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## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1 Objective

- The purpose of this study is to provide a review and independent assessment of cumulative traffic impacts current proposal and other approved proposals within Lane Cove Council's portion of St Leonards. These proposals are located in:
- St Leonards South (residential)

1. St Leonards South Master Plan precinct (bounded by Pacific Highway, Greenwich Road, River Road and Rail line)
2. Loftex development (1-25 Marshall Ave).

- St Leonards East (commercial/mixed use)

1. New Hope development (496-520 Pacific Highway)
2. Winten development (71-79 Lithgow St and 82-90 Christie St)
3. Mirvac development (472-494 Pacific Highway)

### 1.2 Findings

- Overall, this Study finds that traffic increases are very moderate for each of the development sites, especially where proposed developments are "replacing existing substantial buildings". "Levels of service remained essentially the same for all models" compared to a pre-development base (see Section 4).


### 1.3 Recommendations

- Modelling indicates that "relatively minor improvements" would be required to maintain satisfactory network function as a result of all development. Furthermore, these improvements (illustrated in Figure 4 on Page 9) would "be required regardless of the approved and proposed developments subject of this report".
- For the St Leonards South (residential) area, the recommended infrastructure improvements are:
- Removal of the roundabout at the intersection of Marshall Ave/Berry Road and replace with a Give Way intersection, and
- Provide a new road connection between Berry Road and Park Road.
- However it is recommended that the measure involving the proposed removal of the roundabout be further investigated in detail at the Development Application stage.
- For the St Leonards East (commercial/mixed use) area, no infrastructure improvements are recommended.


## 2 INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Study Objective

- The purpose of this study is to provide a review and independent assessment of traffic impacts of current and approved proposals in the Lane Cove portion of St Leonards South and East precincts.
- Specifically, the report aims to address the cumulative impacts of current development in conjunction with other, approved, developments in the same area, namely
- St Leonards South Master Plan development (Rezoning stage - Gateway Determination)
- Proposed number of dwellings - 2,400 (assuming full development from Canberra Avenue up to Park Road)
- Winten development (Rezoning stage - being finalised by State government)
- 71 - 79 Lithgow St and $82-90$ Christie St - 450 residential units \& $7,760 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial/retail area
- Loftex development (DA stage - approved)
- 15-25 Marshall Ave - 66 apartments \& $105 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial/retail area at the ground floor
- 1-13 Marshall Ave - 269 apartments \& $290 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial/ retail space located on Level $1\left(123 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)$ and $3\left(167 \mathrm{~m}^{2}\right)$ of the high rise building
- Mirvac development (DA stage - approved)
- 472-494 Pacific Hwy - 539 apartments \& 8,263 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ of specialty retail and restaurant/cafe tenancies
- New Hope \& VIMG development (DA stage - awaiting final determination)
- 496-504 Pacific Highway - 495 apartments $\& 5,628 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of commercial floor space


### 2.2 History of assessments and modelling approach

- Previously, a microsimulation model was developed by GTA Consultants to examine new large scale developments and the impacts the additional traffic may have on the surrounding road network (GTA model). The GTA model utilised Paramics microsimulation software package.
- The GTA model was approved by RMS as "fit for purpose", although it had some issues, namely fixed traffic signal phasing and limited representation of pedestrian movements. The GTA model was calibrated and validated against a set of data, containing intersection traffic counts and results of travel time and queue length surveys.
- The GTA model was further developed by Transport Modellers Alliance (TMA). TMA explored various development scenarios for St Leonards South on behalf of Lane Cove Council.
- Initially, TMA used the GTA model as a base model and added various developments to create the TMA Base Model 2021 with
- approved developments under LEP 2009
- general network traffic growth and
- developments as per the St Leonards South Master Plan bounded by rail line/Marshall Ave/River Rd/Berry Rd
- The TMA Base Model 2021 is essentially the GTA Model with additional future traffic.
- This TMA Base Model 2021 was then used to test impacts of a number of the recently proposed (some of them now approved) developments along Pacific Hwy (Site A = 84-90 Christie St/ 75-79 Lithgow St and Sites B \& C = 472-520 Pacific Highway).
- The final model, described in TMA report dated 11 September 2015, may be called, for easier reference, TMA Base Model 2021+ABC (refer to Appendix A for a copy of the TMA report).
- Due to a number of reasons, one of them being issues that RMS had with trip generation rates and modelling results for TMA Model 2021+ABC, Council has decided to engage an independent modelling firm (TEF Consulting) to revisit TMA Model 2021+ABC.
- Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the RMS letter with regard to the TMA report of 11 September 2015.
- Given the issues with GTA Model and TMA models based on GTA model previously, TEF approach was to replicate GTA Model in Aimsun environment and then to add on traffic volumes to develop 2021 TEF Base and TEF $2021+$ ABC models in Aimsun instead of Paramics.
- The Aimsun version of the GTA model, TEF Base 2013 model, was built using the trip (OD) matrices from the GTA model, with the road geometry, traffic signal programming and public transport (PT) coded from the beginning.
- TEF Base 2013 was then calibrated and validated using the same data that was used for calibration and validation of the GTA Model.
- It was agreed between RMS and Council that no new (2016) traffic surveys were to be undertaken and it was acceptable for the TEF Base model to be an Aimsun replica of the Paramic based GTA Model, that is calibrated on 2013 survey data.
- TEF Base model was subsequently approved as fit-for-purpose by RMS.
- Details of the TEF Base model are described in the calibration report, a copy of which is attached in Appendix B.
- The decision to move to Aimsun environment has provided an opportunity to improve network representation (actuated traffic signals instead of fixed signals and more detailed pedestrian and PT modelling) and to establish a better base for the model use and expansion in the future.


## 3 MODELLING SPECIFICATIONS

### 3.1 Model Study Area

- Refer to Figure 1


Figure 1: Study area.
3.2 Software

- Aimsun v.8.07

Microsimulation model
3.3 TEF Base Model 2013

- Refer to the TEF Calibration report in Appendix B for a detailed description of the TEF Base (2013) model
3.3.1 Zoning System
- The Base model adopted the zoning system used in GTA Model (same system was also used in TMA models)
- Refer to Figure 4
- 36 zones in total


Figure 2: Model zoning system - Base model 2013.

### 3.3.2 Demand (OD) Matrix

- The demand matrix was imported from the Paramics model developed by GTA Consultants


### 3.4 TEF Base Model 2021

### 3.4.1 Zoning System

- TEF Base model 2021 adopted the zoning system used in TMA Base Model 2021


## - Refer to Figure 3

- 56 zones in total
- Additional zones were introduced to account for LEP 2009 growth, St Leonards South Master Plan and new developments A, B \& C (refer to Section 1.2 of the present report) and also Loftex (Marshall Ave, Site L) sites.


### 3.4.2 Demand (OD) Matrix

- TEF Base model 2021 adopted the trip matrices used in TMA Base Model 2021 with the following trip generators/attractors and changes.
- LEP Growth - imported from TMA model,
- except Site $L$, where the following changes were made
- Trip generation was adjusted to account for the actual approved number of residential units (335) as opposed the number used in the DA report (271 units) prepared by Traffix (report Reference: 11.066 r 03 v 03 )


Figure 3: Model zoning system - Base model 2021.

- Peak hour trip rates were adopted from the Traffix report.
- These rates are the same as in the RMS request as detailed in a letter dated 04 January 2016, that is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM peak) and 0.07 trips per dwelling (PM peak)
- Trip distribution was based on the 2011 Journey to Work data (TZ 1832)
- Percentage of origin and destination suburbs for driver travel mode were extracted for each suburb and the aggregated by general direction.
- For the OD centroids (Aimsun name for "nodes" in Paramics), distribution was then carried out having regard to the actual traffic flow by connection.
- Refer to Appendix C for calculation spreadsheets.
- Growth on RMS network - imported from TMA model
- St Leonards South Master Plan
- Trip generation - corrected as follows
- Number of dwellings was changed from 2,200 (TMA) to 2,400 (as per the latest Council's advice)
- Note that the addition of 650 dwellings described in TMA report is no longer pursued.
- Peak hour trip rates were adopted from the RMS request as detailed in a letter dated 04 January 2016, that is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM peak) and 0.07 trips per dwelling (PM peak)
- Increased from TMA rates of 0.07 (AM) and 0.06 (PM) trips per dwelling.
- Trip distribution was based on the 2011 Journey to Work data (TZ 1832)
- Same as for Site L
- Refer to Appendix C for calculation spreadsheets.


### 3.5 TEF Model 2021 +ABC

### 3.5.1 Demand (OD) Matrix

- Trip generation
- Site A
- Winten development
- 71 - 79 Lithgow St and 82 - 90 Christie St - 450 residential units \& $7,760 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ commercial/retail area
- Trip generation was adopted from the DA report prepared by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes Pty Ltd (report reference: 9351/3 dated December 2014)


## - Site B

- Mirvac development
- 472-494 Pacific Hwy - 539 apartments $\& 8,263 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of specialty retail and restaurant/cafe tenancies
- Trip generation was adopted from the DA report prepared by Calibre Consulting (report reference: 15-002041 dated $07 / 08 / 2015$ ), with the following changes
- The number of residential units was changed from 535 units (report) to 539 (approved)
- The floor area for commercial/retail/supermarket tenancies was changed from $6,494 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (report) to $8,263 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (approved)
- Peak hour trip generation rates for residential units were adopted from the RMS request as detailed in a letter dated 04 January 2016, that is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM peak) and 0.07 trips per dwelling (PM peak)
- Increased from Calibre Consulting rates of 0.07 (AM) and $0.06(\mathrm{PM})$ trips per unit.


## - Site C

- New Hope \& VIMG development
- 496-520 Pacific Hwy, St Leonards - 495 apartments and 5,628 m² of commercial floor space.
- Trip generation was adopted from the DA report prepared by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes Pty Ltd (CBHK) (report reference: 9923/3 dated December 2015)
- Peak hour trip generation rates for residential units were adopted from the RMS request as detailed in a letter dated 04 January 2016, that is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM peak) and
- Decreased from CBHK rates of 0.15 (AM) and 0.19 (PM) trips per unit.
- Trip distribution for all sites A, B, C and L was based on the 2011 Journey to Work data (TZ 1832)
- Same as for Site L and St Leonards South Master Plan
- Refer to Appendix C for calculation spreadsheets.


### 3.6 Model runs

- For each development scenario, the respective models had 5 microsimulation replications (runs) carried out for the morning peak and 5 for the afternoon peak.
- Sets of seed numbers were the same for all model scenarios.
- Seed numbers were set as per the RMS Traffic Modelling Guidelines.
- Analysis of the results was performed on averages calculated for 5 replications in each instance.


## 4 MODELLING RESULTS

### 4.1 TEF Base Model 2021

- This model comprises a calibrated 2013 network with new OD matrices to create a 2021 base traffic situation.
- The OD matrices were imported from TMA models accepted by RMS previously, with the changes as described in Section 2.4.2 of the present report.
- Changes of trip generation introduced by TEF were based on trip rates requested by RMS.
- These changes resulted in higher traffic generation in some areas compared with the previous TMA models.
- TEF model, therefore, considers the same or worse conditions compared with those estimated by TMA previously.
- The initial runs of the model indicated substantial deterioration of the operation of certain intersections and road links.
- Capacity constraints resulted in some microsimulation runs coming to a halt due to interlocking blockages in the system. Because of this situation, average delays and other parameters for network operation assessment could not be extracted.
- A range of measures have been introduced to achieve satisfactory performance of the majority of the links and intersection on the network, before proceeding with loading of additional traffic from the new large-scale developments.
- These measures are detailed in Figure 4 overleaf.
- One particular measure involved replacement of the existing roundabout at the intersection of Marshall Ave and Berry Rd with a priority control intersection.
- This measure was necessary to unlock the gridlock occurring during the microsimulation process. Queuing extending to the south from the intersection of Pacific Hwy and Berry Rd consistently blocked the roundabout, thus not letting vehicles from Marshall Ave to exit. Conversion of this intersection into a Give Way control resolved this issue.
- It is noted that this appears to be an issue with the simulation of the roundabout operation (due to limitations of modelling software) rather than the actual capacity issues. Following a discussion of this matter with an RMS modeller, it was agreed to adopt this change of intersection control for modelling purposes as this change was minor in terms of the overall model and did not impact on modelling results for critical road links and intersections.
- However, it is recommended that the above issue be further investigated separately, as it falls outside of the scope of the current report. The temporary solution introduced by TEF for the modelling purposes only served the purpose of unlocking the model to enable unhindered assessment of the larger network and main roads specifically.
- The base cycle time was increased compared with the Base 2013 model ( 135 to 150 seconds).
- Other measures were generally of minor nature and did not involve infrastructure modifications.
- After the proposed measures, the network operated in a stable manner with acceptable operational parameters. This scenario was regarded as a suitable base case for assessment of the proposed large scale developments.
- Table 3.1 shows results of modelling. Detailed results are contained in Appendix D, together with definitions of Level of Service parameter used in Table 3.1.


Figure 4: Proposed network improvements for Base Model 2021.

- The results contained in Table 3.1 generally indicate better delays and levels of
service at key intersection compared with those reported by TMA (refer to Appendix A) from the Paramics model. In our opinion, this is likely to be due to the use of adaptive, rather than fixed, traffic signals and thus better propagation of traffic between the intersections, as well as due to some network improvements described earlier.
- Following Council's request, the impacts of Site $L$ were analysed prior to the assessment of sites A, B and C. The results included in Table 3.1 are for the full Base Model 2021, inclusive of Site L. Table 3.1a contains modelling results prior to introduction of Site $L$ for comparison. As may have been expected, the differences in delays and queuing are minor and generally fluctuate up and down compared with the full Base Model 2021.

Table 3.1. Intersection operation - Base Model 2021.

| Base Model 2021 |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{array}\right\|$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{array}\right\|$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | 1513 | 16.4 | 9.4 |  |  |  | 1210 | 19.3 | 9.8 | 381 | 27.9 | 9.0 | 18.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1623 | 44.5 | 23.6 | 553 | 41.5 | 6.4 | 919 | 23.4 | 7.0 | 980 | 26.5 | 11.0 | 35.0 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1585 | 15.6 | 10.2 | 257 | 61.4 | 9.2 | 1362 | 22.0 | 12.6 | 196 | 122.9 | 6.8 | 27.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Oxley St | 1644 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 183 | 53.2 | 3.6 | 1496 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 180 | 54.9 | 5.4 | 10.8 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 2057 | 16.8 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 1342 | 13.6 | 4.4 | 620 | 80.4 | 13.2 | 25.5 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 585 | 51.9 | 9.8 | 2640 | 17.5 | 15.2 | 137 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1750 | 16.8 | 11.2 | 20.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Herbert St | 709 | 64.8 | 18.8 | 2364 | 21.2 | 11.6 |  |  |  | 2177 | 15.4 | 4.2 | 24.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 169 | 44.2 | 6.6 | 1981 | 29.7 | 15.6 | 526 | 59.9 | 9.6 | 1891 | 13.1 | 7.6 | 26.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1723 | 10.2 | 7.8 | 584 | 54.5 | 10.0 | 1868 | 17.7 | 11.0 | 19.7 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 587 | 36.4 | 13.4 | 1221 | 17.6 | 8.8 | 192 | 30.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  | 24.3 | B |
| River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 482 | 53.3 | 7.0 | 1601 | 54.9 | 33.4 | 312 | 86.1 | 8.8 | 641 | 50.0 | 8.8 | 56.8 | E |

Afternoon peak

| Base Model 2021 |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | 1170 | 11.2 | 6.4 |  |  |  | 1404 | 19.0 | 10.8 | 288 | 23.1 | 6.8 | 16.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1274 | 41.3 | 20.4 | 723 | 36.3 | 6.6 | 1119 | 27.9 | 10.0 | 930 | 22.4 | 10.2 | 32.4 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1255 | 14.4 | 8.6 | 195 | 60.5 | 8.8 | 1157 | 18.4 | 11.4 | 159 | 82.8 | 5.8 | 23.2 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 1256 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 319 | 104.9 | 6.8 | 1238 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 160 | 59.5 | 5.2 | 19.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 1531 | 9.0 | 8.4 |  |  |  | 1276 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 560 | 62.4 | 12.6 | 19.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 360 | 42.8 | 8.0 | 1977 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 68 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1676 | 13.6 | 10.8 | 14.1 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 858 | 60.5 | 21.0 | 1563 | 20.2 | 8.2 |  |  |  | 2059 | 16.3 | 5.0 | 26.1 | B |
| Pacific Hwy |  | Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 258 | 41.6 | 7.8 | 1402 | 22.2 | 10.4 | 204 | 53.7 | 5.8 | 1948 | 9.8 | 6.4 | 18.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1411 | 6.5 | 4.2 | 268 | 63.4 | 8.6 | 1717 | 16.7 | 10.2 | 16.1 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 856 | 28.2 | 14.8 | 818 | 17.2 | 7.8 | 384 | 36.4 | 7.8 |  |  |  | 25.4 | B |
| River Rd | / | Greenwich Rd | 422 | 63.6 | 7.2 | 942 | 20.5 | 14.6 | 239 | 80.0 | 7.6 | 1175 | 27.0 | 8.4 | 34.9 | C |

Table 3.1a. Intersection operation - Base Model 2021 without Site L.
Morning peak

| Base Model 2021 - L | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy / Alexander St | 1501 | 16.2 | 9.4 |  |  |  | 1220 | 16.4 | 9.2 | 378 | 29.0 | 9.0 | 17.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1616 | 44.8 | 25.0 | 556 | 40.7 | 6.4 | 942 | 25.0 | 7.2 | 969 | 25.0 | 10.8 | 35.0 | C |
| Pacific Hwy / Hume St | 1586 | 16.1 | 10.6 | 250 | 56.5 | 8.6 | 1392 | 22.0 | 12.2 | 196 | 106.1 | 6.8 | 26.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Oxley St | 1646 | 6.6 | 5.0 | 183 | 53.7 | 3.8 | 1524 | 6.1 | 5.2 | 180 | 54.6 | 5.4 | 11.2 | A |
| Pacific Hwy / Albany St | 2034 | 16.9 | 12.0 |  |  |  | 1296 | 12.9 | 5.0 | 624 | 78.3 | 13.6 | 25.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Christie St | 583 | 51.9 | 9.6 | 2625 | 16.9 | 15.8 | 126 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1714 | 16.7 | 12.0 | 20.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Herbert St | 706 | 57.1 | 17.4 | 2358 | 20.7 | 12.0 |  |  |  | 2209 | 16.0 | 4.6 | 23.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 185 | 42.0 | 6.4 | 1972 | 30.5 | 16.0 | 509 | 55.0 | 9.2 | 1909 | 13.1 | 7.2 | 26.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1716 | 10.1 | 7.4 | 557 | 55.3 | 9.8 | 1863 | 16.5 | 10.2 | 19.1 | B |
| Shirley Rd / River Rd | 555 | 36.4 | 13.6 | 1220 | 17.4 | 8.2 | 193 | 27.7 | 4.4 |  |  |  | 23.8 | B |
| River Rd / Greenwich Rd | 486 | 53.1 | 7.6 | 1598 | 53.5 | 32.0 | 311 | 88.6 | 9.0 | 615 | 52.4 | 9.0 | 56.8 | E |

Afternoon peak


- This model comprises TEF Base Model 2021 plus additional traffic generated by Site A.
- It is noted that the approved development on Site A replaces the existing commercial buildings with a total floor area of approximately $6,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and its trip generation.
- Trip generation for the respective OD centroid was reduced accordingly prior to overlaying additional trips from the proposed development.
- Council's Development Control Plan for the 'Winten' site development envisages to close the existing Christie Lane to vehicular traffic. A 'new Christie Lane' would then be relocated to the south of the development site and be a 2 lane road. Council would also partially close the adjoining portion of Lithgow St to allow the development of its Over Rail Plaza. This was illustrated in the draft Voluntary Planning Agreement (reproduced in Figure 5 below). Aimsun model was amended to reflect this proposal (also shown in Figure 5).


