



Reference: 11.294

5th April 2012

KDM & Associates Pty Ltd
10 Millstream Grove
Dural NSW 2158

traffix
traffic & 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

Attention: Mr Keith Hobbs, Project Manager

Re: Rozelle Village Parking Assessment, Cnr Victoria Rd and Darling Street Rozelle
Test of Adequacy

Dear Keith,

We refer to the letter from NSW Planning and Infrastructure dated 21st March 2012, which incorporates (in Attachment 2) a list of technical issues requiring further response. This includes the following issue which relates to our area of responsibility which concerns the proposed parking strategy:

“Consideration should be given to the use of “car sharing” and additional justification providing for an increased parking provision for the residential component, above that required by Council.

In response, we note the following matters:

- i. The seminal reference for parking associated with high-density residential dwellings is the RMS document entitled “Guide to Traffic Generation Developments”. This document provides parking rates for these developments in sub-regional centres which is based on extensive research. In this regard, the developments surveyed by RMS within the sub-regional centres are in most cases served by excellent public transport, including both bus and rail. They are also located within established commercial centres, where many trips involve walking. To this end, adoption of RMS rates can be argued as the minimum level of provision, which would result in a need for 308 spaces for the residential use. Nevertheless, the proposed development provides only 290 spaces for this use, so that it can be concluded that the underlying assumption is that even with 290 spaces provided there will be a significant suppression of car parking supply and hence car use.
- ii. The provision of 290 spaces is also less than the expected demand based on the 2006 census data, which indicates a need for 312 spaces for the residential component of the development.
- iii. We note that Council’s DCP requirement is for 226 spaces for the residential use. This is clearly substantially less than the expected demand based on the available research. Accordingly, the DCP is actively seeking to suppress parking in an attempt to alter the travel behaviour of the future resident population. While this is a legitimate objective, it is a long term objective that carries with it a responsibility to ensure that alternate travel modes are available to meet the balance of demands. We consider that while this may be the case for the journey to work, it is not the case for a whole range of resident trip purposes,



including educational, recreational, social, shopping etc., many of which occur at night time and on weekends; and many of which require the transport of bulky loads that are unsuited to public transport. Hence, while some of this demand can be taken up by using car share schemes (and this is to be investigated as part of a Travel Access Guide), in our view the disparity between the expected demand based on current travel behaviour (312 spaces) and the DCP requirement (226 spaces) represents a significant challenge. In our view, the risks to existing residents associated with such a low level of parking is unacceptable as on-street parking effects will be detrimental to their amenity.

In summary, we consider that the proposed parking (290 spaces) represents a suitable compromise between Council's DCP and the expected demand that will occur in the short to medium term. We also note that for some residents, the parking space provided may in any case be used for the parking of bikes motorcycles and scooters, as well as other general storage requirements.

Please contact us should you have any queries.

Yours faithfully,

traffix

Graham Pindar
Director

Email: graham.pindar@traffix.com.au