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## Introduction

## Purpose of this Report

This report provides an assessment of the anticipated transport implications of the proposed future use of the land as a cemetery and provides recommendations for the masterplan, detailed design and DA documentation, including consideration of the following:
i existing traffic conditions surrounding the site
ii parking requirements in terms of supply (quantum) and layout
iii service vehicle requirements
iv pedestrian and bicycle requirements
$\checkmark$ the traffic generating characteristics of the proposed land use
vi suitability of the proposed access arrangements for the site
vii the transport impact of the development proposal on the surrounding road network.

## References

In preparing this report, reference has been made to the following:

- an inspection of the site and its surrounds on Sunday 9 December 2017 and Tuesday 11 December 2017
- Blacktown City Council Development Control Plan (DCP) 2015
- Blacktown City Council LEP 2015
- traffic surveys undertaken by TTM Group on Sunday 9 December 2017 and Tuesday 11 December 2017, as referenced in the context of this report
- other documents and data as referenced in this report.
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## Tables

## 1. Background

The existing St Bartholomew's Church and Cemetery is located on a 3.17-hectare lot of Ponds Road, Prospect. The cemetery comprises approximately 3,600 occupied graves. In January 2016, Blacktown City Council (Council) received approximately 6 hectares of land east of St Bartholomew's Church from the New South Wales (NSW) State Government under a Land Transfer Agreement. In addition, Council intends to acquire approximately 2 hectares of land east of the existing cemetery.

Further to this, Council is seeking to close St Bartholomew's Place (approximately 0.39 hectares), with the intention of including it in the expansion of the cemetery. This equates to a total of 11.56 hectares of land proposed to be used for the expanded cemetery.

A planning proposal (PP) is being prepared, which seeks to reactivate the existing church and cemetery on the 3.17-hectare land and to reclassify the Council-owned expansion lands from "community land" to "operational land" and to rezone the cemetery expansion lands from RE1 Public Recreation, RU4 Primary Production Small Lots and SP2 Classified Road, under the Blacktown Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2015 to SP1 Cemetery.

In addition to the existing church and cemetery, the expanded cemetery is likely to include ancillary facilities such as an office, café, flower shop and potentially chapel. They will most likely be in the vicinity of Tarlington Place. Details will be determined at the Development Application (DA) stage.

APP Corporation (APP) on behalf of Council has engaged GTA Consultants (GTA) to prepare a transport impact assessment for the St Bartholomew's Cemetery expansion, to support the PP.

## 2. Existing Conditions

### 2.1 Land Use

The site is located on land between the Great Western Highway (GWH) to the north and M4 Western Motorway (M4) to the south and is bounded by the Prospect Highway to the west. The existing cemetery has an area of approximately 3.17 hectares, with the newly acquired land adding a further 6 hectares. A further 2.39 hectares of land is also intended to be acquired, including 2 hectares from other land owners and 0.39 hectares from the closure of St Bartholomew's Place, bringing the total area for the proposed cemetery site to 11.56 hectares. This is an increase of 8.39 hectares to the existing cemetery.

The existing cemetery is zoned SP1 Cemetery under Blacktown LEP 2015. The proposed cemetery expansion land:

- Is predominantly zoned RE1 Public Recreation
- Includes land zoned RU4 Primary Production Small Lots (the site of the old Prospect Post Office)
- Includes land zoned SP2 Classified Road to the south of the existing cemetery.

The existing cemetery contains approximately 3,600 utilised graves. As the last church service was held on the site in 1967 and no new interment rights have been sold at the cemetery since 1972, the existing cemetery site does not regularly attract many visitors.

The cemetery expansion land has been largely vacant and unused since the former Prospect Village (along Tarlington Place) was disrupted and eventually vacated/ demolished following the realignment of the Great Western Highway in 1968 and the construction of the M4 in 1990.

The location of the site and its surrounding environs is shown in Figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1: Subject site and its environs


### 2.2 Access to the Site

Access to and from Tarlington Place can be achieved through the Great Western Highway in the eastbound and westbound directions. Eastbound access is gained via a right turn bay. Access points to the existing cemetery are from Ponds Road, Prospect.