Figure 5: Proposed network improvements for Base Model 2021+A.
4.3 Model 2021+AB

- This model comprises TEF Model 2021+A plus additional traffic generated by Site B.
- It is noted that the approved development on Site B replaces the existing commercial \& retail land uses with a total floor area of approximately $11,800 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and their trip generation.
- Trip generation for the respective OD centroid was reduced accordingly prior to overlaying additional trips from the proposed development.


### 4.4 Model 2021+ABC

- This model comprises TEF Model 2021+AB plus additional traffic generated by Site C.
- It is noted that the approved development on Site C replaces the existing commercial building with a total floor area of approximately $12,380 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and its trip generation.
- Trip generation for the respective OD centroid was reduced accordingly prior to overlaying additional trips from the proposed development.


### 4.5 Comparison of delays and queues

- Tables 3.2 and 3.3 show the results of modelling for morning and afternoon peak hours respectively, for all of the above models for comparison. Detailed results are contained in Appendix D.
- The results of modelling for all development options, with consideration of subsequent cumulative impacts of each large development analysed in this study, are generally consistent with findings of the traffic impact assessment reports submitted for the respective development applications.
- Primarily due to the fact that the proposed developments replace existing substantial buildings, traffic increases as a result were very moderate for each of the developments $L, A, B$ and $C$ and in some cases a reduction of trip generation resulted from the land use change.
- Accordingly, although total traffic delays for the whole network generally increased with each additional development, some intersections even experienced slight improvements (due to traffic redistribution), whilst increased delays at other intersections were minor to moderate. Levels of Service remained essentially the same for all models.


### 4.6 Comparison of travel times

- Figures 5 to 8 show the modelled travel times along the main routes for morning and afternoon peak hours, for all of the above models for comparison.

Table 3.2. Intersection operation - comparison of models - morning peak hour.

| Base Model 2021 |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue $\max$ <br> (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Queue } \\ \max \\ \text { (veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Queue } \\ \text { max } \\ \text { (veh) } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue $\max$ <br> (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Alexander St | 1513 | 16.4 | 9.4 |  |  |  | 1210 | 19.3 | 9.8 | 381 | 27.9 | 9.0 | 18.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1623 | 44.5 | 23.6 | 553 | 41.5 | 6.4 | 919 | 23.4 | 7.0 | 980 | 26.5 | 11.0 | 35.0 | c |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Hume St | 1585 | 15.6 | 10.2 | 257 | 61.4 | 9.2 | 1362 | 22.0 | 12.6 | 196 | 122.9 | 6.8 | 27.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Oxley St | 1644 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 183 | 53.2 | 3.6 | 1496 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 180 | 54.9 | 5.4 | 10.8 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Albany St | 2057 | 16.8 | 14.0 |  |  |  | 1342 | 13.6 | 4.4 | 620 | 80.4 | 13.2 | 25.5 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Christie St | 585 | 51.9 | 9.8 | 2640 | 17.5 | 15.2 | 137 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1750 | 16.8 | 11.2 | 20.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Herbert St | 709 | 64.8 | 18.8 | 2364 | 21.2 | 11.6 |  |  |  | 2177 | 15.4 | 4.2 | 24.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 169 | 44.2 | 6.6 | 1981 | 29.7 | 15.6 | 526 | 59.9 | 9.6 | 1891 | 13.1 | 7.6 | 26.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1723 | 10.2 | 7.8 | 584 | 54.5 | 10.0 | 1868 | 17.7 | 11.0 | 19.7 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 River Rd | 587 | 36.4 | 13.4 | 1221 | 17.6 | 8.8 | 192 | 30.0 | 4.4 |  |  |  | 24.3 | B |
| River Rd | / Greenwich Rd | 482 | 53.3 | 7.0 | 1601 | 54.9 | 33.4 | 312 | 86.1 | 8.8 | 641 | 50.0 | 8.8 | 56.8 | E |


| Base Model 2021 + A |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{array}\right\|$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | 1520 | 17.2 | 9.2 |  |  |  | 1229 | 17.8 | 9.6 | 391 | 29.3 | 9.4 | 18.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1663 | 49.4 | 24.0 | 557 | 42.2 | 6.4 | 968 | 25.9 | 7.8 | 976 | 27.5 | 10.8 | 37.8 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Hume St | 1633 | 17.0 | 10.6 | 254 | 61.0 | 9.4 | 1404 | 21.2 | 12.6 | 196 | 129.9 | 6.4 | 28.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Oxley St | 1663 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 284 | 54.3 | 4.8 | 1542 | 5.5 | 4.8 | 172 | 55.8 | 5.8 | 11.9 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 2062 | 15.8 | 11.6 |  |  |  | 1485 | 15.6 | 5.8 | 621 | 81.2 | 13.6 | 25.5 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Christie St | 601 | 52.2 | 10.2 | 2685 | 18.2 | 15.2 | 175 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1891 | 17.8 | 14.2 | 21.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Herbert St | 709 | 75.2 | 22.2 | 2423 | 22.0 | 12.4 |  |  |  | 2227 | 15.4 | 5.2 | 26.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 163 | 41.0 | 6.2 | 2122 | 31.4 | 17.0 | 460 | 53.6 | 9.0 | 1965 | 12.9 | 7.6 | 26.2 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1727 | 12.1 | 7.8 | 714 | 56.5 | 10.0 | 1896 | 18.9 | 10.4 | 22.4 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 590 | 35.1 | 13.2 | 1211 | 18.0 | 8.8 | 190 | 25.4 | 3.8 |  |  |  | 23.8 | B |
| River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 469 | 55.1 | 7.2 | 1598 | 49.5 | 33.2 | 305 | 76.1 | 8.6 | 651 | 49.4 | 8.2 | 53.0 | D |


| Base Model $2021+$ AB |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / Alexander St | 1561 | 17.8 | 9.8 |  |  |  | 1221 | 16.4 | 8.4 | 369 | 27.9 | 9.6 | 18.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1721 | 47.9 | 26.6 | 588 | 40.0 | 6.6 | 938 | 25.4 | 8.2 | 987 | 28.6 | 11.4 | 37.3 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | / Hume St | 1696 | 20.7 | 12.8 | 263 | 64.8 | 9.2 | 1410 | 21.4 | 12.6 | 180 | 108.0 | 6.8 | 28.7 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | / Oxley St | 1673 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 370 | 54.0 | 6.2 | 1555 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 153 | 57.0 | 5.6 | 13.3 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | / Albany St | 2068 | 15.4 | 11.2 |  |  |  | 1513 | 16.3 | 6.0 | 596 | 69.8 | 13.0 | 23.5 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Christie St | 660 | 58.4 | 10.2 | 2731 | 19.0 | 15.4 | 188 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1902 | 17.3 | 12.6 | 22.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Herbert St | 726 | 78.3 | 25.2 | 2459 | 23.9 | 12.6 |  |  |  | 2278 | 16.0 | 6.0 | 27.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 167 | 46.3 | 6.4 | 2150 | 33.0 | 16.2 | 460 | 64.8 | 8.6 | 1999 | 14.2 | 8.4 | 28.7 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1753 | 11.1 | 7.2 | 695 | 56.0 | 10.0 | 1915 | 18.1 | 11.0 | 21.3 | B |
| Shirley Rd | / River Rd | 567 | 35.9 | 13.0 | 1229 | 18.6 | 9.0 | 196 | 28.0 | 5.0 |  |  |  | 24.5 | B |
| River Rd | / Greenwich Rd | 460 | 55.6 | 7.2 | 1612 | 53.9 | 33.6 | 307 | 81.1 | 9.0 | 656 | 49.9 | 8.0 | 56.1 | D |


| Base Model $2021+$ ABC |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / Alexander St | 1588 | 18.8 | 11.0 |  |  |  | 1248 | 21.6 | 9.0 | 392 | 30.1 | 10.2 | 21.2 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1710 | 51.7 | 25.6 | 601 | 39.7 | 6.4 | 958 | 24.3 | 7.4 | 945 | 29.1 | 11.0 | 38.7 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Hume St | 1698 | 21.4 | 13.4 | 243 | 66.1 | 9.6 | 1372 | 21.5 | 12.4 | 187 | 119.4 | 6.6 | 29.8 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Oxley St | 1654 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 377 | 56.3 | 6.4 | 1512 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 101 | 54.0 | 3.2 | 13.0 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | / Albany St | 2047 | 15.1 | 10.6 |  |  |  | 1515 | 16.2 | 6.0 | 581 | 68.8 | 13.2 | 23.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 Christie St | 654 | 56.8 | 10.2 | 2737 | 19.9 | 15.6 | 152 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1875 | 17.3 | 13.4 | 22.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Herbert St | 702 | 69.6 | 21.2 | 2476 | 25.7 | 12.6 |  |  |  | 2282 | 16.2 | 5.6 | 27.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 166 | 48.1 | 6.8 | 2176 | 34.2 | 16.8 | 474 | 63.6 | 9.0 | 2004 | 13.8 | 8.8 | 29.1 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1805 | 10.7 | 7.6 | 675 | 55.9 | 10.0 | 1939 | 19.1 | 11.0 | 21.3 | B |
| Shirley Rd | / River Rd | 569 | 36.2 | 12.0 | 1244 | 17.6 | 8.6 | 199 | 31.3 | 4.2 |  |  |  | 24.2 | B |
| River Rd | / Greenwich Rd | 452 | 56.0 | 7.4 | 1587 | 48.2 | 31.8 | 307 | 78.9 | 9.0 | 648 | 49.1 | 8.2 | 52.8 | D |

Table 3.3. Intersection operation - comparison of models - afternoon peak hour.

| Base Model 2021 |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue $\max$ <br> (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max <br> (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue $\max$ (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | 1170 | 11.2 | 6.4 |  |  |  | 1404 | 19.0 | 10.8 | 288 | 23.1 | 6.8 | 16.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy |  | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1274 | 41.3 | 20.4 | 723 | 36.3 | 6.6 | 1119 | 27.9 | 10.0 | 930 | 22.4 | 10.2 | 32.4 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1255 | 14.4 | 8.6 | 195 | 60.5 | 8.8 | 1157 | 18.4 | 11.4 | 159 | 82.8 | 5.8 | 23.2 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 1256 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 319 | 104.9 | 6.8 | 1238 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 160 | 59.5 | 5.2 | 19.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 1531 | 9.0 | 8.4 |  |  |  | 1276 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 560 | 62.4 | 12.6 | 19.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 360 | 42.8 | 8.0 | 1977 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 68 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1676 | 13.6 | 10.8 | 14.1 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 858 | 60.5 | 21.0 | 1563 | 20.2 | 8.2 |  |  |  | 2059 | 16.3 | 5.0 | 26.1 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 258 | 41.6 | 7.8 | 1402 | 22.2 | 10.4 | 204 | 53.7 | 5.8 | 1948 | 9.8 | 6.4 | 18.9 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1411 | 6.5 | 4.2 | 268 | 63.4 | 8.6 | 1717 | 16.7 | 10.2 | 16.1 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 856 | 28.2 | 14.8 | 818 | 17.2 | 7.8 | 384 | 36.4 | 7.8 |  |  |  | 25.4 | B |
| River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 422 | 63.6 | 7.2 | 942 | 20.5 | 14.6 | 239 | 80.0 | 7.6 | 1175 | 27.0 | 8.4 | 34.9 | C |


| Base Model $2021+$ A | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Flow (veh) | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Queue } \\ \max \\ \text { (veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Queue } \\ \max \\ \text { (veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy / Alexander St | 1118 | 11.6 | 5.2 |  |  |  | 1430 | 18.1 | 11.2 | 287 | 23.2 | 6.4 | 16.1 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1243 | 39.5 | 19.8 | 689 | 38.2 | 6.4 | 1170 | 27.9 | 10.6 | 959 | 18.9 | 9.6 | 31.1 | C |
| Pacific Hwy / Hume St | 1215 | 12.5 | 8.2 | 210 | 73.2 | 8.4 | 1226 | 18.9 | 11.2 | 159 | 76.6 | 5.6 | 23.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Oxley St | 1250 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 213 | 62.3 | 4.4 | 1313 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 200 | 57.9 | 6.0 | 13.3 | A |
| Pacific Hwy / Albany St | 1524 | 9.8 | 8.6 |  |  |  | 1333 | 11.9 | 4.8 | 545 | 60.5 | 12.8 | 18.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Christie St | 389 | 43.4 | 9.0 | 1968 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 120 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1727 | 13.9 | 11.4 | 14.4 | A |
| Pacific Hwy / Herbert St | 856 | 60.0 | 21.6 | 1564 | 17.8 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 1948 | 17.1 | 5.8 | 25.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 258 | 38.7 | 7.2 | 1488 | 23.3 | 10.6 | 120 | 50.7 | 3.6 | 1854 | 8.1 | 5.2 | 17.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1393 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 361 | 61.5 | 9.2 | 1745 | 17.7 | 10.6 | 18.2 | B |
| Shirley Rd / River Rd | 876 | 29.6 | 15.0 | 811 | 17.3 | 7.6 | 392 | 44.0 | 8.6 |  |  |  | 27.5 | B |
| River Rd / Greenwich Rd | 441 | 63.5 | 7.2 | 974 | 21.1 | 14.8 | 237 | 77.5 | 7.8 | 1108 | 27.2 | 8.0 | 35.2 | C |


| Base Model 2021 + AB |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Queue } \\ \max \\ \text { (veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max <br> (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}$ | Queue <br> max <br> (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | 1111 | 11.7 | 6.8 |  |  |  | 1414 | 18.8 | 11.0 | 291 | 23.6 | 6.6 | 16.5 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1248 | 39.6 | 19.0 | 715 | 37.3 | 6.2 | 1126 | 28.5 | 9.6 | 1011 | 23.8 | 10.4 | 32.3 | C |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1244 | 12.8 | 7.2 | 190 | 62.4 | 8.8 | 1251 | 19.8 | 11.8 | 145 | 73.7 | 5.0 | 22.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 1246 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 231 | 68.9 | 4.6 | 1342 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 176 | 60.7 | 5.4 | 14.1 | A |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 1531 | 10.0 | 8.4 |  |  |  | 1324 | 12.4 | 4.8 | 552 | 61.6 | 13.0 | 19.3 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 455 | 45.4 | 9.4 | 2042 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 157 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1724 | 12.8 | 10.0 | 14.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 880 | 61.8 | 22.0 | 1607 | 18.0 | 7.8 |  |  |  | 1972 | 17.3 | 5.8 | 26.4 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 255 | 40.4 | 7.4 | 1538 | 22.9 | 10.8 | 114 | 53.5 | 3.2 | 1872 | 8.4 | 6.2 | 17.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1445 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 367 | 59.6 | 9.6 | 1690 | 18.1 | 10.8 | 18.1 | B |
| Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 874 | 27.9 | 14.8 | 805 | 17.2 | 7.4 | 394 | 40.2 | 8.2 |  |  |  | 26.1 | B |
| River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 406 | 64.4 | 7.4 | 944 | 20.3 | 13.8 | 239 | 77.4 | 7.2 | 1138 | 26.8 | 8.0 | 34.6 | C |


| Base Model $2021+$ ABC | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Flow <br> (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | Delay time Sec | Queue max (veh) | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay } \\ \text { time Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Queue max (veh) |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy / Alexander St | 1091 | 12.4 | 6.6 |  |  |  | 1430 | 20.5 | 11.0 | 290 | 22.3 | 7.4 | 17.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1254 | 41.8 | 21.0 | 690 | 38.2 | 6.8 | 1114 | 28.9 | 9.0 | 1017 | 23.3 | 11.2 | 33.0 | C |
| Pacific Hwy / Hume St | 1208 | 13.0 | 7.6 | 226 | 77.4 | 9.6 | 1261 | 20.3 | 11.6 | 152 | 81.4 | 5.0 | 25.0 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Oxley St | 1233 | 6.0 | 3.4 | 203 | 61.1 | 4.2 | 1340 | 6.0 | 5.2 | 172 | 60.9 | 5.6 | 13.0 | A |
| Pacific Hwy / Albany St | 1500 | 9.0 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 1315 | 12.0 | 4.6 | 536 | 61.6 | 12.6 | 18.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Christie St | 453 | 47.1 | 9.4 | 2029 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 187 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1711 | 12.6 | 10.4 | 14.7 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Herbert St | 859 | 65.1 | 21.4 | 1617 | 18.0 | 7.4 |  |  |  | 1933 | 17.1 | 5.2 | 26.8 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | 246 | 40.8 | 7.6 | 1554 | 22.6 | 10.8 | 121 | 52.5 | 3.4 | 1849 | 7.9 | 5.4 | 17.6 | B |
| Pacific Hwy / Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 1476 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 359 | 61.2 | 9.2 | 1711 | 17.9 | 10.4 | 18.0 | B |
| Shirley Rd / River Rd | 869 | 28.5 | 15.4 | 809 | 17.9 | 7.6 | 387 | 40.3 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 26.5 | B |
| River Rd / Greenwich Rd | 420 | 65.9 | 7.2 | 971 | 21.0 | 14.8 | 240 | 73.6 | 7.6 | 1095 | 26.9 | 8.0 | 34.9 | C |




Figure 6: Travel times - comparison of models - morning peak hour - Pacific Highway.

