297 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 0.46 | 0.35 | 89 | 68 |
| Total | - | - | - | 325 | 525 |

Source: TTPP Original DA Traffic Assessment Report (17235_r01v01_180110 TIA)
The development traffic arising from the revised proposed development has been estimated adopting the same methodology as that used in the previous traffic assessments conducted by TTPP.

The estimated development traffic for the revised proposed development is presented in Table 3.

[^0]Table 3: Estimated Development Traffic - Revised Proposed Development

| Land Use | Apartments/ Floor Area | Trip Rate (per unit/per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ ) |  | Total Trips (vph) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Morning Period | Evening Period | Morning Period | Evening Period |
| Residential | 637 units | 0.14 | 0.07 | 89 | 45 |
| Supermarket (GLA) | 3,589m² | 2.63 | 7.50 | 94 | 269 |
| Specialty Retail (GLA) | 4,433 ${ }^{2}$ | 0.88 | 2.50 | 39 | 111 |
| Commercial | 19,535 m ${ }^{2}$ | 0.46 | 0.35 | 90 | 68 |
| Total | - | - | - | 312 | 493 |

Using the same traffic estimation methodology as that presented in the original DA traffic report, the revised proposed development is expected to generate 491 vph during the busiest period. When compared with the estimated development traffic for the approved development in the same period (i.e. the evening peak period), this represents approximately 6 per cent reduction in the estimated overall development traffic arising from the revised proposed development.

Similarly, for the morning peak period the estimated development traffic would be reduced by approximately 4 per cent when compared with the estimated development traffic estimated for the approved development.

The estimated development traffic for the revised proposed S4.55 development is less than that expected for the approved development.

The previous traffic assessment reports assessed the traffic effects of the approved development at a number of nearby intersections using SIDRA. The SIDRA traffic models have been extensively reviewed and critiqued by Roads and Maritime Services. The SIDRA traffic models were subsequently approved by Roads and Maritime Services. The intersection analysis indicates that the assessed intersections following the completion of the proposed development would continue to operate satisfactorily with good level of service.

Given that the estimated development traffic for the revised proposed development would be less than that estimated for the approved development, the conclusion from the previous traffic assessment reports, that is the nearby assessed intersections would continue to operate satisfactorily, continues to be valid. That is, following the completion of the revised proposed development the local road network would continue to operate satisfactorily with good level of service.

## Parking Effects of Proposed S4.55 Modifications

The parking requirements for revised proposed development have been assessed against the requirements set out in Table 2 in Part R - Traffic, Transport and Parking of the Lane Cove Development Control Plan (DCP).

The parking requirements are presented in Table 4. Table 4 also presents the required and approved parking for the original development.

Table 4: Revised Proposed Development Parking Requirements

| Land Use | Dwellings/ Foor Area | Parking Rates | Parking Requirements | Proposed Parking Provision | Previous <br> Scheme <br> Required <br> Parking | Previous Approved Parking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - 1-Bedroom | 0 | 0.5 spaces per unit | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| - 1-Bedroom | 181 | 0.5 spaces per unit | 91 |  | 99 |  |
| - 2-Bedroom | 381 | 0.9 spaces per unit | 343 | 542 | 356 | 542 |
| - 3-Bedroom | 71 | 1.4 spaces per unit | 99 |  | 78 |  |
| - 4-Bedroom | 4 | 2.0 spaces per unit | 8 |  | 8 |  |
| - Tenant Sub-Total | - | - | 541 | 542 | 542 | 542 |
| - Visitors | - | 1.0 space per 5 units | 127 | NA§ | 131 | NA§ |
| - Residential Sub-Total | 637 | - | 668 | 542 | 673 | 542 |
| Non-Residential Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Supermarket (Site A) | $\begin{gathered} 2,920 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ \mathrm{GLA} \end{gathered}$ | 6.1 spaces per 100m² | 178 | 316§ | 163 | 316§ |
| - Specialty (Site A) | $\begin{gathered} 2,949 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ \text { GLA } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { space per } \\ 110 m^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 27 |  | 28 |  |
| - Supermarket (Site B) | 669m² GLA | 6.1 spaces per 100m² | 41 | 58 | 66 | 90 |
| - Specialty (Site B) | $\begin{gathered} 1,484 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ \text { GLA } \end{gathered}$ | 1 space per $110 m^{2}$ | 13 |  | 24 |  |
| - Retail Sub-Total | - | - | 259 | 374 | 281 | 406 |
| - Commercial | $\begin{gathered} 19,535 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \\ \text { GFA } \end{gathered}$ | 1 space per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ | 195 | 121 | 193 | 125 |
| - Commercial Sub-Total | - | - | 195 | 121 | 193 | 125 |
| Total | - | - | 1,122 | 1,037 | 1,147 | 1,073 |

GFA/GLA - gross floor area/gross leasable area
$\S$ - see discussion below
From Table 4, it can be seen that the DCP requires the revised proposed development to provide a total of 1,122 car parking spaces. It is proposed to provide a total of 1,037 car parking spaces including a stratum lot containing 316 car parking spaces to be dedicated to Council. This level of car parking provision is considered to be satisfactory for reasons explained below.

The proposed parking provision for the revised development is generally consistent with the approved parking provision for the original approval.

In addition, it is noted that the Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) requires a stratum lot for 316 car parking spaces to be constructed and dedicated to Council. This level of parking has been requested by Council to satisfy the parking demand generated by the proposed retail uses and residential visitors within Site A. The revised proposed development continues to provide a stratum lot containing 316 car parking spaces to comply with the VPA requirement.