### 2.3 Road Network

## Adjoining Roads

## Great Western Highway

The GWH is classified as a Roads and Maritime State Road and is aligned in an east-west direction to the site's north. It is a two-way road with 3 westbound lanes and 4 eastbound lanes near the site, set within a 32-metre carriageway with an approximately 9-metre central median. Being an arterial road, no parking is permitted. The GWH has a posted speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

## Prospect Highway

The Prospect Highway is classified as a Roads and Maritime State Road and is aligned in a northsouth direction to the site's west. It is a two-way road with generally one lane in each direction, set within an approximately 7-metre carriageway. Kerbside parking is not permitted, and the road has a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Ponds Road

Ponds Road is classified as a Roads and Maritime State Road and is aligned in an east-west direction along with the site's north-western boundary. It is a two-way road with 1 lane in each direction, set within an approximately 7-metre carriageway. Ponds Road functions as an exit-ramp to the GWH and connects with the Prospect Highway to the west. It also provides access to the existing cemetery and St Bartholomew's Church. Ponds Road has a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

## M4 Western Motorway

The M4 is classified as a Roads and Maritime State Road and is aligned in an east-west direction to the site's south. It is a two-way road with generally 3 lanes in each direction, set over an approximately 22 -metre wide carriageway, including a central separation barrier. The M4 has a posted speed limit of $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in the vicinity of the site, with off and on-ramps provided to/ from the Prospect Highway.

## Tarlington Place and St Bartholomew's Place

Tarlington Place and St Bartholomew's Place are classified as Local Roads and are internal roads located within the subject site. St Bartholomew's Place is an unsealed road, which runs along the eastern boundary of the existing cemetery while Tarlington Place is a sealed road and primarily functions as the access road to 23 Tarlington Place (the old Prospect Post Office).

Council is looking to close St Bartholomew's Place ( 0.39 hectares) and absorb it into the cemetery expansion lands. It could, however, still function as an access point and internal cemetery road.

Vehicle access to the site is proposed via the existing 2 driveways along Ponds Road (access 1 and access 2) and Tarlington Place (access 3). St Bartholomew's Place, whilst proposed to be closed, may also be used as an access point, depending on how the development is staged.

The internal road network will be determined at the Development Application stage. It is recommended that an internal link between the existing and expanded cemetery areas to be provided.

## 3. Future Conditions

### 3.1 Land Uses

The proposal seeks to rezone the 8.39 hectares of land to allow for the expansion of the existing St Bartholomew's cemetery.

The cemetery expansion will be developed in stages. New burial space is expected to become available approximately five years after development consent is granted for the cemetery. The site plan is outlined in Figure 2.1.

The expanded cemetery is expected to ultimately include:

- Over 10,000 burial plots
- Above ground crypts
- Columbarium walls for ashes interment
- Ancillary facilities such as a chapel, café, office and flower shop, with associated car parking near Tarlington Place.

Table 3.1 summarises the yield of both the existing and potential future expansion of the site.
Table 3.1: Area schedule

| Use |  | Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing cemetery | Reactivation of existing church and <br> cemetery | 3.17 hectares |
| Future cemetery expansion | Cemetery expansion and ancillary <br> facilities | 8.39 hectares |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 6}$ hectares |

## 4. Executive Summary

The land proposed for the expansion of the cemetery has been vacant and unused for over 30 years. The existing cemetery has seen very little regular use since the last Anglican Church service was held in 1967 and the sale of new interment rights was ceased in 1972. The existing St Bartholomew's Church and Cemetery has a site area of approximately 3.17 hectares, with newly acquired land adding a further six hectares. An additional 2.39 hectares of land is intended to be acquired for the cemetery expansion, including two hectares from other land owners and 0.39 hectares from the closure of St Bartholomew's Place, bringing the total area for the proposed cemetery site to 11.56 hectares. This is a total increase of 8.39 hectares to the existing cemetery. The planning proposal seeks to reclassify the Council-owned expansion lands from "community land" to "operational land" and to rezone the additional 8.39 hectares of land to allow for the expansion of the existing St Bartholomew's cemetery.

The proposed cemetery expansion will be developed in stages. New burial space is expected to become available approximately five years after development consent is granted for the cemetery. Stage 1 will involve the opening the one-hectare of vacant land and the existing cemetery site, to burials.

The proposed expanded cemetery is expected to ultimately include:

- over 10,000 burial plots
- above ground crypts
- columbarium walls for ashes interment
- ancillary facilities such as a chapel, café, office and flower shop, with associated car parking near Tarlington Place.

Vehicle access to the site is proposed via the two existing driveways along Ponds Road and one existing driveway at Tarlington Place.

Based on an empirical assessment, the proposed development would likely generate a parking demand of up to 115 parking spaces in the peak hour.

The on-site car park would likely accommodate approximately 50 parking spaces, with the remaining parking demand accommodated for on-street, along 400 metres of Tarlington Place and the proposed internal access road. It is recommended that a provision of two motorcycle spaces be provided on site for use by staff and visitors. It is recommended that a minimum provision of one and 13 bicycle spaces be provided on site for use by staff and visitors, respectively.

The proposed development would generate 37 and 32 trips in the AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively and up to 74 trips during the weekend noon commuter peak hour. The proposed development would generate up to 66 and 115 trips during the cemetery's peak weekday and weekend peak hours respectively.