- Modelled travel times shown in Figure 5 indicate their consistent growth for every additional development in the morning peak hour.
- Travel time increases are spread along the Pacific Highway in the peak direction of travel.
- In the off-peak direction, the main travel time increase occurred at the Herbert St intersection for the $2021+$ ABC model. Other models do not indicate any travel time increases compared with the Base Model 2021.



Figure 7: Travel times - comparison of models - morning peak hour - Shirley Rd / River Rd.

- With the exception of increased travel time on River Road eastbound for $2021+$ AB scenario, travel times on Shirley Road and River Road remain essentially the same for all scenarios in the morning, as evidenced by the information presented in Figure 6.
- For the afternoon peak period, all graphs (Figures 7 and $\mathbf{8}$ overleaf) show no difference in travel time for all scenarios on both main routes.


### 4.7 Previous RMS concerns

- The current models address the concerns raised by RMS with regard to the TMA modelling report (refer to Appendix A) as follows.
- Trip generation rates for all residential developments, including all proposed developments in St Leonards South Master Plan area, were adopted as requested by RMS (that is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM peak) and 0.07 trips per dwelling (PM peak).
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Figure 8: Travel times - comparison of models - afternoon peak hour - Pacific Highway.


Figure 9: Travel times - comparison of models - afternoon peak hour - Shirley Rd / River Rd.

- The modelling results have been disaggregated to show the performance by movements on each approach (refer to Appendix D).
- For the TMA report, RMS requested an explanation for decreased traffic volumes at some intersections, as a result of the proposed additional developments. The TEF models show similar results. This is due to the fact, that the proposed developments replace existing substantial buildings. Also, commercial areas are proposed to be replaced by residential units, which are lower traffic generators. As a result, traffic increases were very moderate for each of the developments $L, A, B$ and $C$ and in some cases a reduction of trip generation resulted from the land use change.
- For the TMA report, RMS requested an explanation for decreased traffic volumes at some intersections, as a result of the proposed additional developments. The TEF models show similar results. This is due to the fact, that the proposed developments replace existing substantial buildings. Also, commercial areas are proposed to be replaced by residential units, which are lower traffic generators. As a result, traffic increases were very moderate for each of the developments $L, A, B$ and $C$ and in some cases a reduction of trip generation resulted from the land use change.
- All models for each hourly peak period were simulated using 5 replications (runs) with different seeds. Seed numbers were adopted from the RMS modelling guidelines and were the same for each model for consistency.
- Some of the issues related specifically to the results of TMA modelling and are not relevant for the TEF models.


## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The measures that are necessary in order to achieve satisfactory performance of the network are detailed in Figure 4 of this report.
- The results of modelling for all development options, with consideration of subsequent cumulative impacts of each large development analysed in this study, are generally consistent with findings of the traffic impact assessment reports submitted for the respective development applications.
- Primarily due to the fact that the proposed developments replace existing substantial buildings, traffic increases as a result are very moderate for each of the developments on sites L (Marshall Ave), A (Winten), B (Mirvac) and C (New Hope \& VIMG).
- Accordingly, although total traffic delays for the whole network generally increased with each additional development, some intersections even experienced slight improvements (due to traffic redistribution), whilst increased delays at other intersections were minor to moderate. Levels of Service remained essentially the same for all models.
- Modelled travel times increased consistently with an addition of each development only in the south-eastbound direction on Pacific Highway and in the eastbound direction on River Road during the morning peak. In all other instances there was virtually no change of modelled travel times.
- In general terms. the modelling results indicate that a number of relatively minor improvements would be required as a result of general growth of network traffic, LEP 2009 developments and the proposed St Leonards South Master Plan development. These improvements will be required regardless of the other approved and proposed developments subject of this report (Loftex, Winten, Mirvac and New Hope/VIMG).
- It is recommended that improvements required for satisfactory operation of the road network under general traffic growth/LEP 2009/St Leonards South Master Plan be further investigated in detail at the later Development Application stage for St Leonards South.
- For the St Leonards South (residential) precinct, the only infrastructure improvements recommended are:
- Removal of roundabout at Marshall Ave/Berry Rd intersection and replacement with a Give Way intersection, and
- Provision of a new road connection between Berry and Park Roads.
- For the St Leonards East (commercial/mixed use) precinct, the Winten, Mirvac and New Hope/VIMG developments will not generate sufficient additional traffic to require infrastructure improvements.

Appendix A

TMA report of 11 September 2015.

RMS letter dated 04 January 2016
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## Formatted

## 1 Introduction

This technical note reports on the updated traffic model that now includes two components:-

- The "base model" - containing:-
o LEP growth, including 1-25 Marshall Avenue* and other developments in accordance with LEP 2009 (as endorsed by the RMS on 11 April 2014)
o St Leonards South Master Plan's 2,200 dwellings (endorsed by the RMS on 2 October 2014) bounded by rail line/ Marshall Av/ River Rd/ Berry Rd (and see below)
o growth on the RMS network.
* Note: The base model incorporates traffic generation for the proposed development at 1-

13A Marshall Avenue for 271 dwellings \& 320m² retail/ commercial, and 15-25 Marshall Avenue, totalling approximately 350 dwellings for Nos.1-25, as allowed under LEP 2009.

- The "future model" containing development sites $A$ and $B C$ in addition to the base model:-
o Site A = 84-90 Christie St/ 75-79 Lithgow St and Sites BC = 472-504 Pacific Highway
o St Leonards South extension from Berry Rd to Park Rd - 650 dwellings (Council 13/7/15).
The note then compares the performance of this future model against that of the base model.


Source: Open street map
Transport Modellers Alliance Pty Ltd
www.transportmodellers.com.au
PO Box 217 Newtown Sydney NSW 2042

The following changes were implemented in the future model:

- Berry Lane was removed from consideration for traffic movement
- A new connection between Park Rd and Berry Rd 100m south of Marshall Ave was implemented
- Lithgow Street's proposed opening to River Rd was not proceeded with.


## 2 Traffic Generation

### 2.1 SITE A

The traffic generation for Site A was taken from the Colston Budd Hunt \& Kafes PTY LTD report Transport Aspects of Planning Proposal for Proposed Mixed Use Developments, Christie Street \& Lithgow Street St Leonards, issued December 2014 on behalf of Winten Property Group.

In this report it is established that Site A will generate 210 and 350 vehicles per hour two way in the AM and PM peaks respectively.

### 2.2 SITE B\&C

Site B and Site C were previously treated as separate sites and have since been amalgamated into one site consisting of 472-486, 500 and 504 Pacific Highway.

The traffic generation for Site B\&C was taken from the Brown report Traffic, Parking and Accessibility Report, issued May 2014 on behalf of Leighton Properties and Charter Hall.

In this report it was established that Site B\&C will generate 236 and 177 vehicles per hour two way in the AM and PM peaks respectively.

### 2.3 BERRY ST PARK RD DWELLIINGS

650 dwelling were added to the model for the St Leonards South Master Plan extension (decided on 13 July 2015) from Berry St to Park Rd, with 50\% of the dwellings being accessed from Berry Rd and the other $50 \%$ being accessed from Park Rd.

As the dwellings will be high density residential at a distance of around 500 m from the train station, the lowest trip generation rate will be used.

The RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments Updated traffic surveys indicates that a trip generation rate of 0.07 trips per dwelling in the AM and 0.06 trips per dwelling in the PM can be used resulting in 46 trips in the AM peak and 39 trips the PM peak being generated.

TABLE 1 TRAFFIC GENERATION SUMMARY

|  |  | AM | PM |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Site A | 88 Christie Street | 210 | 350 |
| Site B | $472-486$ and 504-520 Pacific Hwy |  |  |
| Site C | 500 Pacific Hwy | 236 | 177 |
|  | Berry St Park Rd dwellings | 46 | 39 |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{4 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 6}$ |

## 3 Traffic Distribution

The traffic was broken up into three categories commercial (office), retail and residential, with the traffic generation volumes being broken up into these three categories and then assigned to the network.

Previously established traffic patterns were used for commercial and residential distributions which were extracted from immediately surrounding sites, while a new retail distribution pattern was established.

The retail distribution pattern was established by assessing the size of the retail development and identifying all surrounding retail land uses. This established a catchment that was broken up into areas relating to the model zones and trips were assigned to the individual zones depending of the proportion of residential dwelling in a particular zone as it related to the entire catchment.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 NETWORK PERFORMANCE

## TABLE 2NETWORK STATISTICS

|  | Model | Description | Mean Speed (kph) | VKT | VHT | Unreleased |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM | DO2NO2_AM_21 | Background Growth Only | 22.6 | 18273.0 | 809.9 | 7 |
|  | D13N2O_AM_21 | Future | 20.3 | 18629.9 | 920.4 | 50 |
|  |  | \% diff | $\mathbf{- 1 0 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 \%}$ | $13.7 \%$ |  |
| PM | DO2NO2_PM_21 | Background Growth Only | 21.6 | 18124.4 | 839.7 | 22 |
|  | D13N2O_PM_21 | Future | 21.4 | 19147.8 | 896.1 | 22 |
|  |  | \% diff | $-0.9 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 . 7 \%}$ |  |

Table 2 shows that the introduction of the developments has had some impact on the network statistics with the average speed reducing and the Vehicle Kilometres Travelled (VKT) and the Vehicle Hours Travelled (VHT) increasing.

Some of the increase in VKT and VHT will be a result of the increase in demand and not necessarily a deterioration of network performance, such as in the PM. The AM however has had a smaller increase in trips and had a more adverse effect. The reason for this will be further explored in the proceeding sections.

### 4.2 TRAVEL TIMES

Figure 2 and figure 3 show the impact that the increased demand has had on the Pacific highway.
The Future Base (FB) AM model has seen a 30 second increase in travel times between Greenwich Rd and Berry Rd and the FB PM has seen a 45 second increase in travel times between Rocklands Ave and Shirley Rd. These small increases in travel time are consistent with an increase in volume on the Pacific Hwy travelling towards the development sites.

As the rest of the curves are identical as such the increases are not consistently seen along the length of the curve this suggests that the increase in volume is placing pressure only as specific intersections.


FIGURE 2 PACIFIC HWY EASTBOUND


### 4.3 LEVEL OF SERVICE

## TABLE 3 AM LEVEL OF SERVICE

| Intersection | Approach | Delay (s) | Vehicles | Level of Service | Delay (s) | Vehicles | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Background Growth Only |  |  | Future |  |  |
| Pacific Hwy/Reserve Rd/Berry Rd | Reserve Rd | 72.5 | 82 | F | 61.2 | 105 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwv [E] | 97.2 | 1689 | F | 132.9 | 1661 | F |
|  | Berry Rd | 60.6 | 125 | E | 53.3 | 113 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwv [W] | 122.0 | 1965 | F | 133.4 | 1849 | F |
|  | Intersection | 108.1 | 3861 | F | 128.7 | 3728 | F |
| Pacific Hwy/Herbert St | Herbert St | 54.1 | 618 | D | 124.9 | 686 | F |
|  | Pacific Hwv [E] | 75.5 | 2112 | F | 57.7 | 1994 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwv [W] | 44.5 | 1940 | D | 31.5 | 1801 | C |
|  | Intersection | 59.8 | 4670 | E | 57.5 | 4481 | E |
| Pacific Hwy/Christie St | Christie St [ N ] | 71.9 | 499 | F | 104.3 | 532 | F |
|  | Pacific Hwv [E] | 23.3 | 1995 | B | 13.9 | 1875 | A |
|  | Pacific Hwv [W] | 20.8 | 2249 | B | 16.4 | 2181 | B |
|  | Intersection | 27.2 | 4743 | B | 25.6 | 4588 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Albany St | Pacific Hwv [N] | 29.2 | 1759 | C | 31.5 | 1710 | C |
|  | Albany St | 110.3 | 610 | F | 68.0 | 608 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 34.0 | 1593 | C | 22.3 | 1417 | B |
|  | Intersection | 43.6 | 3962 | D | 34.0 | 3735 | C |
| Pacific Hwy/Oxley St | Pacific Hwv [ N ] | 12.2 | 1387 | A | 18.6 | 1317 | B |
|  | Oxley St [E] | 54.4 | 114 | D | 37.8 | 120 | C |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 14.1 | 1373 | B | 20.2 | 1251 | B |
|  | Oxlev St [W] | 67.3 | 430 | E | 64.9 | 256 | E |
|  | Intersection | 21.6 | 3304 | B | 24.1 | 2944 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Hume St | Pacific Hwv [ N ] | 12.0 | 1446 | A | 12.9 | 1341 | A |
|  | Hume St [E] | 56.7 | 188 | D | 52.4 | 137 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 19.4 | 1257 | B | 19.2 | 1184 | B |
|  | Hume St [W] | 55.6 | 142 | D | 56.3 | 146 | D |
|  | Intersection | 19.9 | 3033 | B | 19.7 | 2808 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Falcon St/Shirley Rd | Pacific Hwv [N] | 51.4 | 1413 | D | 48.6 | 1282 | D |
|  | Falcon St | 114.8 | 879 | F | 135.7 | 813 | F |
|  | Pacific Hwy [S] | 29.6 | 876 | C | 29.2 | 805 | C |
|  | Shirlev Rd | 119.4 | 457 | F | 106.2 | 512 | F |
|  | Intersection | 70.1 | 3625 | F | 73.4 | 3412 | F |
| Pacific Hwy/Alexander St | Pacific Hwy [ N ] | 23.3 | 1253 | B | 20.1 | 1185 | B |
|  | Alexander St | 43.7 | 356 | D | 44.8 | 326 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 32.2 | 1124 | C | 33.7 | 1035 | C |
|  | Intersection | 29.6 | 2733 | C | 28.8 | 2546 | B |
| River Rd/Shirley Rd | Shirley Rd [ N ] | 60.0 | 455 | E | 59.6 | 401 | E |
|  | Shirlev Rd [S] | 49.0 | 202 | D | 49.9 | 215 | D |
|  | River Rd | 52.5 | 894 | D | 50.8 | 929 | D |
|  | Intersection | 54.3 | 1551 | D | 52.9 | 1545 | D |

## TABLE 4 PM LEVEL OF SERVICE

| Intersection | Approach | Delay (s) | Vehicles | Level of Service | Delay (s) | Vehicles | Level of Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Background Growth Only |  |  | Future |  |  |
|  | Reserve Rd | 61.9 | 82 | E | 55.1 | 214 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwy [E] | 92.2 | 1689 | F | 83.3 | 1803 | F |
| Pacific Hwy/Reserve Rd/Berry RelBerry Rd |  | 65.6 | 125 | E | 67.7 | 116 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwy [W] | 105.7 | 1965 | F | 114.6 | 1442 | F |
|  | Intersection | 97.6 | 3861 | F | 93.7 | 3575 | F |
| Pacific Hwy/Herbert St | Herbert St | 50.9 | 618 | D | 50.3 | 850 | D |
|  | Pacific Hww [E] | 61.5 | 2112 | E | 59.4 | 1933 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwy [W] | 27.2 | 1940 | B | 48.3 | 1515 | D |
|  | Intersection | 45.8 | 4670 | D | 53.7 | 4298 | D |
| Pacific Hwy/Christie St | Christie St [ N ] | 168.5 | 499 | F | 52.4 | 391 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwv [E] | 25.6 | 1995 | B | 17.3 | 1918 | B |
|  | Pacific Hwy [W] | 16.3 | 2249 | B | 15.4 | 1943 | B |
|  | Intersection | 36.2 | 4743 | C | 19.7 | 4252 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Albany St | Pacific Hwy [ N ] | 23.4 | 1759 | B | 27.6 | 1480 | B |
|  | Albany St | 74.8 | 610 | F | 66.4 | 611 | E |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 28.4 | 1593 | B | 24.6 | 1548 | B |
|  | Intersection | 33.4 | 3962 | C | 32.8 | 3639 | C |
| Pacific Hwy/Oxley St | Pacific Hwy [ N ] | 13.4 | 1387 | A | 13.9 | 1178 | A |
|  | Oxlev St [E] | 45.7 | 114 | D | 40.0 | 132 | C |
|  | Pacific Hwy [S] | 11.9 | 1373 | A | 15.5 | 1367 | B |
|  | Oxlev St [W] | 91.6 | 430 | F | 94.1 | 500 | F |
|  | Intersection | 24.1 | 3304 | B | 28.3 | 3177 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Hume St | Pacific Hwy [ N ] | 13.5 | 1446 | A | 14.8 | 1319 | B |
|  | Hume St [E] | 46.5 | 188 | D | 51.3 | 163 | D |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 19.2 | 1257 | B | 19.7 | 1294 | B |
|  | Hume St [W] | 54.6 | 142 | D | 51.7 | 173 | D |
|  | Intersection | 19.8 | 3033 | B | 21.1 | 2949 | B |
| Pacific Hwy/Falcon St/Shirley Rd | Pacific Hwv [ N ] | 63.2 | 1413 | E | 63.6 | 1258 | E |
|  | Falcon St | 85.8 | 879 | F | 93.0 | 954 | F |
|  | Pacific Hwy [S] | 65.7 | 876 | E | 66.2 | 1072 | E |
|  | Shirlev Rd | 99.2 | 457 | F | 99.5 | 642 | F |
|  | Intersection | 73.8 | 3625 | F | 77.3 | 3926 | F |
| Pacific Hwy/Alexander St | Pacific Hwv [ N ] | 15.2 | 1253 | B | 15.7 | 1080 | B |
|  | Alexander St | 69.2 | 356 | E | 89.0 | 261 | F |
|  | Pacific Hwv [S] | 47.6 | 1124 | D | 41.5 | 1305 | C |
|  | Intersection | 35.6 | 2733 | C | 35.7 | 2646 | C |
| River Rd/Shirley Rd | Shirlev Rd [N] | 27.1 | 455 | B | 27.4 | 775 | B |
|  | Shirlev Rd [S] | 38.8 | 202 | C | 50.8 | 398 | D |
|  | River Rd | 34.4 | 894 | C | 32.6 | 644 | C |
|  | Intersection | 32.9 | 1551 | c | 34.3 | 1817 | c |

The AM Level of service graph further reinforces what was discovered in the travel time results being that there has been an adverse effect to the Pacific Hwy at Berry St, delay has also gone up at Herbert St and Christie St.

The volumes at the Christie St intersection have dropped as a result of the increase in delay and as a result the volumes southbound along the Pacific Hwy are also lower indicating that the Berry St intersection is operating at capacity.

There are no real increases in delay in the PM with most of the intersection Level of Service remanning similar with some of the intersection actually being improved upon as a result of signal optimisation along the Pacific Hwy.

Transport Modellers Alliance Pty Ltd
PO Box 217 Newtown Sydney NSW 2042

### 4.4 QUEUE DIAGRAMS



FIGURE 4 AM QUEUE DIAGRAMS


## FIGURE 5 PM QUEUE DIAGRAMS

Figure 4 confirms that the increase in delay the AM had at the Berry Pacific Berry intersection is also accompanied by and increase in queueing.