The proposed car parking provision provides compliant car parking provision for the residential use as well as the retail use on Site B, and the 316 car parking spaces required under the VPA is also met. The exception is the proposed car parking provision for the commercial use where there would be a shortfall of some 74 car parking spaces. In this regard, it is noted that the approved parking for the commercial use also had a shortfall of some 68 car parking spaces when compared with the DCP requirement.

It is also noted that the approved commercial use relates to some $19,322 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ which the DCP requires 193 car parking spaces to be provided. However, the previous proposed development sought for a lesser amount of parking to be provided - 125 car parking spaces, which was subsequently approved. The proposed floor area for the commercial use in the revised proposed development continues to be consistent with the approved commercial floor area. As such, the required parking for the commercial use should continue to be in the same order as that originally approved, but further dispensation should be applied as discussed below.

It is noted that Lane Cove Council's DCP requires commercial developments in close proximity to St Leonards Railway Station to have parking provided at a rate of one space per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. This is considered to be excessive.

The development control plan applicable to commercial developments located in St Leonards CBD under the jurisdiction of North Sydney Council stipulates a parking provision rate of one space per 400m² (maximum). Similarly, in Willoughby Council's development control plan, it stipulates a parking provision rate of one space per $200 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

It is further noted that the subject site is located in close proximity to existing and future public transport hubs, namely the existing St Leonards Railway Station and bus services on Pacific Highway being at the doorsteps of the site as well as the future Crows Nest Metro station and not to mention a plethora of amenities and services surrounding the subject site.

In the light of the above discussion, there are merits to reduce parking requirement for commercial use outlined in the DCP.

As such, the overall proposed parking provision of 1,037 car parking spaces is considered to be satisfactory.

In relation to the design of the car park, it is proposed to design the car parking spaces to comply with the design requirements set out in the relevant Australian Standard for car parking facilities, namely AS2890.1:2004 and AS2890.6:2009.

The revised architectural plans of the basement car park are contained in Attachment One of this statement.

## Proposed Service Vehicle Bays

The revised proposed development proposed to provide the same number of service vehicle bays as approved. The proposed service vehicle bays comprise:

- $1 \times 14.7 \mathrm{~m}$ long bay accommodating vehicles up to 14.7 m long delivery trucks
- $2 \times 12.5 \mathrm{~m}$ long bays accommodating service vehicles up to an Australian Standard 12.5 m long heavy rigid vehicle
- $2 \times 8.8 \mathrm{~m}$ long bays accommodating service vehicles up to an Australian Standard 8.8 m long medium rigid vehicle, and
- $1 \times 6.4 \mathrm{~m}$ long bay accommodating service vehicles up to an Australian Standard 6.4 m long small rigid vehicle.

All proposed service vehicle bays (with the exception of the 14.7 m long bay which is for supermarket exclusive use) will be shared between different uses of the proposed development.

The proposed loading dock also includes a turn table to assist service vehicles accessing the loading bays, and to facilitate entry and exit in a forward direction.

The loading dock is proposed to be designed to comply with the design requirements set out in AS2890.2:2018.

## Proposed Access Arrangements

Consistent with the approved development, the proposed development (including for service vehicles) will be accessed from the approved new laneway near the termination of Lithgow Street. As per the approval, the access will continue to have three traffic lanes (at the property boundary) comprising:

- single lane, two-way ramp providing access to the loading dock
- single entry lane into the public car park which also permits residential traffic to diverge into the express ramp in the evening period, and
- $\quad$ single exit lane from the public car park which residential traffic will merge into during the morning period.

In addition, consistent with the approval a driveway layback is also proposed such that the access into the driveway appears and operates as a private driveway.

In addition, roller shutter gates be provided at the end of the proposed contra flow express residential access. The roller shutter gates will be provided to Council's requirements.

## Summary and Conclusion

MLA has conducted a traffic and parking review for the subject proposed Section 4.55 application to modify the approved development at 82-90 Christie Street, 84a Christie Street, 71-79 Lithgow Street and 546-564 Pacific Highway, St Leonards.

The proposed modifications in this $\$ 4.55$ application include the reduction of the approved number of apartments and changes to the non-residential floor areas. Minor design changes to the overall car park and loading dock layout are also proposed. However, these minor design changes will not alter the approved car park and loading dock layout such that they are no longer consistent with the approved plans.

In terms of the traffic effects of the proposed modifications, the review indicates that the revised proposed development would generate less traffic than that adopted in the traffic assessment that accompanied the original development application. As such, the revised proposed development is not expected to create any traffic impacts worse than the original approved scheme. Following the completion of the revised proposed development, the surrounding road network would continue to operate satisfactorily with acceptable level of service.

The overall proposed parking provision of 1,037 car parking space for the revised proposed development is considered to be generally in compliance with the parking requirements outlined in the DCP with the exception of the proposed parking provision for the commercial use. It is also generally consistent with the approved parking for the original approved development. For reasons explained in this report, it is considered the parking provision for the commercial use is also satisfactory.

As such, the proposed parking provision is expected to continue to provide adequate car parking for the proposed development and not result in any adverse impact to the on-street parking in the local area.

Overall, the traffic and parking aspects of the revised proposed development are satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,


Michael Lee Director

## Attachment One

## Architectural Car Park Plans














[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Original DA Traffic Assessment Report prepared by TTPP Ref: 17235_r01v01_180110 TIA dated 10 January 2018 and Amended DA Traffic Assessment Report prepared by TTPP Ref: 17235IO7-DA Addendum Traffic Report 180824 dated 24 August 2018