Roads and Maritime Services (Roads and Maritime) is planning the future upgrade of the Prospect Highway between Reservoir Road at Prospect and 200 metres north of St Martins Crescent at Blacktown for a length of 3.6 kilometres. Considering a growth rate of 1.2 per cent per annum over the next 10 years and the proposed upgrade of Prospect Highway, the key intersections near the site are all expected to operate within satisfactory levels of service, with only minor increases in the delay and queue at the intersections of Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps and Great Western Highway (GWH)/ Tarlington Place.

It is recommended that two bus stops be located along Prospect Highway and GWH, with associated shared paths and crossings recommended for pedestrians and cyclists across the Prospect Highway.

Against existing traffic volumes near the site, the additional traffic generated by the proposed development could not be expected to compromise the safety and function of the surrounding road network.

## 5. Existing Operations

### 5.1 Surrounding Key Intersections

The following key intersections currently exist near the site (as shown in Figure 5.1):

1. Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road (unsignalised)
2. Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps (unsignalised roundabout)
3. Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps (signalised)
4. GWH/ Tarlington Place (unsignalised).

These intersections are shown in Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2.
Figure 5.1: Site


Figure 5.2: Surrounding key intersections


Base map source: Sydway Publishing Pty Ltd, accessed 07/02/18.

### 5.2 Traffic Volumes

GTA commissioned traffic movement counts at the following four key intersections on Sunday 9 December 2017 and Tuesday 11 December 2017 during the weekday ( 7 am to 9 am and 4 pm to 6 pm ) and weekend (1lam to 1 pm ) peak periods:

- Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road (unsignalised)
- Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps (unsignalised roundabout)
- Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps (signalised)
- GWH/ Tarlington Place (unsignalised).

Photos of the adjoining roads are shown in Appendix A.
The weekday AM and PM as well as weekend noon peak hour traffic volumes are summarised in Figure 5.3, with full results contained in Appendix B.

It is noted that the U-turning traffic volumes at the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection is a reflection of the number of vehicles which intended to make a right-turn from Ponds Road onto the Prospect Highway, however did not attempt such manoeuvres as it is particularly difficult to turn right from Ponds Road onto the Prospect Highway. As such, the right-turning volumes from Ponds Road are theoretically higher than the surveyed volumes.

Figure 5.3: Existing weekday AM/ PM and weekend noon peak hour traffic volumes


Weekday AM (Weekday PM) [Weekend Noon]

### 5.3 Intersection Operation

The operation of the key intersections within the study area have been assessed using SIDRA Intersection', a computer-based modelling package which calculates intersection performance. The commonly used measure of intersection performance, as defined by RMS, is vehicle delay. SIDRA Intersection determines the average delay that vehicles encounter and provides a measure of the level of service. A level of service $D$ or better is generally considered to be acceptable operating conditions.

Table 5.1 shows the criteria that SIDRA Intersection adopts in assessing the level of service.

[^0]Table 5.1: SIDRA Intersection level of service criteria

| Level of <br> service | Average delay per <br> vehicle <br> (seconds/vehicle) | Traffic signals, roundabout | Give way and stop sign |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| A | Less than 14 | Good operation | Good operation |
| B | 15 to 28 | Good with acceptable delays <br> and spare capacity | Acceptable delays and spare capacity |
| C | 29 to 42 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory, but accident study required |
| D | 43 to 56 | Near capacity | Near capacity, accident study required |
| E | 57 to 70 | At capacity, at signals incidents <br> will cause excessive delays | At capacity, requires other control <br> mode |
| F | Greater than 70 | Extra capacity required | Extreme delay, major treatment required |

Table 5.2 presents a summary of the existing operation of the intersection, with full results presented in Appendix C of this report.
Table 5.2: Existing operating conditions