Figure 5 shows that previously the PM had a small rolling queue extending back from the Berry St intersection and even though the intersection performance hasn't deteriorated this rolling queue has grown indicating that the queue is dissipating quickly. A similar story can be told for the Pacific Falcon St intersection as there has been an increase in queueing without a substantial increase in delay.

## 5 Conclusion

In summary the PM model does not experience any major network deterioration as a result of the introduction of the Site A and Site BC developments. There is the potential for an increase in queues; however the models showed that the queues dissipate quickly and as such there has been no deterioration in intersection performance.

The improvement of some approaches at the PM intersections can be accounted for as a result of optimisation (in line with what is possible within SCATS) of signals along the Pacific Hwy.

The results do however there indicate the potential for some network deterioration in the AM centred around the Pacific Berry St intersection (also potentially the PM if demands increase further). Previous modelling has indicated that it is the interaction between the Berry, Herbert and Christie Street intersections that causes the delay at Berry Street and that this is a bottleneck on the network.

The performance of the Berry St intersection is more sensitive in the AM due to the more directed nature of AM flows. The increase in delay on the western approach is around 11 seconds and is manageable, as a result the network is able to cope with the increase in demand associated with the new developments but any further increase in development will need to be tested. Transport for NSW

Stephanie Bashford<br>Manager, Strategic Planning<br>Lane Cove Council<br>PO Box 20<br>Lane Cove NSW 1595

# RECEIVED <br> 4 JAN 2018 

## RECORDS

Dear Ms Bashford,

## St Leonards Traffic Modelling Report and Planning Proposal for 88 Christie St, St Leonards

Thank you for meeting with officers from Transport for NSW (TfNSW) and Roads and Maritime Services (Roads and Maritime) on 20 November 2015 regarding the planning proposal at 88 Christie Street, St Leonards. Please consider this as a joint response from both agencies.

Given the number of proposed developments in St Leonards within the Lane Cove local government area, TfNSW and Roads and Maritime have a strong interest in understanding the cumulative impact of these developments on the operation of the road network, and in particular, the performance of the Pacific Highway.

TfNSW and Roads and Maritime have reviewed Council's Traffic Modelling Report dated 11 September 2015 by TMA, which was received on 26 November 2015. A number of issues have been identified which requires further clarification and analysis. These issues include the use of appropriate traffic generation rates for St Leonards, details of assumptions used in the modelling process, and further explanation of modelling outputs which were not documented in the report. Detailed technical comments on the TMA Traffic Modelling Report are provided in Attachment A.

TfNSW and Roads and Maritime also have minor comments on the Concept Design Report and the Transport Aspects of Planning Proposal report, both dated December 2014. These comments are provided in Attachment B.

As suggested by TfNSW and Roads and Maritime at the meeting, an overarching transport and traffic report should be produced for the purpose of public exhibition, which integrates the developer's transport report with Council's Traffic Modelling Report. This overarching report should seek to provide a comprehensive overview of the transport and traffic impacts of the planning proposal, the likely cumulative impact of proposed developments in St Leonards, and identify actions or issues that are to be addressed.

Given the number of issues identified in the TMA Traffic Modelling Report, TfNSW and Roads and Maritime request for further modelling work to be undertaken, and the report be revised to address the issues identified. The revised report should be submitted to TfNSW and Roads and Maritime for further review and comment prior to its finalisation for public exhibition.

TfNSW and Roads and Maritime are keen to work with Council in ensuring that the modelling report provides an appropriate level of assessment of road network operational impacts. A technical meeting with Council and TMA to discuss the traffic modelling results and address the issues identified would be productive in that regard.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact James Li, Senior Transport Planner at TfNSW, on 0282022179 / james.li@transport.nsw.gov.au or Andrew Popoff, Senior Land Use Planner at Roads and Maritime, on 0288492180 / andrew.popoff@rms.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely,


Executive Director, Transport Strategy
Freight, Strategy and Planning

## ATTACHMENT A

## Comments on the TMA Traffic Modelling Report (11 September 2015)

Development generated traffic impact may or may not be significant to Pacific Highway traffic performance but the report does not provide a complete view on the impact of the proposed developments.

There is insufficient information documented in the report from the modelling exercise to enable full assessment as some essential matters are not clearly addressed. The following matters identified require clarification and needs to be addressed in further modelling work and documented in the report.

1. Concerns are raised with regard to the use of 0.07 trips per dwelling (AM Peak) and 0.06 trips per dwelling (PM Peak) for High Density Residential as these are the "lowest" surveyed rates provided within the "Guide to Traffic Generating Developments - Updated Traffic Surveys (TDT2013/04a) which have come from differing areas in the Sydney Metro area. The more appropriate trip generation rates which should be used would be the High Density Residential rates taken from the St Leonards site within (TDT2013/04a) which is 0.14 trips per dwelling (AM Peak) and 0.07 trips per dwelling (PM Peak). The modelling should be amended accordingly based on these more appropriate generation rates.
2. The modelling results provided within Tables 3 and 4 (intersection performance results) needs to be disaggregated, showing the performance by movements on each approach in the report (as an appendix to the report). This is necessary to enable closer investigation of future intersection impacts. This should be provided in the revised report.
3. Some of the provided modelling results require an explanation. For example, intersection traffic volumes at the various Pacific Highway intersections appear to have decreased, as a result of the proposed additional developments. In particular, results given in Tables 3 and 4 appear to be unexpected and no explanation has been given.

The following are some key modelling issues that need further explanation by Council and TMA.
a) Are the given traffic numbers extracted from a single model run? Or, are they averages from several different "seed" runs?
b) Why has Pacific Highway traffic at many intersections decreased in the AM peak?
c) Why has the Pacific Highway PM Peak traffic at the Reserve Road / Berry Road and Albany Street intersections changed significantly between "Background Growth Only" and "Future Base" scenarios? For example, Background Growth Only has Pacific Highway (west approach flows) higher than Pacific Highway (east approach flows), but these approach flows then have Pacific Highway (east approach flows) higher than Pacific Highway (west approach flows) in the Future scenario at the Reserve Road / Berry Road intersection. A similar pattern is also identified for Pacific Highway approach flows at the Albany Street intersection).
d) Why has the Pacific Highway/Reserve Road/Berry Road intersection performance in the AM Peak decreased significantly in the Future scenario when, at the same time, the intersection volume is lower. Is this resulting from an adjacent critical intersection?
e) Where is the development traffic coming / going within this model? How was trip modal choice determined? In the AM Peak, there is only about $55 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ more on Shirley Road approaching the Pacific Highway/Falcon Street /Shirley Road intersection, and only a marginal traffic increase at some other intersections, and even small ( $-12 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) decrease along Berry Road at Pacific Highway intersection. In the PM Peak, there are about 185 vehicles more at Shirley Road approaching Pacific Highway, and 70 vehicles more at Oxley Street.
f) Why has Christie Street PM Peak traffic decreased by 108 vehicles and at the same time the Herbert Street traffic increases by 232 vehicles. Are those traffic variations related to the proposed developments?
4. How have the intersection traffic signal settings been determined, for the "Background Growth Only" and "Future Base" models? Model input assumptions need to be documented, with information on signal phasing, timing and offsets.
5. Why in Network wide traffic performance (Table 2), has only unreleased vehicles been reported whereas total traffic is not reported?

In summary, to ensure the completeness of the traffic modelling report for the purpose of the public exhibition, the analysis and modelling to be undertaken and documented should include:
A. Estimated development generated/attracted traffic from all proposed developments based on the trip generation rates surveyed for St Leonards.
B. Estimated traffic directional distribution - showing where development generated traffic is going to and where development attracted traffic is coming from.
C. Identify key intersections affected by development traffic, and estimate traffic turning movements - separately for background traffic and development traffic.
D. State what future year traffic signals settings at signalised intersections that were adopted in the model.
E. Provide details on intersection performance (by approach and movement) with and without development traffic.

Furthermore, based on the revised modelling results, Council and/or the developer will need to identify the intersection improvements measures (if any) that may be required to support this current planning proposal and other proposed developments in the area.

This is necessary to inform any development contributions or planning agreements for any additional infrastructure that may be required to support these developments. It will also assist in determining whether or not such improvements are feasible. This identification and scoping process should begin prior to the planning proposal being placed on public exhibition such that these requirements which may be attributable to the planning proposal could be determined and agreed to before the LEP amendment is made.

## ATTACHMENT B

## Comments on Planning Proposal for 88 Christie Street, St Leonards

## Concept Design Report - Development access via Christie Street to the Pacific Highway

It is noted that section 6.2 of the Concept Design Report, proposes to open Christie Street between Nicholson Street and the Pacific Highway to two way traffic, which is currently limited to one way traffic heading southbound only.

TfNSW and Roads and Maritime note the developer's representation at the meeting that this was an editorial error and that current traffic arrangement are to remain unchanged for this section of Christie Street. As such, the Concept Design Report should be amended prior to public exhibition.

Roads and Maritime reaffirms that it will not support any proposal to open Christie Street to two way access to/from the Pacific Highway.

## Transport Aspects of Planning Proposal report

The report by Colston Budd Hunt and Kafes dated December 2014 provides a high level overview on the traffic generation expected with the two potential development yields on the site.

Council should note that TfNSW and Roads and Maritime would require a detailed Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) supported by traffic modelling analysis for any future development applications at the site, based on the scale of the proposed development at that time. The TIA will need to address road network impacts from development traffic generated and access issues. The developer should consult with TfNSW and Roads and Maritime to obtain input into the preparation of the TIA prior to development application lodgement with Council.

Appendix B

TEF Calibration report for the Base Model 2013

## ST LEONARDS SOUTH AIMSUN MODEL

## CALIBRATION／VALIDATION REPORT

Prepared for<br>Lane Cove Council

By
O．Sannikov
TEF Consulting
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## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Study Objective

- The purpose of this study is to provide a calibrated and validated Aimsun model for the St Leonards south road network for future use.
- Previously, a microsimulation model was developed by GTA Consultants to examine new large scale developments and the impacts the additional traffic may have on the surrounding road network (GTA model). The GTA model utilised Paramics microsimulation software package.
- The new Aimsun model has been developed for the same purpose. It uses the data from the previous base model and report developed by GTA Consultants for the same area.
- This report discusses the calibration and validation procedure for the model and why it is fit for use as a base road network model.


### 1.2 Purpose of this Report

- The report covers the following topics
- Model development
- Transport data
- Calibration and validation methodology
- Results


## $\square$

## 2 MODELLING SPECIFICATION

### 2.1 Previous Paramics Model

- A Paramics model was developed by GTA Consultants for Lane Cove Council (GTA model) and subsequently approved by RMS as fit for purpose.
- The GTA model represented the existing road geometry, intersection control and demands within the study area.
- The GTA model has been used as a base for the current Aimsun model with permission from Lane Cove Council
2.2 Software
- Aimsun v.8.07
- Microsimulation model


### 2.3 Model Study Area

- Refer to Figure 1


Figure 1: Study area.
2.3.1 Road Network

- The study area includes the following arterial roads:
- Pacific Highway
- River Road
- Chandos Street
- Shirley Road
- Falcon Street
- Alexander Street
- All other roads within the study area are local or local collector roads
- On street parking is available on Pacific Highway for both sides on some sections of the roads
- Parking is restricted by time limits
- Local streets have a mixture of time restrictions and permit parking


### 2.3.2 Public Transport

- St Leonards has very good public transport provision
- St Leonards railway station is located between Herbert and Christie Streets
- Services the T1 North Shore line
- There are multiple bus routes on Pacific Highway and River Road with frequent services in both directions of travel


### 2.3.3 Pedestrian Infrastructure

- Most of the roads in the study area incorporate pedestrian footpaths on both sides of the road
- Signalised intersections on the Pacific Highway provide pedestrian crossing facilities


### 2.4 Time Period

- The modelled time periods were the same as in the GTA Paramics model, as follows.
- weekday AM peak - from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.
- weekday PM peak - from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.


### 2.4.1 Warm up period

- A "warm up period" is required to populate model with traffic so that the model is run and analysed under stabilised conditions
- According to the RMS Traffic Modelling Guidelines 2013 (RMS 2013), the warm up period is required to be at least twice the time length of the longest trip
- The longest trip was 5 minutes and 13 seconds on the Pacific Highway from the travel time surveys used for model validation by GTA Consultants
- Refer to Section 3.2 for more information on the travel time surveys
- A 30 minute warm up period was used for the modelling process.


## 3 TRANSPORT DATA

### 3.1 Overview

- Comprehensive transport data for the study area was provided by Council to GTA Consultants during the development of the Paramics model, as follows.
- SCATS traffic volumes
- Manual turning movements counts
- O-D surveys
- Pedestrian counts
- Queue length surveys
- SCATS IDM data


### 3.2 Travel Time Data

- GTA Consultants conducted travel time surveys. These were documented in the GTA calibration report as follows.
- "Time travel surveys were undertaken on Thurs 4 April and Thursday 19 September 2013 during the AM peak period using the moving observer method. The surveys were carried out on two bidirectional routes."*
- Refer to Figure 2 for locations of the surveys.
- The surveys were carried out on sections of the Pacific Highway (bidirectional)
- Refer to an extract from the GTA report below.

Route A

| Route No. | Route Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | Pacific Highway south-east bound (between Greenwich Road and Hume Street) |
| Route 2 | Pacific Highway north-west bound (between Hume Street and Greenwich Road) |

Route B

| Route No. | Route Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| Route 1 | Pacific Highway (between Greenwich Road and Hume Street) |
| Route 2 | River Road via Shirley Road (between Pacific Highway and Greenwich Road) |

- "In order to obtain representative travel time data, the drivers were instructed to maintain a speed consistent with other road users, whilst observing the posted speed limits. Each route was broken down into segments and the travel times were recorded as vehicles pass the centre point of each signalised intersection on its route."*
- Table 1 below summarises the number of travel time runs obtained for each route

Table 1. Number of Travel Time Runs*.

| Route No. | Direction | 4 April 2013 | 19 Seplember <br> 2013 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound | 5 | 2 | 7 |
|  | Westbound | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Route 2 | Eastbound | 0 | 3 | 3 |
|  | Westbound | 0 | 3 | 3 |

- GTA Consultants noted that there was a"variance in travel time results between each day"*
- The data was considered to be "sufficient for this study however, a more comprehensive travel time survey would be recommended to provide more robust travel time information."*
- Because the base model developed in Aimsun replicated the same 20122013 conditions used by GTA, new surveys, if conducted in 2016, would be inapplicable.
- For GTA survey results, refer to an Appendix to this report


Figure 2: Travel time survey locations. *

## 4 DEVELOPMENT OF BASE MODEL NETWORK

### 4.1 Network Structure

- The Aimsun model network structure is the same as that of the GTA model.
- Refer to Figure 3


### 4.2 Overlay

- The road network structure was developed using aerial photograph analysis, based on www.maps.six.nsw.gov.au
- Configurations of traffic lanes and intersections were confirmed by a site inspection.


### 4.3 Zoning System

- The Aimsun model adopts the zoning system used by GTA Consultants
- Refer to Figure 4
- 36 zones in total
- Refer to Table 2

[^0]
## T파



Figure 3: Aimsun model network structure


Figure 4: Model zoning system *

[^1]Table 2. Description of Zones *

| Zone Number | Road Name | Location | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Highway | Western end | Primary State arterial road |
| 2 | Reserve Road | Northern end | North / East and West approaches to roundabout - Local Council road |
| 3 | Herbert Street | Northern end | Major Council road |
| 4 | Chandos Street | Western end | Chandos Street car park |
| 5 | Christie Street | Northern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 6 | Chandos Street | Eastern end | Retail strip - Secondary State arterial road |
| 7 | Albany Street | Eastern end | Retail strip - Local Council Road |
| 8 | Oxley Street | Eastern end | Local Council Road |
| 9 | Hume Street | Eastern end | Local Council Road |
| 10 | Pacific Highway | Eastern end | Primary State arterial road |
| 11 | Hume Street | Western end | Local Council Road |
| 12 | Christie Street | Southern end | Local Council Road |
| 13 | Lithgow Street | Southern end | Local Council Road |
| 14 | Shirley Road | Western end | Local Council Road |
| 15 | Russell Street | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 16 | Greenwich Road | Southern end | Major Council road |
| 17 | River Road | Western end | Secondary State arterial road |
| 18 | Berry Road | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 19 | Holdsworth Avenue | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 20 | Marshall Lane | Middle | Rear laneway access to retail on Pacific Highway |
| 21 | Bellevue Avenue | Western end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 22 | Gore Hill Park Access | Northern end | Car park access |
| 23 | Royal North Shore Hospital Access | Eastern end | Access to Royal North Shore Hospital |
| 24 | Atchison Lane / Atchison Street | Eastern end | Retail strip - Local Council Road |
| 25 | Wilona Avenue | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 26 | Anglo Lane / Anglo Road | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 27 | Anglo Lane / Anglo Road | Northern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 28 | Park Lane | Southern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 29 | Park Lane | Northern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 30 | Duntroon Avenue Access | Eastern end | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 31 | Carlyle Street | Southern End | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 32 | Sinclair Street | Southern End | Residential street - Local Council Road |
| 33 | Falcon Street | Eastern End | Primary State arterial road |
| 34 | Alexander Street | Northern End | Major Council road |
| 35 | Willoughby Road | Northern End | Retail strip - Secondary State arterial road |
| 36 | Hayberry Street | Eastern End | Access to Alexander Street and Alexander Lane |

[^2]4.4 Assignment

- Microsimulation was carried out using $100 \%$ stochastic route choice with a logit function.
- Similarly to the GTA model, this assignment method is considered to be appropriate to realistically replicate driving behaviour and travel patterns for this network having consideration to the following:
- Relatively small size of the network
- Two key routes exist within the model extent along with Pacific Highway corridor and River Road
- Dynamic assignment provides and opportunity for motorists to realistically seek alternate routes within the network when congestion builds" *


### 4.5 Nodes and Junctions

- These were modelled using standard Aimsun methods, similarly to the GTA Model
- Nodes were coded into the model at all intersections
- Zone connectors were coded at model entry points where it is appropriate the vehicles enter the network at speed


### 4.6 Links

- Link geometry, lanes and turn restrictions were coded based on aerial photography, checked in the field during the site inspection
- Link speed limits were coded based on street view images and aerial photography, checked in the field during the site inspection.
- Link categories were defined using the standard categories.
- Car parking has not been included on the model as it is not a car parking model assessment, in agreement with the approach utilised in the GTA model as per below.
- "It is noted that car parking, particularly along the Pacific Highway, has not been included as this model is not considered a car parking model assessment. Further, site observations indicate little or no friction between general driver behaviour and car parking along the Pacific Highway. '"*


### 4.7 Kerbs and Stoplines

- Kerbs and stoplines positioning were coded based on the aerial photography.


