

Reference: 24267

17 October 2025

RSDNC

Joey Zeaiter

Email [REDACTED]

Dear Joey,

Re: 30 Marskeill Circuit, Mudgee – Traffic Response to RFI

I have considered the relevant traffic and parking matters contained in Council's RFI (DA0224/2025) of 12 September 2025.

This supplementary assessment responds to those matters and is to be read in conjunction with the architectural plans prepared by RSDNC. The corresponding responses are outlined in the following:

2. Vehicle/Road Safety

2. Tandem car spaces are proposed. The current layout is highly impractical, especially for a large number of spaces and when combined with blind aisle parking spaces where no through access is proposed. This is especially seen where vehicles are expected to park right off the entrance (i.e car space S1). Further, car park be full, how will vehicles successfully manoeuvre and exit the site? Are there turning circle diagrams for this scenario?

Our Response

- The proposed tandem parking spaces are reserved for staff only and is a typical arrangement for child care centres. Their use and function result in minimal conflict with visitors/carers as staff members typically arrive/depart outside the Centre's peak set down and pick up periods.
- A swept path diagram demonstrating a B99 vehicle turning around at a fully occupied car park is provided in Attachment 1.

3. No nominated pedestrian pathway is proposed within the car park. Please provide a pedestrian pathway from the carpark to the reception/lobby area.

[REDACTED]

Pedestrian pathways have been nominated on the revised plans.

4. In practice, all parking spaces will be used for pick up/drop off – except the staff parking forward of the stacked spaces. Will these be nominated?

Our Response

Appropriate signage can be provided to prevent parents from misusing the staff parking spaces.

5. Please advise how waste will be collected, and deliveries will be made to the site. Noting the tight confines and limited turn around area within the car park please submit details of the largest size vehicle to enter the site and appropriate swept paths.

Our Response

It is advised that the Centre will be employing the services of private waste contractor to serve the Centre. The nominated truck (a small rigid truck) will stand on the vacant visitor car parking area (outside set down and pick up periods) when attending the site.

16. Queueing and Drop-Off Behaviour: The report does not evaluate the potential for vehicle queueing during peak drop-off and pick-up times. Without modelling or observation-based assumptions, it is unclear whether on-street parking or congestion may result during busy periods.

Our Response

The proposal involves a 62-place child care centre. Section 6.2 of the accompanying Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) evaluates traffic generation using the TfNSW-specified rates, projecting peak inbound traffic of 24 vehicles during the morning peak hour and 14 vehicles during the afternoon peak hour. This equates to an average arrival rate of approximately 1 vehicle every 2 to 3 minutes.

A total of 7 visitor parking spaces are provided onsite. According to the *Validation Trip Generation Surveys for Child Care Centres* published by TfNSW, the average vehicle dwell time is 6.7 minutes. On this basis, each parking space could theoretically accommodate 8 to 9 drop-off/pick-up movements per hour, providing an overall capacity of approximately 56 vehicle movements per hour.

The available parking capacity (7 spaces) therefore comfortably exceeds the projected peak inbound traffic demand, indicating minimal risk of parking overflow or congestion within or adjacent to the site.

17. Emergency Waste Vehicles and Delivery Vehicle Access: There is no mention of access suitability for emergency vehicles such as ambulances or fire trucks, which is a critical operational consideration for a childcare facility. Further, there is no information on waste collection or delivery vehicles. Details of the maximum vehicle size to enter the site are requested.

Our Response

Standard ambulances (6.5 m) and fire-fighting vehicles (10.5 m) are expected to attend the site in the event of an emergency. Sufficient space is available within the visitor car park to accommodate an ambulance. Should the car park be fully occupied at the time of attendance, a staff parking space can be temporarily vacated to facilitate access. In addition, there is ample on-street parking available for emergency vehicles. Fire-fighting vehicles typically do not enter the site during emergency operations.

18. Driveway Location The proposed driveway is located in conflict with the power pole, Electrical pillar, telecommunications pit and sewer IO. To facilitate access, these services will need to be relocated at the cost of the developer. Please advise if this is your intention?

Our Response

Yes.

i. Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD): Most notably, the report does not assess whether the proposed driveway provides adequate Safe Intersection Sight Distance (SISD) in accordance with Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4A and AS2890.1:2004. SISD is a fundamental safety requirement ensuring vehicles can safely exit the site with clear visibility of oncoming traffic. This omission is significant and should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Our Response

The proposed driveway has been assessed against the sight line requirements set out in Clause 3.2.4 of the AS2890.1:2004. Details of the driver and pedestrian sightlines are demonstrated in **Attachment 2**.

ii. Blind Aisle Consideration: The carparks referenced as S1, S2, S9 & S10 and the shared space are a Blind Aisle. Therefore, these must be redesigned to ensure that they comply with the requirements for blind aisles as specified in AS2890.1. In addition, the detailed dimensioned plan of each car park space must be provided separately, along with confirmation that the blind aisle provisions have been met for the applicable spaces. Additionally, please confirm what would occur in the event a car entered, and all spaces were full. How would this vehicle be able to manoeuvre and exit in a safe manner?

All car spaces have been designed to satisfy the requirements of AS2890.1:2004, including provision for blind aisle where required. Furthermore, all car spaces have been annotated accordingly as required.

iii. Lack of a Parking Plan of Management (POM): The proposal includes tandem parking arrangements. Noting the potential for conflicts, any consideration of such an arrangement would require a clear Parking Plan of Management (POM) to ensure that all car spaces remain accessible, particularly during overlapping staff shifts and parent drop-off periods. Without a POM, the risk of inefficient parking use and potential conflict increases.

Our Response

Details to be provided in a Plan of Management (POM).
[REDACTED]

iv. Pedestrian Linkages/Footpath Access: The report does not appear to address the availability of footpaths or pedestrian connections to the site. Given the nature of a childcare centre, it is important to ensure safe and convenient access for families who may arrive on foot or with prams. It would be helpful if the proposal could consider or incorporate formal pedestrian linkages to support safe and inclusive access to the facility.

Our Response

The site is located within a developing residential subdivision area. Existing footpaths currently terminate at Salesyard Lane, approximately 120 metres north of the site. It is anticipated that Council will extend the footpath network as surrounding residential development progresses. The proposal includes the provision of footpaths along the site frontage, consistent with standard development practice for projects of this nature.

In relation to Fencing:

• *There are concerns that the retaining and fencing (total height 2.4m forward of the building line will impact on sightlines and driver safety, especially when it is proposed only 1.318m from the boundary at the corner.*

Our Response

The revised plan will no longer propose retaining structure/fencing that exceed the driver's eye height i.e. 1.1 metre.

I trust the above adequately responds to Council's concerns. Otherwise, please do not hesitate to contact me at 02 7255 8198 to discuss this further.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Bernard Lo BE (Civil), MTrans, PRE 0001491, NER
Principal

Attachment 1

Swept Path Assessment