| Intersection | Peak | Leg | Degree of saturation | Average delay (second) | 95th percentile queue (metre) | Level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road | AM | South - Prospect Highway | 0.10 | 10 | 3 | A |
|  |  | East - Ponds Road | 0.93 | 38 | 47 | C |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.42 | 6 | 139 | A |
|  | PM | South - Prospect Highway | 0.10 | 10 | 3 | A |
|  |  | East - Ponds Road | 0.98 | 52 | 83 | D |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.41 | 6 | 304 | A |
|  | Saturday | South - Prospect Highway | 0.11 | 16 | 3 | B |
|  |  | East - Ponds Road | 0.86 | 37 | 26 | C |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.97 | 8 | 0 | A |
| Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps | AM | Southeast - M4 eastbound offramp | 0.41 | 11 | 28 | A |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.98 | 55 | 199 | D |
|  |  | Southwest - Prospect Highway | 0.50 | 22 | 38 | B |
|  | PM | Southeast - M4 eastbound offramp | 0.46 | 11 | 25 | A |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 1.04 | 109 | 199 | F |
|  |  | Southwest - Prospect Highway | 0.54 | 26 | 51 | B |
|  | Saturday | Southeast - M4 eastbound offramp | 0.36 | 11 | 19 | A |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.90 | 21 | 183 | B |
|  |  | Southwest - Prospect Highway | 0.29 | 17 | 11 | B |
| Prospec $\dagger$ Highway/ M4 westbound ramps | AM | South - Prospect Highway | 0.81 | 31 | 178 | C |
|  |  | East - M4 westbound off-ramp | 0.85 | 35 | 122 | C |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.83 | 20 | 93 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.85 | 29 | 178 | C |
|  | PM | South - Prospect Highway | 0.92 | 37 | 278 | C |
|  |  | East - M4 westbound off-ramp | 0.89 | 44 | 102 | D |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.93 | 28 | 80 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.93 | 36 | 278 | C |
|  | Saturday | South - Prospect Highway | 0.56 | 32 | 49 | C |
|  |  | East - M4 westbound off-ramp | 0.58 | 34 | 10 | C |


| Intersection | Peak | Leg | Degree of saturation | Average delay (second) | 95th percentile queue (metre) | ```Level of service``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | North - Prospect Highway | 0.57 | 17 | 6 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.58 | 26 | 11 | B |
| GWH/ <br> Tarlington Place | AM | East - GWH | 0.26 | 6 | 0 | A |
|  |  | West - GWH | 0.01 | 22 | 1 | B |
|  |  | Southwest - Tarlington Place | 0.00 | 9 | 0 | A |
|  | PM | East - GWH | 0.47 | 6 | 1 | A |
|  |  | West - GWH | 0.03 | 32 | 1 | C |
|  |  | Southwest - Tarlington Place | 0.00 | 9 | 0 | A |
|  | Saturday | East - GWH | 0.22 | 6 | 0 | A |
|  |  | West - GWH | 0.01 | 17 | 0 | B |
|  |  | Southwest - Tarlington Place | 0.00 | 8 | 0 | A |

Based on the above assessment and site observations, there is considerable traffic congestion through the Prospect Highway, M4 eastbound ramps and M4 westbound ramps. The roundabout of Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps and major signalised intersection of Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps experiencing peak period queuing and delays during the PM peak hour.

The above congestion will be addressed as part of the Prospect Highway upgrade which will provide increased capacity in order to cater for future traffic growth on the Prospect Highway between Reservoir Road at Prospect and St Martins Crescent at Blacktown. The Prospect Highway upgrade is detailed in Section 6.2.

The worst delay occurs on the southbound movement on the Prospect Highway approaching the M4 eastbound ramps, with an average delay of 109 seconds while the maximum vehicle queve of 199 metres occurs during the PM peak hour. The vehicle queue associated with the southbound movement extends past Ponds Road during the weekday AM and PM peak periods.

The northbound movements on the Prospect Highway are observed to be affected by the entering traffic from the M4 and GWH eastbound ramps onto the Prospect Highway and the intersections to the north, including Prospect Highway with Stoddart Road and Harrod Street.

Much of the congestion at the intersection of Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road is influenced by the intersection of Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps with the westbound Ponds Road traffic and southbound Prospect Highway traffic affected by the southbound Prospect Highway queue at the M4 eastbound ramps.

The northern and eastern legs of the intersection of Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road currently operate at capacity with level of service C and D during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The eastern approach experiences vehicle queues of up to 47 metres and 83 metres during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Notwithstanding that, the westbound traffic turning right from Ponds Road and Prospect Highway are not adversely affected by the southbound traffic as the southbound traffic was observed to give way to these movements. The southern approach of this intersection currently experiences negligible queuing and delays during both the weekday AM and PM peak periods.

The intersection of Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps currently operates satisfactorily with the worst delay occurring on the eastern approach of the westbound movement on the M4 exitramp. This movement has an average delay of 44 seconds while the maximum vehicle queue of 278 metres occurs on the southbound movement on Prospect Highway during the PM peak hour.

The vehicle queue along Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps for the southbound movement extends past the M4 eastbound ramps in the PM peak.

The intersection of GWH/ Tarlington Place currently operates satisfactorily with minimal queues and delays on all approaches.

### 5.4 Car Parking

There is an informal on-site car park for the St Bartholomew's Church and Cemetery. The car park is unsealed with no line marking.

Figure 5.4: Existing on-site parking


Basemap source: Sydway

### 5.5 Public Transport

There are limited bus services in the area. A review of these services is summarised in Table 5.3. The existing bus stops are located more than 500 metres from the existing church and 1.1 kilometres from the proposed chapel, which are outside generally acceptable walking distance.