### 4.8 Lane changing and lance choice rules

- Default Aimsun parameters were used for lane changing and lane choice.


### 4.9 Car following

- Default Aimsun car following model parameters were used.


### 4.10 Signal Control

- All signalised intersection phasing and timing were modelled based on

[^3]Intersection Diagnostic Monitor \{IDM) data extracted from RMS SCATS system (data provide by Council to GTA and by GTA to TEF Consulting).

- Unlike in the GTA model, TEF model utilises adaptive phasing for all signalised intersections.
- Intersection operation and actual peak hour phasing sequences were video recorded and the video footage was used to check consistency with the modelled phasing.


### 4.11 Vehicle parameters

- Standard vehicle parameters from Austroads microsimulation standards Technical Note 2 were used.


### 4.12 Matrix Demand Development

- The demand matrix was imported from the Paramics model developed by GTA Consultants


### 4.13 Matrix Structure

- The matrix structure was retained as per the GTA model, quoted below.
- "Two matrix levels, Cars/LGVs and HGVs were developed with the proportion of heavy vehicles estimated directly from the intersection turn counts. '"*


### 4.14 Profile (Demand)

- Demand profiles were retained as per the GTA model, quoted below.
- "To ensure that the correct number of vehicles are released into the network within defined time slices, a demand profile was constructed. To accurately reflect traffic arrival patterns on the external links into the network within the modelled time period, temporal traffic profiles have been adopted on a zone by zone basis. These profiles are based on the existing traffic count data and have been developed for 15 minute periods across the modelled 1.5 hours. "*


### 4.15 Public Transport - Buses

- Public transport services were coded as per the GTA model (refer to quoted text below), except instead of average service frequencies, actual timetables were coded in. This is regarded as an improvement.
- "Public transport data was coded into the model using the following information:
- Bus stop information
- Location of bus stops
- Dwell time at key bus stops - dwell time information was based on site observation and the results of the dwell time survey provided by Council.
- Bus route information
- Bus service providers and route number"*


### 4.16 Pedestrians

- Pedestrian flows were modelled using standard modules in Aimsun software.,

[^4]based on counts provided in the GTA model.

### 4.17 Modelling Techniques

- The following modelling techniques were adopted in the course of the development and calibration and the model:
- In order to reduce modelled queue lengths to better match the observed queue lengths, driver reaction time parameter was reduced on the following intersection approaches
- Shirley Road / River Road
- Northern and western approaches
- River Road / Greenwich Road
- Northern, western and eastern approaches
- Pacific Highway / Shirley Road / Falcon Street
- Eastern approach
- In order to reduce attractiveness of local streets for transit vehicles, driver reaction time parameter was increased on the following northern approaches to River Road.
- Portview Road, ParkRoad and Berry Lane


## 5 MODEL CALIBRATION AND VALIDATION

### 5.1 Calibration and Validation Criteria

- Model calibration and validation were carried out using the same approach as that used for the GTA model, as quoted from the GTA report below.
- "The role of the calibration and validation process in this project was to develop a model that is 'fit for purpose' and produces results that will be suitable for assessing development proposals and improvement options within the study area
- The calibration and validation criteria were based on the RMS Modelling Guidelines, March 2013 and are presented in Table 3"*

Table 3: Calibration and Validation Criteria*.

| Item | Criteria |
| :--- | :--- |
| Link and Turn Volumes | Tolerance limits for individual link and turn volumes: <br> $85 \%$ of individual link or turn volumes to have a GEH $\leq 5$ <br> All individual link and turn volumes should have GEH $\leq 10$ <br> Plots of observed versus modelled hourly flows: <br> Slope value to be included with plots and be $>0.95$ <br> $R^{2}$ value to be included with plots and be >0.9 |
| Travel Time Average | Average modelled travel time to be within $15 \%$ or one minute (whichever is greater) of <br> average observed journey time for full length of route. <br> Average modelled travel time to be within $15 \%$ of average observed travel time for <br> individual sections. <br> Average and 95\% confidence intervals to be plotted for observed and modelled travel <br> times for each journey time route (to modellers and RMS satisfaction). |
| Visual Checks | Key locations to review in terms queuing, pedestrian movements and vehicle-pedestrian <br> interaction. |

- "In terms of traffic data used in the calibration process, the available turn and link counts were used
- The validation process utilised the surveyed travel time data to ensure that the simulated travel times are as close as possible to surveyed travel times"*


### 5.2 Model Calibration and Validation Results

### 5.2.1 Model Stability

- A total of five seed runs were undertaken with the RMS standard seed values (560, 28, 7771, 86524 and 2849).
- The results of five seed runs for total travel time (referred to as Vehicle Hours Travelled or VHT in the GTA report) were plotted on a digram shown in Figure 5 overleaf. Descriptive statistics are included in Table 4.
- Figures 6 and 7 show comparisons of the total number of vehicles in the network over the modelled period, for the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively.
- The results show consistent values, in line with typical variations in daily traffic volumes.

[^5]

Figure 5: Scatter plot for total travel time.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for total travel time.

| Statistic | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Runs | 5 | 5 |
| Mean | 825.00 | 762.80 |
| Standard Deviation | 19.04 | 45.65 |
| Standard Error | 8.51 | 20.41 |
| Range | 43.00 | 113.00 |
| Minimum | 798.00 | 730.00 |
| Maximum | 841.00 | 843.00 |
| Confidence Level(95.0\%) | 23.64 | 56.68 |
| Upper Confudence Limit | 798.00 | 730.00 |
| Lower Confidence Limit | 841.00 | 843.00 |



Figure 6: Total vehicles in the network - AM peak.


Figure 7: Total vehicles in the network - PM peak.

### 5.3 Model Calibration Results

- The calibration results are presented for the average of 5 model runs for both morning and afternoon peak hours.


### 5.3.1 Link and Turn Flow Results

- Table 5 compares the observed versus the modelled vehicle volumes.
- Figures 8 and 9 present the results of the scatter plot analysis for the AM and PM peak hours respectively.
- For detailed results refer to an Appendix.
- The results of turn and link count calibration meet the RMS criteria for GEH and scatter analysis.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for total travel time.

| Measure | Criteria | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detectors |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 85\% of individual link or turns counts | GEH $\leq 5$ | $83.54 \%$ | $89.87 \%$ |
| All individual link or turn counts | GEH $\leq 10$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Slope | $>0.95$ | 1.012 | 0.996 |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $>0.90$ | 0.991 | 0.984 |
| Turns |  |  |  |
| All individual link or turn counts | GEH $\leq 5$ | $86.00 \%$ | $91.00 \%$ |
| Slope | GEH $\leq 10$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ | $>0.95$ | 1.015 | 0.997 |

$\qquad$


Figure 8: Link and turn flow comparison (8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.)


Figure 9: Link and turn flow comparison (5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

### 5.4 Model Validation Results

### 5.4.1 Demand Release

- Similarly to GTA approach, the demand release percentages were checked for each model run
- "Whilst demand release is not a specific validation criteria in the RMS Traffic Modelling Guidelines, it is considered important to show that the model is correctly releasing the appropriate demands into the network. Table 6 presents the demand release percentage for the median seed run in the AM peak model."
- In all runs, the number of unreleased vehicles was less than $1 \%$. This is considered to be acceptable. Please refer to Table 6 overleaf.


### 5.4.2 Travel Time Results

- Results of travel time surveys carried out by GTA for model validation were used for the validation of the current model.
- Figure 10 shows the travel time survey locations.
- Details of GTA travel time survey results are included in the Appendix.
- Figures 11 to $\mathbf{1 8}$ show comparison results of observed and modelled travel times.
- The comparison results indicate good correspondence of travel times, within $15 \%$ or one minute.

Table 6: Travel time comparison (observed times are those reported by GTA).

AM peak

| Route | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed Min } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed } \\ \text { Max Travel } \\ \text { Time, Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Modelled } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Difference } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | Difference, \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Meets <br>

Criteria\end{array}\right]\)

PM peak

| Route | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed Min } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Observed } \\ \text { Max Travel } \\ \text { Time, Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Modelled } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Difference } \\ \text { Travel Time, } \\ \text { Sec }\end{array}$ | Difference, \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Meets <br>

Criteria\end{array}\right]\)

[^6]

Figure 10: Travel time route sections*.

[^7]

Figure 11: Pacific Hwy South-east bound travel time - AM Peak.

## Pacific Hwy

Average Section Travel time
AM Peak Base 2013 North-west Bound


Pacific Hwy
AM Peak Base 2013 North-west Bound


Figure 12: Pacific Hwy North-west bound travel time - AM Peak.


Figure 13: River Rd/Shirley Rd Eastbound travel time - AM Peak.

Shirley Rd/River Rd
Average Section Travel time
AM Peak Base 2013 Westbound


Shirley Rd/River Rd
AM Peak Base 2013 Westbound


Figure 14: River Rd/Shirley Rd Westbound travel time - AM Peak.


Figure 15: Pacific Hwy South-east bound travel time - PM Peak.


Figure 16: Pacific Hwy North-west bound travel time - PM Peak.


Figure 17: River Rd/Shirley Rd Eastbound travel time - PM Peak.


Figure 18: River Rd/Shirley Rd Westbound travel time - PM Peak.

### 5.4.3 Queuing

- Modelled queues on intersection approaches were compared with the survey results contained in GTA reports where available.
- The results of this comparison, presented in Table 7, indicate good matching between the modelled and the observed queues (as stated in the GTA report). It must be noted that comparison of queuing can only be approximate due to differences in definition of queuing between observers in the field and in modelling packages like Aimsun or Paramics.

Table 7: Queue length comparison (observed queues are those reported by GTA).

| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| № | Intersection |  |  | Modelled Queue max (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (95 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Modelled Queue max (veh) | Observed Queue (veh) (85\%) | Observed Queue (veh) (95\%) | Modelled Queue max (veh) | Observed Queue (veh) (85\%) | Observed Queue (veh) (95\%) | Modelled Queue max (veh) | Observed Queue (veh) (85\%) | Observed Queue (veh) (95\%) |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 19 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 10 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 1 |  | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 5 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 10 |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 12 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  | 6 | 21 | 21 | 13 | 20 | 20 |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 7 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 9 | 11 |  |  |  | 10 | 12 | 21 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 19 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 |  |  |  | 6 | 16 | 18 |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | 5 | 3 | 5 | 17 |  | 12 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 7 |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | , | Greenwich Rd |  |  |  | 7 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| 11 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 14 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 12 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 7 | 7 | 10 | 34 | 12 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 24 | 25 |

PM Peak

|  | Intersection |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| № |  |  |  | Modelled Queue max (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (95 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Modelled Queue max (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Observed Queue (veh) $(95 \%)$ | Modelled Queue max (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (95 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Modelled Queue max (veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Observed } \\ \text { Queue (veh) } \\ (85 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Observed Queue (veh) (95\%) |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 19 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | , | Hume St | 10 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St |  | 7 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 12 | 8 | 11 |  |  |  | 6 | 21 | 21 | 13 | 20 | 20 |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 7 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 7 | 9 |  |  |  | 10 | 11 | 19 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 19 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 14 |  |  |  | 6 | 19 | 18 |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | I | Reserve Rd | 5 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 10 |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 0 |  |  | 7 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 5 | 6 |
| 11 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 14 |  |  | 9 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 12 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 7 | 7 | 9 | 34 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 16 |

## 6 EXISTING CONDITIONS MODEL RESULTS

6.1 Intersection operation

- The results for the performance of the intersections in the network from the Aimsun model are shown in Table 8.


### 6.2 Specific conditions

- Substantial congestion and queuing were noted at the following intersections.
- Shirley Rd / River Rd in the eastbound direction
- River Rd / Greenwich Rd in the southbound direction
- Alexander St / Falcon St in the westbound direction
- Pacific Hwy / Herbert St in the southbound direction
- During the calibration process, some transit vehicles which were supposed to use Pacific Hwy, consistently attempted to use local streets. In most instances such behaviour was eliminated by reducing reaction times on the local street approaches to intersections with higher level roads.

Table 8: Intersection operation parameters.

| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intersection |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| № |  |  |  | Flow (veh) | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Delay time } \\ \text { Sec } \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Queue } \\ \max (\text { veh }) \end{array}\right\|$ | Flow (veh) | $\text { \|Delay time } \mid$ $\mathrm{Sec}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Queue } \\ \max (\text { veh }) \end{array}\right\|$ | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay time } \\ \text { Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Queue } \\ \max (\mathrm{veh}) \end{array}\right\|$ | Flow (veh) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Delay time } \\ \text { Sec } \end{gathered}\right.$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Queue } \\ \max (\text { veh }) \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | 1356 | 21.85 | 14.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1173 | 14.86 | 8.00 | 393 | 24.88 | 8.00 | 19.45 | B |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1453 | 37.96 | 19.00 | 491 | 44.46 | 6.00 | 971 | 20.88 | 9.00 | 860 | 31.39 | 11.00 | 32.91 | C |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1439 | 20.15 | 10.00 | 183 | 113.42 | 9.00 | 1358 | 19.19 | 12.00 | 182 | 85.54 | 6.00 | 28.90 | C |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 1443 | 6.54 | 5.00 | 193 | 53.55 | 4.00 | 1429 | 8.26 | 9.00 | 182 | 55.82 | 5.00 | 12.85 | A |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 1831 | 17.45 | 12.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1304 | 13.52 | 6.00 | 554 | 52.71 | 13.00 | 21.36 | B |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 471 | 30.78 | 7.00 | 2271 | 17.69 | 15.00 | 126 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 1685 | 13.50 | 10.00 | 17.03 | B |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 717 | 47.48 | 19.00 | 1886 | 25.15 | 13.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2029 | 14.55 | 6.00 | 23.96 | B |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | 92 | 41.36 | 5.00 | 1876 | 27.63 | 17.00 | 198 | 41.13 | 5.00 | 1798 | 17.09 | 8.00 | 23.84 | B |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1584 | 10.66 | 7.00 | 640 | 50.10 | 10.00 | 1565 | 26.59 | 11.00 | 23.90 | B |
| 11 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 566 | 32.74 | 14.00 | 1152 | 15.16 | 9.00 | 172 | 21.03 | 5.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.96 | B |
| 12 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 339 | 54.90 | 7.00 | 1558 | 43.74 | 34.00 | 314 | 61.00 | 8.00 | 646 | 46.28 | 9.00 | 47.54 | D |

PM Peak

| № | Intersection |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | NB |  |  | WB |  |  | AVD | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Flow (veh) | Delay time | Queue | Flow (veh) | Delay time | Queue | Flow (veh) | Delay time | Queue | Flow (veh) | Delay time | Queue |  |  |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | 1356 | 21.85 | 14.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1173 | 14.86 | 8.00 | 393 | 24.88 | 8.00 | 19.45 | B |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | 1453 | 37.96 | 19.00 | 491 | 44.46 | 6.00 | 971 | 20.88 | 9.00 | 860 | 31.39 | 11.00 | 32.91 | c |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | 1439 | 20.15 | 10.00 | 183 | 113.42 | 9.00 | 1358 | 19.19 | 12.00 | 182 | 85.54 | 6.00 | 28.90 | C |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | 1443 | 6.54 | 5.00 | 193 | 53.55 | 4.00 | 1429 | 8.26 | 9.00 | 182 | 55.82 | 5.00 | 12.85 | A |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | 1831 | 17.45 | 12.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1304 | 13.52 | 6.00 | 554 | 52.71 | 13.00 | 21.36 | B |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | 471 | 30.78 | 7.00 | 2271 | 17.69 | 15.00 | 126 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 1685 | 13.50 | 10.00 | 17.03 | B |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | 717 | 47.48 | 19.00 | 1886 | 25.15 | 13.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2029 | 14.55 | 6.00 | 23.96 | B |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | 92 | 41.36 | 5.00 | 1876 | 27.63 | 17.00 | 198 | 41.13 | 5.00 | 1798 | 17.09 | 8.00 | 23.84 | B |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1584 | 10.66 | 7.00 | 640 | 50.10 | 10.00 | 1565 | 26.59 | 11.00 | 23.90 | B |
| 11 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | 566 | 32.74 | 14.00 | 1152 | 15.16 | 9.00 | 172 | 21.03 | 5.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.96 | B |
| 12 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | 339 | 54.90 | 7.00 | 1558 | 43.74 | 34.00 | 314 | 61.00 | 8.00 | 646 | 46.28 | 9.00 | 47.54 | D |

## 7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- The results of the calibration and validation presented in this report indicated
- a high level of correlation to observed vehicle counts;
- that modelled travel times were mostly within the adopted criteria range;
- that modelled queue lengths generally conformed with the observed conditions.
- The visual analysis also indicates a good representation of the observed performance of the network.


### 7.1 Model Calibration and Validation Declaration

- Based on the results presented herein, the existing condition model meets the requirements of the RMS Modelling Guidelines for both morning and afternoon peak hour conditions.
- The model is thus proposed to be approved as "fit for purpose".

Appendix
Details of GEH analysis.
GTA travel time survey data.

| № | Intersection |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{Z} \\ & \text { D } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\#} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | O 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 | Flow - Real <br> Data Set <br> PM Base <br> 2013 DT - <br> All | Flow - <br> Average <br> PM Base 2013-All | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | N | In | 3279 | 979.00 | 964.00 | -15.00 | -1.53 | 0.48 |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | N | Out | 3278 | 1297.00 | 1332.40 | 35.40 | 2.73 | 0.98 |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | S | In | 3281 | 1602.00 | 1573.80 | -28.20 | -1.76 | 0.71 |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | S | Out | 3280 | 1226.00 | 1189.40 | -36.60 | -2.99 | 1.05 |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | E | In | 3283 | 310.00 | 354.60 | 44.60 | 14.39 | 2.45 |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | E | Out | 3282 | 368.00 | 408.60 | 40.60 | 11.03 | 2.06 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | W | In | 3294 | 611.00 | 538.00 | -73.00 | -11.95 | 3.05 |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | W | Out | 3295 | 513.00 | 534.40 | 21.40 | 4.17 | 0.94 |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | E | In | 3294 | 611.00 | 538.00 | -73.00 | -11.95 | 3.05 |
| 10 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | E | Out | 3291 | 897.00 | 907.20 | 10.20 | 1.14 | 0.34 |
| 11 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | N | In | 3298 | 1511.00 | 1452.20 | -58.80 | -3.89 | 1.53 |
| 12 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | N | Out | 3299 | 1432.00 | 1400.00 | -32.00 | -2.23 | 0.85 |
| 13 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | W | In | 3304 | 112.00 | 106.00 | -6.00 | -5.36 | 0.57 |
| 14 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | W | Out | 3305 | 208.00 | 198.40 | -9.60 | -4.62 | 0.67 |
| 15 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | S | In | 3302 | 1428.00 | 1422.00 | -6.00 | -0.42 | 0.16 |
| 16 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | S | Out | 3303 | 1369.00 | 1357.40 | -11.60 | -0.85 | 0.31 |
| 17 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | E | In | 3300 | 144.00 | 161.00 | 17.00 | 11.81 | 1.38 |
| 18 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | E | Out | 3301 | 186.00 | 181.80 | -4.20 | -2.26 | 0.31 |
| 19 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | W | In | 3306 | 335.00 | 283.40 | -51.60 | -15.40 | 2.93 |
| 20 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | W | Out | 3307 | 171.00 | 182.40 | 11.40 | 6.67 | 0.86 |
| 21 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | E | In | 3308 | 143.00 | 207.20 | 64.20 | 44.90 | 4.85 |
| 22 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | E | Out | 3309 | 248.00 | 180.80 | -67.20 | -27.10 | 4.59 |
| 23 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | N | In | 3313 | 1721.00 | 1707.00 | -14.00 | -0.81 | 0.34 |
| 24 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | N | Out | 3314 | 1775.00 | 1828.60 | 53.60 | 3.02 | 1.26 |
| 25 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | S | In | 3317 | 1412.00 | 1421.00 | 9.00 | 0.64 | 0.24 |
| 26 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | S | Out | 3318 | 1325.00 | 1341.40 | 16.40 | 1.24 | 0.45 |
| 27 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | E | In | 3315 | 501.00 | 518.80 | 17.80 | 3.55 | 0.79 |
| 28 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | E | Out | 3316 | 534.00 | 563.60 | 29.60 | 5.54 | 1.26 |
| 29 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | In | 3321 | 525.00 | 516.00 | -9.00 | -1.71 | 0.39 |
| 30 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | Out | 3322 | 496.00 | 472.80 | -23.20 | -4.68 | 1.05 |
| 31 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | W | In | 3319 | 1949.00 | 1988.60 | 39.60 | 2.03 | 0.89 |
| 32 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | W | Out | 3320 | 2201.00 | 2272.20 | 71.20 | 3.23 | 1.51 |
| 33 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | S | In | 3323 | 174.00 | 131.80 | -42.20 | -24.25 | 3.41 |
| 34 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | In | 3326 | 688.00 | 607.80 | -80.20 | -11.66 | 3.15 |
| 35 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | Out | 3327 | 639.00 | 674.00 | 35.00 | 5.48 | 1.37 |
| 36 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | W | In | 3324 | 1708.00 | 1762.80 | 54.80 | 3.21 | 1.32 |
| 37 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | W | Out | 3325 | 1906.00 | 1924.00 | 18.00 | 0.94 | 0.41 |
| 38 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | E | In | 3328 | 2219.00 | 2273.40 | 54.40 | 2.45 | 1.15 |
| 39 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | E | Out | 3329 | 2010.00 | 2054.60 | 44.60 | 2.22 | 0.99 |
| 40 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | N | In | 3332 | 234.00 | 272.40 | 38.40 | 16.41 | 2.41 |
| 41 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | N | Out | 3333 | 122.00 | 111.20 | -10.80 | -8.85 | 1.00 |
| 42 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | W | In | 3330 | 1558.00 | 1568.40 | 10.40 | 0.67 | 0.26 |
| 43 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | W | Out | 3331 | 1868.00 | 1908.00 | 40.00 | 2.14 | 0.92 |
| 44 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | S | In | 3334 | 183.00 | 210.40 | 27.40 | 14.97 | 1.95 |
| 45 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | S | Out | 3335 | 177.00 | 199.60 | 22.60 | 12.77 | 1.65 |
| 46 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | In | 3336 | 1362.00 | 1389.40 | 27.40 | 2.01 | 0.74 |
| 47 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | Out | 3337 | 1598.00 | 1572.20 | -25.80 | -1.61 | 0.65 |
| 48 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | In | 3342 | 532.00 | 485.20 | -46.80 | -8.80 | 2.08 |
| 49 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | Out | 3343 | 714.00 | 640.60 | -73.40 | -10.28 | 2.82 |
| 50 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | In | 3338 | 1968.00 | 1917.40 | -50.60 | -2.57 | 1.15 |
| 51 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | Out | 3339 | 1550.00 | 1549.20 | -0.80 | -0.05 | 0.02 |
| 52 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | N | In | 3351 | 639.00 | 750.40 | 111.40 | 17.43 | 4.23 |
| 53 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | N | Out | 3350 | 444.00 | 586.20 | 142.20 | 32.03 | 6.27 |
| 54 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | W | In | 3353 | 520.00 | 676.00 | 156.00 | 30.00 | 6.38 |
| 55 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | W | Out | 3354 | 914.00 | 1137.40 | 223.40 | 24.44 | 6.98 |
| 56 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | S | In | 3355 | 433.00 | 489.60 | 56.60 | 13.07 | 2.64 |
| 57 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | S | Out | 3356 | 234.00 | 194.00 | -40.00 | -17.09 | 2.73 |
| 58 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | N | In | 3359 | 568.00 | 519.00 | -49.00 | -8.63 | 2.10 |
| 59 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | N | Out | 3360 | 394.00 | 383.40 | -10.60 | -2.69 | 0.54 |
| 60 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | In | 3357 | 773.00 | 800.60 | 27.60 | 3.57 | 0.98 |
| 61 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | Out | 3358 | 1574.00 | 1489.20 | -84.80 | -5.39 | 2.17 |
| 62 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | In | 3363 | 215.00 | 279.40 | 64.40 | 29.95 | 4.10 |
| 63 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | Out | 3364 | 294.00 | 314.00 | 20.00 | 6.80 | 1.15 |
| 64 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | In | 3361 | 1265.00 | 1246.80 | -18.20 | -1.44 | 0.51 |
| 65 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | Out | 3362 | 559.00 | 658.80 | 99.80 | 17.85 | 4.04 |
| 66 | Berry Rd | 1 | Marshall Ln | S | In | 4374 | 135.00 | 181.20 | 46.20 | 34.22 | 3.67 |
| 89 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | N | In | 4395 | 48.00 | 74.60 | 26.60 | 55.42 | 3.40 |
| 90 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | N | Out | 4396 | 66.00 | 153.40 | 87.40 | 132.42 | 8.34 |
| 91 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | W | In | 4397 | 538.00 | 641.20 | 103.20 | 19.18 | 4.25 |
| 92 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | W | Out | 4398 | 1172.00 | 1178.80 | 6.80 | 0.58 | 0.20 |
| 93 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | E | In | 4399 | 1211.00 | 1219.60 | 8.60 | 0.71 | 0.25 |
| 94 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | E | Out | 4400 | 559.00 | 606.40 | 47.40 | 8.48 | 1.96 |
| 95 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | N | In | 4401 | 50.00 | 21.60 | -28.40 | -56.80 | 4.75 |
| 96 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | N | Out | 4402 | 4.00 | 7.60 | 3.60 | 90.00 | 1.49 |
| 97 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | W | In | 4403 | 635.00 | 733.20 | 98.20 | 15.46 | 3.75 |
| 98 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | W | Out | 4404 | 1211.00 | 1190.80 | -20.20 | -1.67 | 0.58 |
| 99 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | S | In | 4407 | 33.00 | 37.80 | 4.80 | 14.55 | 0.81 |
| 100 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | S | Out | 4408 | 126.00 | 134.00 | 8.00 | 6.35 | 0.70 |
| 101 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | E | In | 4405 | 1165.00 | 1179.40 | 14.40 | 1.24 | 0.42 |
| 102 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | E | Out | 4406 | 542.00 | 638.40 | 96.40 | 17.79 | 3.97 |


| № | Intersection |  |  | Bound | Turn | Turns ID | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Flow - Real } \\ \text { Data Set AM } \\ \text { Base 2013 } \\ \text { DT - All } \end{array}$ | Flow - <br> Average AM <br> Base 2013 - <br> All | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | / | Alexander St | N | L | 2314 | 14.00 | 54.20 | 40.20 | 287.14 | 6.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  | T | 2313 | 1283.00 | 1279.60 | -3.40 | -0.27 | 0.09 |
| 3 |  |  |  | S | T | 2317 | 930.00 | 886.80 | -43.20 | -4.65 | 1.43 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | R | 2318 | 296.00 | 304.80 | 8.80 | 2.97 | 0.51 |
| 5 |  |  |  | E | L | 2315 | 319.00 | 305.80 | -13.20 | -4.14 | 0.75 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | R | 2316 | 49.00 | 77.80 | 28.80 | 58.78 | 3.62 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | / | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | N | L | 2293 | 351.00 | 357.40 | 6.40 | 1.82 | 0.34 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | T | 2294 | 260.00 | 241.40 | -18.60 | -7.15 | 1.17 |
| 9 |  |  |  | W | L | 2295 | 28.00 | 46.00 | 18.00 | 64.29 | 2.96 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | T | 2294 | 260.00 | 241.40 | -18.60 | -7.15 | 1.17 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | R | 2296 | 225.00 | 246.80 | 21.80 | 9.69 | 1.42 |
| 12 |  |  |  | S | L | 2291 | 203.00 | 230.60 | 27.60 | 13.60 | 1.87 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  | T | 2290 | 762.00 | 742.20 | -19.80 | -2.60 | 0.72 |
| 14 |  |  |  | E | L | 1728 | 18.00 | 31.60 | 13.60 | 75.56 | 2.73 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | T | 2297 | 299.00 | 306.60 | 7.60 | 2.54 | 0.44 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | R | 2298 | 580.00 | 565.00 | -15.00 | -2.59 | 0.63 |
| 17 | Pacific Hwy | / | Hume St | N | L | 2278 | 68.00 | 54.20 | -13.80 | -20.29 | 1.77 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | T | 2277 | 1364.00 | 1346.20 | -17.80 | -1.30 | 0.48 |
| 19 |  |  |  | W | L | 2287 | 106.00 | 44.60 | -61.40 | -57.92 | 7.08 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  | T | 2286 | 76.00 | 107.00 | 31.00 | 40.79 | 3.24 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  | R | 2288 | 26.00 | 47.20 | 21.20 | 81.54 | 3.50 |
| 22 |  |  |  | S | L | 2281 | 23.00 | 19.20 | -3.80 | -16.52 | 0.83 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  | T | 2280 | 1346.00 | 1349.80 | 3.80 | 0.28 | 0.10 |
| 24 |  |  |  | E | L | 2284 | 38.00 | 33.60 | -4.40 | -11.58 | 0.74 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  | T | 2283 | 89.00 | 86.80 | -2.20 | -2.47 | 0.23 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  | R | 2285 | 59.00 | 60.00 | 1.00 | 1.69 | 0.13 |
| 27 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | N | L | 2268 | 74.00 | 85.40 | 11.40 | 15.41 | 1.28 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  | T | 2267 | 1341.00 | 1338.40 | -2.60 | -0.19 | 0.07 |
| 29 |  |  |  | W | L | 2271 | 53.00 | 36.80 | -16.20 | -30.57 | 2.42 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  | T | 2270 | 69.00 | 121.80 | 52.80 | 76.52 | 5.41 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  | R | 2272 | 49.00 | 20.60 | -28.40 | -57.96 | 4.81 |
| 32 |  |  |  | S | L | 2265 | 224.00 | 142.00 | -82.00 | -36.61 | 6.06 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  | T | 2264 | 1291.00 | 1304.60 | 13.60 | 1.05 | 0.38 |
| 34 |  |  |  | E | L | 2273 | 33.00 | 36.40 | 3.40 | 10.30 | 0.58 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  | T | 2275 | 215.00 | 141.60 | -73.40 | -34.14 | 5.50 |
| 36 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | N | L | 2209 | 389.00 | 426.20 | 37.20 | 9.56 | 1.84 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  | T | 2208 | 1386.00 | 1404.40 | 18.40 | 1.33 | 0.49 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  | T | 2206 | 1213.00 | 1167.80 | -45.20 | -3.73 | 1.31 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  | R | 2207 | 112.00 | 164.60 | 52.60 | 46.96 | 4.47 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  | L | 2211 | 26.00 | 27.40 | 1.40 | 5.38 | 0.27 |
| 41 |  |  |  | E | R | 2212 | 508.00 | 536.80 | 28.80 | 5.67 | 1.26 |
| 42 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | L | 2254 | 70.00 | 71.40 | 1.40 | 2.00 | 0.17 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  | T | 2253 | 103.00 | 55.40 | -47.60 | -46.21 | 5.35 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  | R | 2255 | 323.00 | 343.80 | 20.80 | 6.44 | 1.14 |
| 45 |  |  |  | W | L | 2249 | 525.00 | 516.20 | -8.80 | -1.68 | 0.39 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  | T | 2248 | 1676.00 | 1763.20 | 87.20 | 5.20 | 2.10 |
| 47 |  |  |  | E | L | 2252 | 71.00 | 76.20 | 5.20 | 7.32 | 0.61 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  | T | 2251 | 1626.00 | 1644.80 | 18.80 | 1.16 | 0.46 |
| 49 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | L | 2261 | 522.00 | 500.00 | -22.00 | -4.21 | 0.97 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  | T | 2262 | 177.00 | 172.60 | -4.40 | -2.49 | 0.33 |
| 51 |  |  |  | W | L | 2260 | 209.00 | 157.00 | -52.00 | -24.88 | 3.84 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  | T | 2259 | 1697.00 | 1774.20 | 77.20 | 4.55 | 1.85 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  | T | 2257 | 1531.00 | 1593.20 | 62.20 | 4.06 | 1.57 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  | R | 2258 | 479.00 | 451.20 | -27.80 | -5.80 | 1.29 |
| 55 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | N | L | 2238 | 90.00 | 52.80 | -37.20 | -41.33 | 4.40 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  | T | 2239 | 8.00 | 19.40 | 11.40 | 142.50 | 3.08 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  | R | 2240 | 24.00 | 37.00 | 13.00 | 54.17 | 2.35 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2234 | 88.00 | 98.60 | 10.60 | 12.05 | 1.10 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2233 | 1711.00 | 1749.60 | 38.60 | 2.26 | 0.93 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  | R | 2246 | 69.00 | 59.40 | -9.60 | -13.91 | 1.20 |
| 61 |  |  |  | S | L | 2241 | 70.00 | 43.60 | -26.40 | -37.71 | 3.50 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  | T | 2242 | 5.00 | 29.60 | 24.60 | 492.00 | 5.91 |
| 63 |  |  |  |  | R | 2243 | 102.00 | 125.80 | 23.80 | 23.33 | 2.23 |
| 64 |  |  |  | E | L | 2236 | 106.00 | 132.00 | 26.00 | 24.53 | 2.38 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2235 | 1464.00 | 1496.60 | 32.60 | 2.23 | 0.85 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  | R | 2237 | 141.00 | 144.20 | 3.20 | 2.27 | 0.27 |
| 67 | Pacific Hwy | / | Greenwich Rd |  | T | 2374 | 1396.00 | 1349.00 | -47.00 | -3.37 | 1.27 |
| 68 |  |  |  |  | R | 2375 | 202.00 | 228.40 | 26.40 | 13.07 | 1.80 |
| 69 |  |  |  | S | L | 2376 | 142.00 | 70.00 | -72.00 | -50.70 | 6.99 |
| 70 |  |  |  | S | R | 2377 | 572.00 | 569.60 | -2.40 | -0.42 | 0.10 |
| 71 |  |  |  | E | L | 2371 | 330.00 | 229.80 | -100.20 | -30.36 | 5.99 |
| 72 |  |  |  | E | T | 2370 | 1220.00 | 1320.80 | 100.80 | 8.26 | 2.83 |
| 73 | Shirley Rd | , | River Rd | N | T | 2800 | 62.00 | 39.00 | -23.00 | -37.10 | 3.24 |
| 74 |  |  |  |  | R | 2799 | 382.00 | 546.20 | 164.20 | 42.98 | 7.62 |
| 75 |  |  |  | w | L | 2797 | 543.00 | 687.00 | 144.00 | 26.52 | 5.81 |
| 76 |  |  |  |  | R | 2798 | 371.00 | 450.60 | 79.60 | 21.46 | 3.93 |
| 77 |  |  |  | S | L | 2801 | 138.00 | 130.60 | -7.40 | -5.36 | 0.64 |
| 78 |  |  |  |  | T | 2802 | 96.00 | 63.40 | -32.60 | -33.96 | 3.65 |
| 79 |  |  |  |  | L | 2656 | 72.00 | 56.60 | -15.40 | -21.39 | 1.92 |
| 80 |  |  |  | N | T | 2655 | 102.00 | 129.40 | 27.40 | 26.86 | 2.55 |


| № | Intersection |  |  | Bound | Turn | Turns ID | Flow - Real <br> Data Set AM <br> Base 2013 <br> DT - All | Flow - <br> Average AM <br> Base 2013 - <br> All | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81 | River Rd | / | Greenwich Rd |  | R | 2657 | 220.00 | 198.80 | -21.20 | -9.64 | 1.47 |
| 82 |  |  |  | W | L | 2647 | 433.00 | 385.60 | -47.40 | -10.95 | 2.34 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | T | 2646 | 1091.00 | 1064.80 | -26.20 | -2.40 | 0.80 |
| 84 |  |  |  |  | R | 2648 | 50.00 | 38.00 | -12.00 | -24.00 | 1.81 |
| 85 |  |  |  | S | L | 2653 | 57.00 | 58.60 | 1.60 | 2.81 | 0.21 |
| 86 |  |  |  |  | T | 2652 | 135.00 | 133.60 | -1.40 | -1.04 | 0.12 |
| 87 |  |  |  |  | R | 2654 | 102.00 | 122.40 | 20.40 | 20.00 | 1.93 |
| 88 |  |  |  | E | L | 2650 | 63.00 | 112.00 | 49.00 | 77.78 | 5.24 |
| 89 |  |  |  |  | T | 2649 | 496.00 | 543.20 | 47.20 | 9.52 | 2.07 |
| 55 | River Rd | / | Duntroon Ave | N | L | 2617 | 46.00 | 83.00 | 37.00 | 80.43 | 4.61 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  | R | 2616 | 20.00 | 69.60 | 49.60 | 248.00 | 7.41 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2612 | 7.00 | 40.60 | 33.60 | 480.00 | 6.89 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2611 | 1165.00 | 1137.00 | -28.00 | -2.40 | 0.83 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2614 | 518.00 | 571.40 | 53.40 | 10.31 | 2.29 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  | R | 2613 | 41.00 | 34.20 | -6.80 | -16.59 | 1.11 |
| 55 | River Rd | / | Canberra Ave/Russell St | N | L | 2635 | 4.00 | 7.60 | 3.60 | 90.00 | 1.49 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2638 | 50.00 | 21.60 | -28.40 | -56.80 | 4.75 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2637 | 1161.00 | 1171.20 | 10.20 | 0.88 | 0.30 |
| 61 |  |  |  | S | L | 2632 | 126.00 | 134.40 | 8.40 | 6.67 | 0.74 |
| 64 |  |  |  | E | L | 2629 | 33.00 | 37.80 | 4.80 | 14.55 | 0.81 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2628 | 509.00 | 600.00 | 91.00 | 17.88 | 3.86 |