Further, the access to the existing bus stops along the Prospect Highway from the site is limited by the lack of safe crossing at the Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road and Prospect Highway/ GWH eastbound ramps intersections. There is also a lack of pedestrian footpath link on the eastern side of the Prospect Highway and Clunies Ross Street.

Table 5.3: Public transport provision

| Route number | Route description | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stop ID } \\ & \text { (see } \\ & \text { Figure 5.5) } \end{aligned}$ | Location of stop | Distance to nearest stop | Frequency on/ off peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 700 | Blacktown to Parramatta | 1 and 2 | Blacktown Road opposite and at Bethany Christian School | 1.2 km to existing Church 600 m to proposed chapel | 15 minutes peak/ 30 minutes off peak |
| 800 | Fairfield to Blacktown via Wetherill Park | 3 | Clunies Ross Street after GWH |  |  |
| 812 | Blacktown to Fairfield | 4 | Prospect Highway opposite Stoddart Road | 630 m to existing Church <br> 1.2 km to proposed chapel | 30 minutes peak only |
|  |  | 5 | Prospect Highway after Stoddart Road | 520 m to existing Church <br> 1.1 km to proposed chapel |  |

Figure 5.5: Existing bus stop locations


Basemap source: Sydway
The 700 bus route is shown in Figure 5.6 and the 800 and 812 bus routes are shown in Figure 5.7.
Figure 5.6: 700 bus route


Source: CDC Bus, accessed 12 June 2018

Figure 5.7: 800 and 812 bus routes


Source: Transit Systems, accessed 24 May 2018

### 5.6 Pedestrian Infrastructure

There is limited pedestrian amenity surrounding the site, with pedestrian paths only provided along the western side of the Prospect Highway. Signalised pedestrian crossings are provided on the western legs of the M4 eastbound and westbound ramps intersections with the Prospect Highway.

### 5.7 Cycle Infrastructure

A shared path is provided along the western side of the Prospect Highway providing a connection between Blacktown to the sites north and the M4 for cyclists. The M4 also has dedicated cycling lanes in both directions. Signalised pedestrian and cyclist crossings are provided on the left-turn slip lane from the Prospect Highway (southbound) onto the M4 eastern on-ramp and the M4 western on-ramp.

The surrounding cycling network is shown in Figure 5.8.

Figure 5.8: Surrounding cycling network


Source: http://www.sydneycycleways.net/map/, accessed 07/02/18.
The Prospect Highway upgrade would improve the temporary pedestrian and cycleway path located between the M4 westbound on-ramp and Harrod Street on the western side of Prospect Highway, detailed in Section 6.

### 5.8 Crash History

Crash data for the roads around the site has been obtained from RMS. The crash data relates to the latest five-year period to December 2017.

Within this period, 164 crashes occurred in vicinity of the site, with most of the crashes occurring on the M4 and GWH. The reported crashes do not include any fatalities.

A summary of crash history is provided as follows:

- 14 crashes occurred at the Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road intersection with the following characteristics:
- Five crashes involved rear-end collisions on Prospect Highway at the intersection and resulted in serious injury.
- Four crashes involved vehicles from adjacent directions (non-opposing directions) at the intersection, colliding with through traffic and resulted in serious injury.
- 14 crashes occurred at the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection with the following characteristics:
- Five crashes involved rear-end collisions at intersection and resulting in serious injury. - Six crashes involved drivers losing control turning right on a bend and exiting the carriageway on the outside of the curve resulting in serious injury.
- 14 crashes occurred at the Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps intersection with the following characteristics:
- Six crashes involved rear-end collisions at the intersection, resulting in serious injury.
- Two crashes involved vehicles from the adjacent direction at the intersection, colliding with through traffic and resulting in serious injury.
- Two crashes involved drivers losing control turning right on a bend and exiting the carriageway on the outside of the curve resulting in serious injury.
- One crash involved a U-turning vehicle at the GWH/ Tarlington Place intersection and resulted in a non-casualty crash.

Using GIS software, the data was plotted with the crashes classified based on crash severity and shown in Figure 5.9.

Figure 5.9: Crashes near the site in the last five years


## 6. Traffic Impact Assessment

### 6.1 Vehicle Access

Vehicle access to the site is proposed via the existing two driveways along Ponds Road (access one and access two) and Tarlington Place (access three), as detailed in Figure 6.1. St Bartholomew's Place, whilst proposed to be closed, may also be used as an access point, depending on how the development is staged.