| № | Intersection |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { İ } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { On } \end{aligned}$ | E | E | Flow - Real Data Set PM Base 2013 DT - All | Flow - <br> Average PM <br> Base 2013 - <br> All | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | , | Alexander St | N | L | 2314 | 33.00 | 61.20 | 28.20 | 85.45 | 4.11 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  | T | 2313 | 946.00 | 1065.20 | 119.20 | 12.60 | 3.76 |
| 3 |  |  |  | S | T | 2317 | 1042.00 | 1060.20 | 18.20 | 1.75 | 0.56 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  | R | 2318 | 295.00 | 296.80 | 1.80 | 0.61 | 0.10 |
| 5 |  |  |  | E | L | 2315 | 214.00 | 186.80 | -27.20 | -12.71 | 1.92 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | R | 2316 | 67.00 | 88.80 | 21.80 | 32.54 | 2.47 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | , | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | N | L | 2293 | 392.00 | 403.00 | 11.00 | 2.81 | 0.55 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | T | 2294 | 406.00 | 383.20 | -22.80 | -5.62 | 1.15 |
| 9 |  |  |  | W | L | 2295 | 43.00 | 31.60 | -11.40 | -26.51 | 1.87 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  | T | 2294 | 406.00 | 383.20 | -22.80 | -5.62 | 1.15 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  | R | 2296 | 138.00 | 219.20 | 81.20 | 58.84 | 6.08 |
| 12 |  |  |  | S | L | 2291 | 401.00 | 475.40 | 74.40 | 18.55 | 3.55 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  | T | 2290 | 710.00 | 684.00 | -26.00 | -3.66 | 0.98 |
| 14 |  |  |  | E | L | 1728 | 29.00 | 26.60 | -2.40 | -8.28 | 0.46 |
| 15 |  |  |  |  | T | 2297 | 428.00 | 374.40 | -53.60 | -12.52 | 2.68 |
| 16 |  |  |  |  | R | 2298 | 459.00 | 394.60 | -64.40 | -14.03 | 3.12 |
| 17 | Pacific Hwy | / | Hume St | N | L | 2278 | 47.00 | 31.40 | -15.60 | -33.19 | 2.49 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  | T | 2277 | 1255.00 | 1245.20 | -9.80 | -0.78 | 0.28 |
| 19 |  |  |  | W | L | 2287 | 54.00 | 53.60 | -0.40 | -0.74 | 0.05 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  | T | 2286 | 90.00 | 85.00 | -5.00 | -5.56 | 0.53 |
| 21 |  |  |  |  | R | 2288 | 25.00 | 45.60 | 20.60 | 82.40 | 3.47 |
| 22 |  |  |  | S | L | 2281 | 34.00 | 30.80 | -3.20 | -9.41 | 0.56 |
| 23 |  |  |  |  | T | 2280 | 1130.00 | 1089.80 | -40.20 | -3.56 | 1.21 |
| 24 |  |  |  | E | L | 2284 | 46.00 | 14.60 | -31.40 | -68.26 | 5.70 |
| 25 |  |  |  |  | T | 2283 | 103.00 | 76.00 | -27.00 | -26.21 | 2.85 |
| 26 |  |  |  |  | R | 2285 | 47.00 | 50.80 | 3.80 | 8.09 | 0.54 |
| 27 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | N | L | 2268 | 70.00 | 90.80 | 20.80 | 29.71 | 2.32 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  | T | 2267 | 1092.00 | 1092.80 | 0.80 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| 29 |  |  |  | W | L | 2271 | 131.00 | 93.20 | -37.80 | -28.86 | 3.57 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  | T | 2270 | 190.00 | 125.00 | -65.00 | -34.21 | 5.18 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  | R | 2272 | 141.00 | 119.20 | -21.80 | -15.46 | 1.91 |
| 32 |  |  |  | S | L | 2265 | 97.00 | 34.20 | -62.80 | -64.74 | 7.75 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  | T | 2264 | 1131.00 | 1156.40 | 25.40 | 2.25 | 0.75 |
| 34 |  |  |  | E | L | 2273 | 72.00 | 56.80 | -15.20 | -21.11 | 1.89 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  | T | 2275 | 120.00 | 100.00 | -20.00 | -16.67 | 1.91 |
| 36 | Pacific Hwy | / | Albany St | N | L | 2209 | 339.00 | 347.20 | 8.20 | 2.42 | 0.44 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  | T | 2208 | 1136.00 | 1131.40 | -4.60 | -0.40 | 0.14 |
| 38 |  |  |  |  | T | 2206 | 1161.00 | 1108.60 | -52.40 | -4.51 | 1.56 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  | R | 2207 | 118.00 | 135.60 | 17.60 | 14.92 | 1.56 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  | L | 2211 | 38.00 | 55.60 | 17.60 | 46.32 | 2.57 |
| 41 |  |  |  | E | R | 2212 | 533.00 | 523.00 | -10.00 | -1.88 | 0.44 |
| 42 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | L | 2254 | 51.00 | 44.00 | -7.00 | -13.73 | 1.02 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  | T | 2253 | 38.00 | 31.40 | -6.60 | -17.37 | 1.12 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  | R | 2255 | 281.00 | 239.80 | -41.20 | -14.66 | 2.55 |
| 45 |  |  |  | W | L | 2249 | 420.00 | 438.60 | 18.60 | 4.43 | 0.90 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  | T | 2248 | 1441.00 | 1437.80 | -3.20 | -0.22 | 0.08 |
| 47 |  |  |  | E | L | 2252 | 36.00 | 47.80 | 11.80 | 32.78 | 1.82 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  | T | 2251 | 1646.00 | 1600.00 | -46.00 | -2.79 | 1.14 |
| 49 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | L | 2261 | 577.00 | 596.20 | 19.20 | 3.33 | 0.79 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  | T | 2262 | 217.00 | 240.80 | 23.80 | 10.97 | 1.57 |
| 51 |  |  |  | w | L | 2260 | 136.00 | 161.00 | 25.00 | 18.38 | 2.05 |
| 52 |  |  |  | W | T | 2259 | 1283.00 | 1280.80 | -2.20 | -0.17 | 0.06 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  | T | 2257 | 1638.00 | 1554.00 | -84.00 | -5.13 | 2.10 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  | R | 2258 | 381.00 | 377.80 | -3.20 | -0.84 | 0.16 |
| 55 | Pacific Hwy | / | Reserve Rd | N | L | 2238 | 95.00 | 127.80 | 32.80 | 34.53 | 3.11 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  | T | 2239 | 3.00 | 21.00 | 18.00 | 600.00 | 5.20 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  | R | 2240 | 68.00 | 65.20 | -2.80 | -4.12 | 0.34 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2234 | 42.00 | 70.20 | 28.20 | 67.14 | 3.77 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2233 | 1239.00 | 1237.80 | -1.20 | -0.10 | 0.03 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  | R | 2246 | 51.00 | 51.40 | 0.40 | 0.78 | 0.06 |
| 61 |  |  |  | S | L | 2241 | 85.00 | 61.20 | -23.80 | -28.00 | 2.78 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  | T | 2242 | 5.00 | 10.40 | 5.40 | 108.00 | 1.95 |
| 63 |  |  |  |  | R | 2243 | 83.00 | 70.00 | -13.00 | -15.66 | 1.49 |
| 64 |  |  |  | E | L | 2236 | 84.00 | 75.60 | -8.40 | -10.00 | 0.94 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2235 | 1712.00 | 1637.60 | -74.40 | -4.35 | 1.82 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  | R | 2237 | 63.00 | 82.20 | 19.20 | 30.48 | 2.25 |
| 67 | Pacific Hwy | / | Greenwich Rd |  | T | 2374 | 992.00 | 1065.00 | 73.00 | 7.36 | 2.28 |
| 68 |  |  |  |  | R | 2375 | 216.00 | 220.20 | 4.20 | 1.94 | 0.28 |
| 69 |  |  |  |  | L | 2376 | 99.00 | 74.40 | -24.60 | -24.85 | 2.64 |
| 70 |  |  |  | S | R | 2377 | 332.00 | 273.60 | -58.40 | -17.59 | 3.36 |
| 71 |  |  |  |  | L | 2371 | 551.00 | 388.00 | -163.00 | -29.58 | 7.52 |
| 72 |  |  |  | E | T | 2370 | 1417.00 | 1371.00 | -46.00 | -3.25 | 1.23 |
| 73 | Shirley Rd | , | River Rd | N | T | 2800 | 122.00 | 120.60 | -1.40 | -1.15 | 0.13 |
| 74 |  |  |  |  | R | 2799 | 692.00 | 702.60 | 10.60 | 1.53 | 0.40 |
| 75 |  |  |  | W | L | 2797 | 440.00 | 564.20 | 124.20 | 28.23 | 5.54 |
| 76 |  |  |  |  | R | 2798 | 220.00 | 265.20 | 45.20 | 20.55 | 2.90 |
| 77 |  |  |  | S | L | 2801 | 155.00 | 207.00 | 52.00 | 33.55 | 3.87 |
| 78 |  |  |  |  | T | 2802 | 149.00 | 145.40 | -3.60 | -2.42 | 0.30 |
| 79 |  |  |  |  | L | 2656 | 86.00 | 54.60 | -31.40 | -36.51 | 3.75 |
| 80 |  |  |  | N | T | 2655 | 130.00 | 99.40 | -30.60 | -23.54 | 2.86 |


| № | Intersection |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ | E | 寿 | Flow - Real <br> Data Set PM <br> Base 2013 <br> DT - All | Flow Average PM Base 2013 All | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 81 | River Rd | / | Greenwich Rd |  | R | 2657 | 494.00 | 411.40 | -82.60 | -16.72 | 3.88 |
| 82 |  |  |  | W | L | 2647 | 184.00 | 234.40 | 50.40 | 27.39 | 3.48 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | T | 2646 | 548.00 | 597.60 | 49.60 | 9.05 | 2.07 |
| 84 |  |  |  |  | R | 2648 | 44.00 | 41.00 | -3.00 | -6.82 | 0.46 |
| 85 |  |  |  | S | L | 2653 | 63.00 | 49.20 | -13.80 | -21.90 | 1.84 |
| 86 |  |  |  |  | T | 2652 | 104.00 | 76.20 | -27.80 | -26.73 | 2.93 |
| 87 |  |  |  |  | R | 2654 | 73.00 | 116.00 | 43.00 | 58.90 | 4.42 |
| 88 |  |  |  | E | L | 2650 | 97.00 | 144.00 | 47.00 | 48.45 | 4.28 |
| 89 |  |  |  |  | T | 2649 | 826.00 | 900.20 | 74.20 | 8.98 | 2.53 |
| 55 | River Rd | / | Duntroon Ave | N | L | 2617 | 57.00 | 119.40 | 62.40 | 109.47 | 6.64 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  | R | 2616 | 33.00 | 53.00 | 20.00 | 60.61 | 3.05 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2612 | 9.00 | 20.40 | 11.40 | 126.67 | 2.97 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2611 | 703.00 | 719.80 | 16.80 | 2.39 | 0.63 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2614 | 841.00 | 961.40 | 120.40 | 14.32 | 4.01 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  | R | 2613 | 32.00 | 24.60 | -7.40 | -23.13 | 1.39 |
| 55 | River Rd | / | Canberra Ave/Russell St | N | L | 2635 | 4.00 | 9.80 | 5.80 | 145.00 | 2.21 |
| 58 |  |  |  | W | L | 2638 | 41.00 | 9.60 | -31.40 | -76.59 | 6.24 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  | T | 2637 | 714.00 | 726.80 | 12.80 | 1.79 | 0.48 |
| 61 |  |  |  | S | L | 2632 | 120.00 | 93.80 | -26.20 | -21.83 | 2.53 |
| 64 |  |  |  | E | L | 2629 | 28.00 | 37.20 | 9.20 | 32.86 | 1.61 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | T | 2628 | 847.00 | 974.00 | 127.00 | 14.99 | 4.21 |


| № | Intersection |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{Z} \\ & \text { D } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\#} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | O 0.0 0.0 0.0 0 | Flow - Real <br> Data Set <br> PM Base <br> 2013 DT - <br> All | Flow - <br> Average <br> PM Base $2013 \text { - All }$ | Absolute Difference | Relative Difference (\%) | GEH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | N | In | 3279 | 1109.00 | 1149.40 | 40.40 | 3.64 | 1.20 |
| 2 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | N | Out | 3278 | 963.00 | 1128.00 | 165.00 | 17.13 | 5.10 |
| 3 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | S | In | 3281 | 1160.00 | 1234.40 | 74.40 | 6.41 | 2.15 |
| 4 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | S | Out | 3280 | 1337.00 | 1354.60 | 17.60 | 1.32 | 0.48 |
| 5 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | E | In | 3283 | 312.00 | 363.60 | 51.60 | 16.54 | 2.81 |
| 6 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Alexander St | E | Out | 3282 | 281.00 | 307.00 | 26.00 | 9.25 | 1.52 |
| 7 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | W | In | 3294 | 798.00 | 849.20 | 51.20 | 6.42 | 1.78 |
| 8 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | W | Out | 3295 | 587.00 | 633.80 | 46.80 | 7.97 | 1.89 |
| 9 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | E | In | 3294 | 798.00 | 849.20 | 51.20 | 6.42 | 1.78 |
| 10 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Shirley Rd/Falcon St | E | Out | 3291 | 916.00 | 798.00 | -118.00 | -12.88 | 4.03 |
| 11 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | N | In | 3298 | 1231.00 | 1191.40 | -39.60 | -3.22 | 1.14 |
| 12 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | N | Out | 3299 | 1302.00 | 1272.60 | -29.40 | -2.26 | 0.82 |
| 13 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | W | In | 3304 | 137.00 | 106.80 | -30.20 | -22.04 | 2.74 |
| 14 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | W | Out | 3305 | 169.00 | 184.00 | 15.00 | 8.88 | 1.13 |
| 15 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | S | In | 3302 | 1326.00 | 1300.00 | -26.00 | -1.96 | 0.72 |
| 16 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | S | Out | 3303 | 1164.00 | 1111.40 | -52.60 | -4.52 | 1.56 |
| 17 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | E | In | 3300 | 137.00 | 116.40 | -20.60 | -15.04 | 1.83 |
| 18 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Hume St | E | Out | 3301 | 196.00 | 143.00 | -53.00 | -27.04 | 4.07 |
| 19 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | W | In | 3306 | 217.00 | 134.20 | -82.80 | -38.16 | 6.25 |
| 20 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | W | Out | 3307 | 462.00 | 340.80 | -121.20 | -26.23 | 6.05 |
| 21 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | E | In | 3308 | 260.00 | 215.60 | -44.40 | -17.08 | 2.88 |
| 22 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Oxley St | E | Out | 3309 | 193.00 | 160.00 | -33.00 | -17.10 | 2.48 |
| 23 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | N | In | 3313 | 1694.00 | 1633.80 | -60.20 | -3.55 | 1.48 |
| 24 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | N | Out | 3314 | 1475.00 | 1478.20 | 3.20 | 0.22 | 0.08 |
| 25 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | S | In | 3317 | 1174.00 | 1183.00 | 9.00 | 0.77 | 0.26 |
| 26 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | S | Out | 3318 | 1279.00 | 1249.00 | -30.00 | -2.35 | 0.84 |
| 27 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | E | In | 3315 | 457.00 | 418.60 | -38.40 | -8.40 | 1.84 |
| 28 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Albany St | E | Out | 3316 | 571.00 | 578.40 | 7.40 | 1.30 | 0.31 |
| 29 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | In | 3321 | 420.00 | 437.80 | 17.80 | 4.24 | 0.86 |
| 30 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | N | Out | 3322 | 370.00 | 318.80 | -51.20 | -13.84 | 2.76 |
| 31 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | W | In | 3319 | 1927.00 | 1839.40 | -87.60 | -4.55 | 2.02 |
| 32 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | W | Out | 3320 | 1861.00 | 1871.00 | 10.00 | 0.54 | 0.23 |
| 33 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Christie St | S | In | 3323 | 74.00 | 79.20 | 5.20 | 7.03 | 0.59 |
| 34 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | In | 3326 | 517.00 | 538.20 | 21.20 | 4.10 | 0.92 |
| 35 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | N | Out | 3327 | 794.00 | 838.20 | 44.20 | 5.57 | 1.55 |
| 36 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | W | In | 3324 | 1855.00 | 1791.40 | -63.60 | -3.43 | 1.49 |
| 37 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | W | Out | 3325 | 1419.00 | 1435.00 | 16.00 | 1.13 | 0.42 |
| 38 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | E | In | 3328 | 1860.00 | 1876.60 | 16.60 | 0.89 | 0.38 |
| 39 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Herbert St | E | Out | 3329 | 2019.00 | 1941.00 | -78.00 | -3.86 | 1.75 |
| 40 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | N | In | 3332 | 110.00 | 162.80 | 52.80 | 48.00 | 4.52 |
| 41 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | N | Out | 3333 | 166.00 | 217.60 | 51.60 | 31.08 | 3.73 |
| 42 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | W | In | 3330 | 1865.00 | 1759.80 | -105.20 | -5.64 | 2.47 |
| 43 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | W | Out | 3331 | 1332.00 | 1353.40 | 21.40 | 1.61 | 0.58 |
| 44 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | S | In | 3334 | 138.00 | 147.80 | 9.80 | 7.10 | 0.82 |
| 45 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Reserve Rd | S | Out | 3335 | 173.00 | 142.40 | -30.60 | -17.69 | 2.44 |
| 46 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | In | 3336 | 1516.00 | 1445.20 | -70.80 | -4.67 | 1.84 |
| 47 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | Out | 3337 | 1208.00 | 1282.80 | 74.80 | 6.19 | 2.12 |
| 48 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | In | 3342 | 767.00 | 633.60 | -133.40 | -17.39 | 5.04 |
| 49 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | Out | 3343 | 431.00 | 351.00 | -80.00 | -18.56 | 4.05 |
| 50 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | In | 3338 | 1324.00 | 1336.60 | 12.60 | 0.95 | 0.35 |
| 51 | Pacific Hwy | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | Out | 3339 | 1968.00 | 1756.00 | -212.00 | -10.77 | 4.91 |
| 52 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | N | In | 3351 | 589.00 | 708.60 | 119.60 | 20.31 | 4.70 |
| 53 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | N | Out | 3350 | 814.00 | 825.80 | 11.80 | 1.45 | 0.41 |
| 54 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | W | In | 3353 | 847.00 | 909.60 | 62.60 | 7.39 | 2.11 |
| 55 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | W | Out | 3354 | 660.00 | 830.00 | 170.00 | 25.76 | 6.23 |
| 56 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | S | In | 3355 | 342.00 | 385.80 | 43.80 | 12.81 | 2.30 |
| 57 | Shirley Rd | 1 | River Rd | S | Out | 3356 | 304.00 | 352.00 | 48.00 | 15.79 | 2.65 |
| 58 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | N | In | 3359 | 288.00 | 310.80 | 22.80 | 7.92 | 1.32 |
| 59 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | N | Out | 3360 | 710.00 | 563.80 | -146.20 | -20.59 | 5.79 |
| 60 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | In | 3357 | 1383.00 | 1361.60 | -21.40 | -1.55 | 0.58 |
| 61 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | W | Out | 3358 | 776.00 | 874.20 | 98.20 | 12.65 | 3.42 |
| 62 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | In | 3363 | 271.00 | 284.20 | 13.20 | 4.87 | 0.79 |
| 63 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | S | Out | 3364 | 240.00 | 241.40 | 1.40 | 0.58 | 0.09 |
| 64 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | In | 3361 | 707.00 | 768.60 | 61.60 | 8.71 | 2.27 |
| 65 | River Rd | 1 | Greenwich Rd | E | Out | 3362 | 923.00 | 1043.40 | 120.40 | 13.04 | 3.84 |
| 66 | Berry Rd | 1 | Marshall Ln | S | In | 4374 | 126.00 | 114.80 | -11.20 | -8.89 | 1.02 |
| 89 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | N | In | 4395 | 41.00 | 45.20 | 4.20 | 10.24 | 0.64 |
| 90 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | N | Out | 4396 | 90.00 | 171.60 | 81.60 | 90.67 | 7.13 |
| 91 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | W | In | 4397 | 874.00 | 1013.80 | 139.80 | 16.00 | 4.55 |
| 92 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | W | Out | 4398 | 712.00 | 739.20 | 27.20 | 3.82 | 1.01 |
| 93 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | E | In | 4399 | 760.00 | 839.00 | 79.00 | 10.39 | 2.79 |
| 94 | River Rd | 1 | Duntroon Ave | E | Out | 4400 | 873.00 | 986.40 | 113.40 | 12.99 | 3.72 |
| 95 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | N | In | 4401 | 41.00 | 9.60 | -31.40 | -76.59 | 6.24 |
| 96 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | N | Out | 4402 | 4.00 | 10.00 | 6.00 | 150.00 | 2.27 |
| 97 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | W | In | 4403 | 967.00 | 1067.40 | 100.40 | 10.38 | 3.15 |
| 98 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | W | Out | 4404 | 755.00 | 736.00 | -19.00 | -2.52 | 0.70 |
| 99 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | S | In | 4407 | 28.00 | 37.00 | 9.00 | 32.14 | 1.58 |
| 100 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | S | Out | 4408 | 120.00 | 94.00 | -26.00 | -21.67 | 2.51 |
| 101 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | E | In | 4405 | 718.00 | 737.80 | 19.80 | 2.76 | 0.73 |
| 102 | River Rd | 1 | Canberra Ave | E | Out | 4406 | 875.00 | 1011.60 | 136.60 | 15.61 | 4.45 |