The suitability of the proposed access arrangements is discussed in Section 7.3 of this report.
Figure 6.1: Vehicle accesses


Basemap source: Sydway
The internal road network will be determined at the DA stage. It is recommended that an internal link between the existing and expanded cemetery area be provided.

It is proposed that the internal access road be sign-posted at 10 kilometres per hour between the proposed parking area and 100 metres south of Ponds Road to facilitate pedestrian safety through low vehicle speeds.

Further, it is proposed that Tarlington Place be signed posted at $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ at entry point from GWH with a further speed reduction to 10 kilometres per hour at the proposed parking area.
Improvements to the existing Tarlington Place would be required to maintain a safe environment for all users, and may include line marking, pedestrian facilities, signage and speed humps.

### 6.2 The Prospect Highway Upgrade

Roads and Maritime is planning to upgrade the Prospect Highway between Reservoir Road, Prospect and St Martins Crescent, Blacktown for a length of 3.6 kilometres. The proposed upgrade primarily involves upgrading Prospect Highway from a generally two-lane undivided road to a generally four-lane divided road, with the proposed arrangement near the site shown in Figure 6.2.

The proposed upgrade aims to improve performance of the road corridor with the objective to meet future traffic demand, reduce travel times and improve road safety.

The key features of the Prospect Highway upgrade near the site include:

- Upgrading Prospect Highway to two lanes in each direction with a wide central median between Reservoir Road and Blacktown Road.
- Construction of two new bridge structures over the M4and the GWH to support the Prospect Highway increased carriageway.
- Upgrading the existing GWH eastbound exit ramp to a two-way link road, providing eastbound and westbound access between the GWH and the Prospect Highway.
- Minor upgrades to the M4 westbound ramps/ Prospect Highway signalised intersection.
- Construction of three new signalised intersections, including:
- M4eastbound ramps/ Prospect Highway
- Two-way link road/ GWH; and
- Two-way link road/ Prospect Highway.
- Conversion of the existing priority-controlled intersection of Ponds Road/ Prospect Highway to the left in and left out movements only. As a result, vehicles must access Ponds Road from Prospect Highway by travelling southbound along the Prospect Highway.
- Upgrading pedestrian and cyclist facilities, shared path between the M4westbound exit ramp and Harrod Street.

Figure 6.2: Prospect Highway upgrade - general arrangement


Source: MR644 - Prospect Highway from Reservoir Road to Prospect Highway Upgrade 200m North of St Martins Crescent, 100\% Detailed Design, City of Blacktown, Drawings Number RD-0103, RD-0104 and RD-0105, http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/,accessed 05/02/18.

### 6.3 Traffic Generation

There is currently no traffic generation guidance given within the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (2002) for cemeteries. As such, the proposed land use's traffic generation was determined based on an empirical assessment of the existing operational Liverpool Cemetery
which is of a similar size. Table 6.1 summarises the similarities between Liverpool Cemetery and $\mathrm{S} \dagger$ Bartholomew's Cemetery.

Table 6.1: Similarities between Liverpool Cemetery and St Bartholomew's Cemetery

| Site | Size of site (Ha) | Supporting facilities |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Liverpool Cemetery | 9.5 | Two chapels, condolence lounge, mausoleum and staff office |
| St Bartholomew's <br> Cemetery | 11.56 | Reactivation of the existing cemetery, expansion of the cemetery <br> to the east, including ancillary facilities around Tarlington Place <br> such as a staff office, cafe, flower shop and potentially a chapel |

Based on the similarities of the two sites, it is assumed that the proposed land use and the current Liverpool Cemetery have similar traffic generation rates for each hectare.

Traffic counts completed at Liverpool Cemetery's three access points indicate that there are between 30 and 25 trips generated in the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively. The trips equate to 3.2 and 2.6 trips for every hectare in the weekday AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively.

The cemetery generated 60 trips during the weekend noon peak hour, which represents 6.3 trips per hectare.

This traffic will have comprised visitors to gravesites, use of the two chapels, the condolence room and staff.

Figure 6.3: Existing two-way traffic volumes of Liverpool Cemetery access


Based on 11.56 hectares, it is likely that the proposed land use would generate 37 and 32 trips in the AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively and up to 74 trips during the weekend noon commuter peak hour.

It is noted that the peak for cemetery would generally occur during mid/ late morning (such as 10am to 11 am ), which is confirmed by Figure 6.3, which shows a profile of weekday and weekend traffic volumes at Liverpool Cemetery.

Traffic counts completed at Liverpool Cemetery access points indicate that there are 54 and 94 trips generated in the weekday and weekend cemetery peak hours, respectively. The trips equate to 5.7 and 9.9 trips per hectare in the weekday and weekend cemetery peak hours, respectively.

In the busiest weekday and weekend cemetery peak hours, the proposed land use would generate up to 66 and 115 trips, respectively.