Travel Time Survey

| Date of Survey | Thursday 04 April 2013 |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | Thursday 19 September 2013 |
| Time of Survey | AM Peak (8:00-9:00am) <br> PM Peak (5:00-6:00pm) |
|  | Thomas $\mathrm{Ng} /$ Chris Slenders |

Travel Routes
Figure 1: Travel Time Route along Pacific Highway


[^8]AM Peak - Travel Time Results
Table 1: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - AM Peak Pacific Highway Eastbound

| Date |  |  | 4 April 2013 |  |  |  |  | 19 Sept 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Run 4 | Run 5 | Run 6 | Run 7 | Average | Standard Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Greenwich Rd | Reserve Rd | 38 | 48 | 89 | 50 | 76 | 66 | 46 | 59 | 18 | 45 | 73 |
| 2 | Reserve Rd | Herbert St | 66 | 12 | 24 | 19 | 101 | 98 | 17 | 48 | 39 | 19 | 77 |
| 3 | Herbert St | Christie St | 24 | 21 | 25 | 22 | 16 | 23 | 16 | 21 | 4 | 18 | 24 |
| 4 | Christie St | Albany St | 23 | 71 | 19 | 62 | 21 | 18 | 20 | 33 | 23 | 17 | 50 |
| 5 | Albany St | Oxley St | 15 | 17 | 13 | 19 | 17 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 2 | 14 | 17 |
| 6 | Oxley St | Hume St | 38 | 13 | 13 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 9 | 10 | 24 |
| All Sections | Greenwich Rd | Hume St | 204 | 182 | 183 | 188 | 245 | 229 | 128 | 194 | 38 | 166 | 222 |

Figure 2: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - AM Pacific Highway Eastbound.


Table 2: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - AM Peak Pacific Highway Westbound.

| Date |  |  | 4 April 2013 |  |  |  |  | 19 Sept 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Run 4 | Run 5 | Run 6 | Run 7 | Average | Standard <br> Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Hume St | Oxley St | 8 | 20 | 11 | 14 | 38 | 13 | 13 | 17 | 10 | 9 | 29 |
| 2 | Oxley St | Albany St | 34 | 16 | 18 | 15 | 55 | 43 | 50 | 33 | 17 | 20 | 43 |
| 3 | Albany St | Christie St | 33 | 16 | 20 | 38 | 43 | 16 | 16 | 26 | 12 | 17 | 40 |
| 4 | Christie St | Herbert St | 17 | 85 | 62 | 16 | 72 | 101 | 12 | 52 | 37 | 25 | 78 |
| 5 | Herbert St | Reserve Rd | 30 | 18 | 16 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 13 | 27 |
| 6 | Reserve Rd | Greenwich Rd | 39 | 39 | 61 | 68 | 88 | 30 | 46 | 53 | 20 | 38 | 77 |
| All Sections | Hume St | Greenwich Rd | 204 | 182 | 183 | 188 | 245 | 213 | 149 | 199 | 30 | 173 | 217 |

Figure 3: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - AM Pacific Highway Westbound.


Table 3: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - AM Peak Pacific River Road Eastbound

| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Average | Standard <br> Deviation | Lower | Upper |
|  | Greenwich Rd | Shirley Rd | 80 | 102 | 100 | 94 | 12 | 80 | 108 |
| 2 | Shirley Rd | Pacific Hwy | 164 | 133 | 127 | 141 | 20 | 119 | 164 |
| All Sections | Greenwich Rd | Pacific Hwy | $\mathbf{2 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 5}$ |

Figure 4: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - AM Peak River Road Eastbound.


Table 4: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - AM Peak Pacific River Road Westbound.

| Date |  | 19 September 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Average | Standard <br> Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | Shirley Rd | 45 | 83 | 37 | 55 | 25 | 27 | 83 |
| 2 | Shirley Rd | Greenwich Rd | 106 | 113 | 76 | 98 | 20 | 76 | 121 |
| All Sections | Pacific Hwy | Greenwich Rd | $\mathbf{1 5 1}$ | 196 | 113 | 153 | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | 106 | $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ |

Figure 5: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - AM Peak River Road Westbound.


PM Peak - Travel Time Results
Table 5: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - PM Peak Pacific Highway Eastbound.

| Dale |  |  | 4 April 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 Sept 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Run 4 | Run 5 | Run 6 | Run 7 | Run 8 | Run 9 | Average | Standard Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Greenwich Rd | Reserve Rd | 65 | 34 | 34 | 64 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 43 | 30 | 42 | 13 | 34 | 51 |
| 2 | Reserve Rd | Herbert St | 12 | 77 | 55 | 13 | 13 | 90 | 87 | 11 | 9 | 41 | 36 | 17 | 64 |
| 3 | Herbert St | Christie St | 14 | 15 | 33 | 14 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 13 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 14 | 23 |
| 4 | Christie St | Albany St | 18 | 18 | 18 | 64 | 56 | 19 | 20 | 82 | 16 | 35 | 25 | 18 | 51 |
| 5 | Albany St | Oxiey St | 15 | 13 | 21 | 14 | 19 | 43 | 31 | 11 | 27 | 22 | 10 | 15 | 28 |
| 6 | Oxley St | Hume St | 41 | 21 | 15 | 35 | 57 | 15 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 25 | 16 | 14 | 35 |
| All Sections | Greenwich Rd | Hume St | 165 | 178 | 176 | 204 | 201 | 226 | 210 | 168 | 106 | 182 | 35 | 159 | 205 |

Figure 6: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - PM Pacific Highway Eastbound.


Table 6: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - PM Peak Pacific Highway Westbound.

| Date |  |  | 4 April 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19 Sept 2013 |  | Average | Standard Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Run 4 | Run 5 | Run 6 | Run 7 | Run 8 | Run 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Hume St | Oxley St | 11 | 13 | 30 | 34 | 30 | 21 | 18 | 9 | 32 | 22 | 10 | 16 | 28 |
| 2 | Oxley St | Albany St | 12 | 15 | 36 | 22 | 40 | 32 | 19 | 11 | 34 | 25 | 11 | 17 | 32 |
| 3 | Albany St | Christie St | 12 | 51 | 47 | 51 | 29 | 32 | 37 | 77 | 78 | 46 | 22 | 32 | 60 |
| 4 | Christie St | Herbert St | 59 | 16 | 80 | 22 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 86 | 125 | 49 | 40 | 23 | 75 |
| 5 | Herbert St | Reserve Rd | 19 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 14 | 33 | 31 | 20 | 7 | 15 | 24 |
| 6 | Reserve Rd | Greenwich Rd | 66 | 51 | 57 | 62 | 67 | 36 | 90 | 37 | 36 | 56 | 18 | 44 | 68 |
| All Sections | Hume St | Greenwich Rd | 179 | 162 | 266 | 208 | 203 | 150 | 196 | 253 | 336 | 217 | 59 | 179 | 255 |

Figure 7: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - PM Pacific Highway Westbound.


Table 7: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - PM Peak Pacific River Road Eastbound.

| Date |  |  |  | 19 September 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Average | Standard <br> Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Greenwich Rd | Shirley Rd | 124 | 96 | 84 | 101 | 21 | 78 | 125 |
| 2 | Shirley Rd | Pacific Hwy | 131 | 217 | 76 | 141 | 71 | 61 | 222 |
| All Sections | Greenwich Rd | Pacific Hwy | 255 | 313 | 160 | 242 | 77 | 155 | 330 |

Figure 8: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - PM Peak River Road Easfbound.


Table 8: Travel Time Summary (Seconds) - PM Peak Pacific River Road Westbound.

| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | From | To | Run 1 | Run 2 | Run 3 | Average | Standard <br> Deviation | Lower | Upper |
| 1 | Pacific Hwy | Shirley Rd | 55 | 61 | 55 | 57 | 4 | 53 | 61 |
| 2 | Shirley Rd | Greenwich Rd | 157 | 148 | 78 | 128 | 43 | 79 | 177 |
| All Sections | Pacific Hwy | Greenwich Rd | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 9}$ | 133 | $\mathbf{1 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ |

Figure 9: Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits - PM Peak River Road Westbound

## Average Section Travel Time and Confidence Limits PM Peak Westbound



## Appendix C

Calculations of trip generation and distribution
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2011 Journey to Work
Source:
Selected TZS:
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## D:\DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting \16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling $\backslash 16020$ aimsun $\backslash 16020$ Google routes $\backslash[16020$ trips.x|sx]AM Peak OD 2400

 Flow Other|  | 3400 |  |  |  |  | 67 | 269 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.14 | 336 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 18 | $3.912 \%$ | 3 | 11 |  |  |  |
| Other | 19 | $47.941 \%$ | 32 | 129 |  |  |  |
| All | 40 | $12.501 \%$ | 8 | 34 |  |  |  |
| Other | 42 | $14.245 \%$ | 10 | 38 |  |  |  |
|  | 43 | $5.401 \%$ | 4 | 15 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 44 | $15.994 \%$ | 11 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |

D:\DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting\16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling\16020 aimsun\16020 Google routes\[16020 trips.x|sx]PM Peak OD 2400 Flow Other

|  | 2400 | 0.07 | 168 |  | 134 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Out |  |  | 34 |  |  |
|  | All | 18 | $3.912 \%$ | 5 | 1 |
|  | Other |  | 19 | $47.941 \%$ | 64 |
|  | All | 40 | $12.501 \%$ | 17 | 4 |
|  | Other | 42 | $14.245 \%$ | 19 | 5 |
|  |  | 43 | $5.401 \%$ | 7 | 2 |
|  |  | 44 | $15.994 \%$ | 21 | 5 |

D:\DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting\16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling\16020 aimsun\16020 Google routes\[16020 trips.x|sx]AM Peak OD MarAve
Residential Commercial

| Rate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 290 | $0.4 / 110$ | $1-13$ |
| Residential | 269 | 0.14 |  |
| Commercial | 105 | $0.4 / 110$ | 15 |
| Residential | 66 | 0.14 |  |


|  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out |  | In Out |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Res | Com | 20.00\% | 80.00\% | 75.00\% | 25.00\% | ID |  |  |
| 1-13 | 38 | 1 | 8 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 10 | 38 |
| 15 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

D:\DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting\16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling\16020 aimsun\16020 Google routes\[16020 trips.x|sx]PM Peak OD MarAve
Residential Commercial

| Rate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 290 | $0.4 / 110$ | $1-13$ |
| Residential | 269 | 0.15 |  |
| Commercial | 105 | $0.4 / 110$ | 15 |
| Residential | 66 | 0.15 |  |


|  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out |  | In |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Res | Com | 20.00\% | 80.00\% | 75.00\% | 25.00\% | ID |  |  |
| 1-13 | 40 | 1 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 11 | 41 |
| 15 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |




D: \DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting\16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling\16020 aimsun\16020 Google routes\[16020 trips.x|sx]AM Peak OD B

## Residential Commercial

| Commercial | 6874 | 0.85 | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other | 1389 | 0.00 |  |
| Residential | 539 | 0.14 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Ex
100

|  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | In | Out |
|  | Res | Com | 20.00\% | 80.00\% | 75.00\% | 25.00\% |  | ID |  |  |
| B | 75 | 58 | 15 | 60 | 77 | 48 | B | 48 | 92 | 108 |
| C |  |  |  |  |  |  | C | 47 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | by CBHK |  |  |  |  |  | 92 | 108 |
| C | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

Trip generation for supermarket and child care from report (Cells P5, Q5)

D:\DB - do not touch\Dropbox\TEF Consulting\16020 - St Leonards South Model - Lane Cove Council\16020_modelling\16020 aimsun\16020 Google routes\[16020 trips.x|sx]PM Peak OD B

## Residential <br> Commercial

| Commercial | 6874 | 0.78 | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Retail | 1389 | 0.00 |  |
| Residential | 539 | 0.07 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Ex
93

|  | Res | Com | 20.00\% | 80.00\% | 75.00\% | 25.00\% |  | ID |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 38 | 54 | 8 | 30 | 96 | 56 | B | 48 | 104 | 86 |
| c |  |  |  |  |  |  | c | 47 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | by CBHK |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 86 |
| c | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

Trip generation for supermarket and child care from report (Cells P5, Q5)

## Residential Commercial



Ex
250

Trip generation for supermarket and child care from report (Cells P5, Q5)
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## Residential Commercial
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Trip generation for supermarket and child care from report (Cells P5, Q5)
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## Appendix D

Definition of Level of Service (RMS)

Detailed modelling results

Table 4.2
Level of service criteria for intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Delay per <br> Vehicle (secs/veh) | Traffic Signals, <br> Roundabout | Give Way \& Stop <br> Signs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | < 14 | Good operation | Good operation |
| B | 15 to 28 | Good with acceptable delays <br> \& spare capacity |  <br> spare capacity |
| C | 29 to 42 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory, but <br> accident study <br> required |
| D to 56 | Operating near capacity |  <br> accident study <br> required |  |
| E | 57 to 70 | At capacity; at signals, <br> incidents will cause <br> excessive delays | At capacity, requires <br> other control mode |
| Roundabouts require other |  |  |  |
| control mode |  |  |  |$\quad$

The figures in Table 4.2 are intended as a guide only. Any particular assessment should take into account site-specific factors including maximum queue lengths (and their effect on lane blocking), the influence of nearby intersections and the sensitivity of the location to delays. In many situations, a comparison of the current and future average delay provides a better appreciation of the impact of a proposal, and not simply the change in the level of service.

Although in some situations additional traffic does not alter the level of service, particularly where the level of service is E or F, additional capacity may still be required. This is particularly appropriate for service level $F$, where small increases in flow can cause disproportionately greater increases in delay. In this situation, it is advisable to consider means of control to maintain the existing level of absolute delay.

### 4.2.3 Urban roads.

The capacity of urban roads is generally determined by the capacity of the intersections. Where major reconstruction of intersections is proposed, the ability of the approach roads to feed the intersection at appropriate flow rates may need to be reviewed. As set out in Table 4.3 (reproduced from Table 7.1 of AUSTROADS Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice - Part 2: Roadway Capacity, (1988)), typical oneway mid-block lane capacities on urban arterial roads under interrupted flow conditions are 900-1000 veh/hr/lane. This calculation assumes Clearway conditions. The capacity falls to $600 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr} / \mathrm{lane}$ for a kerbside lane with occasional parked vehicles. These capacities at times may increase under ideal conditions to 1200-1400 veh/hr.

The mid-block level of service on urban roads is assessed on a vehicle's average travel speed. Travel speed surveys may be undertaken to determine the existing level of service. Table 7.2 of AUSTROADS Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice - Part 2: Roadway Capacity, (1988) sets out levels of service for different travel speeds.

When assessing the mid-block road capacity requirement in a strategic planning study, the traffic flow limits for different levels of service are of value. Table 4.4 sets out peak hour flows for one and two lanes of unidirectional travel, based on volume / capacity ratios applicable for rural roads in level terrain with no sight distance restrictions on overtaking. It should be noted that these are indicative figures based on the rural volume / capacity ratios with a lane capacity of $1400 \mathrm{veh} / \mathrm{hr}$. This figure can be achieved under normal urban interrupted flow conditions. The lower per lane capacity for one-lane
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