### 6.4 Distribution and Assignment

The directional distribution and assignment of traffic generated by the proposed land use will be influenced by a number of factors, including the:
i configuration of the arterial road network in the immediate vicinity of the site
ii existing operation of intersections providing access between the local and arterial road network
iii distribution of households near the site
iv likely distribution of visitor's residences in relation to the site
$\checkmark$ configuration of access points to the site.
Considering the above, for the purposes of estimating vehicle movements, the following directional distributions as shown in Figure 6.4.

Figure 6.4: Peak hour arrival and departure distribution of traffic


In addition, the directional split of traffic (such as the ratio between the inbound and outbound traffic movements) was determined based on traffic surveys at the Liverpool Cemetery and would be:

- Weekday AM peak hour: $75 \%$ inbound/ $25 \%$ outbound
- Weekday PM peak hour: $50 \%$ inbound/ $50 \%$ outbound
- Weekend noon peak hour: $50 \%$ inbound/ $50 \%$ outbound.

Based on the above, Figure 6.5 through Figure 6.7 show the estimated marginal increase in turning movements in the vicinity of the proposed land use.

Figure 6.5: Future weekday AM peak hour plus site generated traffic volumes


Future Weekday AM Peak Traffic Volumes (+Weekday AM Peak Development Generated Traffic)

Figure 6.6: Future weekday PM peak hour plus site generated traffic volumes


Future Weekday PM Peak Traffic Volumes (+Weekday PM Peak Development Generated Traffic)

Figure 6.7: Future weekend noon peak hour plus site generated traffic volumes


Future Weekend Noon Peak Traffic Volumes (+Weekend Noon Peak Development Generated Traffic)

### 6.5 Traffic Impact

A review of the Prospect Highway Upgrade Traffic and Transport Assessment², the proposed upgrade matrices show that the number of trips in the corridor will grow from 2018 to 2028 at about 1.2 per cent per year.

Based on the above assessment, an annual 1.2 per cent compound growth rate has been adopted for the intersection operation assessment at the expected completion year of 2028. The future assessment provides an estimate of future traffic volumes to ensure the intersection layout and operation consider background traffic growth.

The results of the future operation of the key intersections considering the cemetery expansion being operational and with the Prospect Highway upgrade, during the weekday AM and PM peak as well as the weekend noon peak are summarised in Table 6.2, with full results provided in Appendix C.

[^1]Table 6.2: Future operating conditions (with cemetery expansion being operational and with the Prospect Highway upgrade)

| Intersection | Peak | Leg | Degree of saturation | Average delay (sec) | ```95th percentile queue (m)``` | Level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road [1] | AM | South | 0.51 | 0 | 0 | A |
|  |  | East | 0.32 | 13 | 11 | A |
|  |  | North | 0.02 | 6 | 0 | A |
|  | PM | South | 0.57 | 0 | 0 | A |
|  |  | East | 0.36 | 13 | 14 | A |
|  |  | North | 0.04 | 6 | 0 | A |
|  | Saturday | South | 0.39 | 0 | 0 | A |
|  |  | East | 0.22 | 14 | 6 | A |
|  |  | North | 0.06 | 6 | 0 | A |
| Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps ${ }^{[1]}$ | AM | Southeast | 0.68 | 23 | 109 | B |
|  |  | North | 0.68 | 25 | 124 | B |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.88 | 49 | 127 | D |
|  |  | Overall | 0.88 | 30 | 127 | C |
|  | PM | Southeast | 0.82 | 20 | 95 | B |
|  |  | North | 0.83 | 32 | 131 | C |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.9 | 53 | 125 | D |
|  |  | Overall | 0.90 | 31 | 131 | C |
|  | Saturday | Southeast | 0.46 | 15 | 53 | A |
|  |  | North | 0.47 | 14 | 90 | A |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.92 | 63 | 88 | E |
|  |  | Overall | 0.92 | 23 | 90 | B |
| Prospec $\dagger$ Highway/ M4 westbound ramps | AM | South | 0.77 | 35 | 135 | C |
|  |  | East | 0.8 | 29 | 140 | C |
|  |  | North | 0.78 | 24 | 96 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.80 | 29 | 140 | C |
|  | PM | South | 0.7 | 28 | 133 | B |
|  |  | East | 0.89 | 43 | 114 | D |
|  |  | North | 0.72 | 26 | 97 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.89 | 31 | 133 | C |
|  | Saturday | South | 0.43 | 31 | 60 | C |
|  |  | East | 0.92 | 54 | 110 | D |
|  |  | North | 0.43 | 17 | 67 | B |
|  |  | Overall | 0.92 | 31 | 110 | C |
| GWH/ Tarlington Place | AM | East | 0.29 | 6.1 | 0.6 | A |
|  |  | West | 0.02 | 26.6 | 0.5 | B |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.01 | 9.0 | 0.2 | A |
|  | PM | East | 0.53 | 6.1 | 0.8 | A |
|  |  | West | 0.02 | 41.9 | 0.5 | C |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.01 | 10.0 | 0.2 | A |
|  | Saturday | East | 0.24 | 6.1 | 0.8 | A |
|  |  | West | 0.02 | 19.6 | 0.4 | B |
|  |  | Southwest | 0.02 | 8.4 | 0.5 | A |

[1] Worst movement reported for unsignalised intersection.

Based on the above assessment, the intersection of Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road is expected to operate at level of service A during the weekday AM and PM as well as weekend noon peak hours with the conversion of the intersection to left-in left-out movements only.

There is considerable reduction in the peak period queuing and delays at the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection, specifically with the currently congested northern leg. The intersection would generally continue to operate at the same levels of service $C$ during the weekday peak hours and level of service B during the weekend noon peak hour. The northern leg is expected to experience reductions to average delays of up to 77 seconds and 95 th percentile queues up to 93 metres during the peak hours.

It is predicted that Prospect Highway/ M4 westbound ramps intersection will operate at similar level of service C during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

The intersection of GWH/ Tarlington Place is expected to continue to operate satisfactorily with minimal queues and delays on all approaches, with minor increase of delay up to 10 seconds per vehicle on the eastbound right-turn lane.

### 6.6 Summary

As discussed, the proposed land use would generate 37 and 32 trips in the AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively and up to 74 trips during the weekend noon cemetery peak hour.

In addition, the proposed land use would generate up to 66 and 115 trips during the cemetery's busiest weekday and weekend peak hours respectively.

The additional development traffic volumes are no more than one vehicle movement every minute through the adjacent key intersections during the weekday and weekend peak hours and no more than two vehicle movements during the cemetery's busiest weekday and weekend peak hours.

Moreover, the use of Ponds Road and GWH by vehicles accessing the cemetery and church uses which abut them is entirely appropriate and consistent with their existing functional role in the road network.

In summary, against existing traffic volumes near the site, the additional traffic generated by the proposed cemetery use could not be expected to compromise the safety and function of the surrounding road network.

### 6.7 Construction Traffic Impact

A construction traffic management plan should be prepared prior to works commencing on-site.

## 7. Parking and Vehicle Access

### 7.1 Parking Requirements

## Car Parking

There are currently no parking requirements within DCP 2015 in relation to cemeteries. As such, the proposed land use's car parking requirement was determined based on an empirical assessment of the existing similar size Liverpool Cemetery.

Off-street car parking to support the expanded cemetery will include existing parking around St Bartholomew's Church and a new car park area, likely to be located around Tarlington Place.

Considering the peak demand of traffic generated by the proposed land use discussed in Section 6.1, parking demand of up to 115 vehicles could be generated during the busiest period. It is recommended that approximately half ( 60 spaces) of the parking spaces required be provided within a formal car park near the proposed ancillary facilities at Tarlington Place. The remaining 55 car parking spaces, equivalent to about 350 metres (based upon an average car park length of 6 metres) of kerbside parking could be accommodated along Tarlington Place and the internal access road.

The internal access road and parking aisles should be designed with a minimum width of 6 metres to facilitate two-way movements and an additional 2.1 metres paved surfaces on either/ both sides of the road where on-street parking are proposed.

It is proposed that the kerbside parking be staggered on either side of Tarlington Place and the internal access road every 50 metres to provide parking opportunities for vehicles entering from both the access two via Ponds Road and access three via Tarlington Place.

## Minibus Parking

DCP 2015 does not require dedicated minibus parking.
However, it is common for minibuses (maximum of 7 metres length, for a Toyota Coaster minibus or similar) to be used to transport visitors to/ from services associated with funeral activities. The use of minibuses, which typically have a capacity of approximately 20 passengers, is encouraged to reduce the overall traffic volumes generated by the proposed land use, during extraordinary events.

It is recommended that two minibus parking spaces be provided, with the minibus arriving and departing via Tarlington Place only. The proposed minibus parking spaces should be designed to not impact the car circulation within the proposed parking area.

In the rare event when more than two minibus parking spaces are required, these minibuses could park on the kerbside along the Tarlington Place.

Figure 7.1: Proposed minibus approach and departure routes


Basemap source: Sydway.

## Service Vehicle

Given the nature of the proposed land use, servicing requirements (for larger vehicles) would be limited to regular refuse collection (up to Council's 11 -metre long garbage truck), the occasional service vehicle (e.g. maintenance/ delivery/ trade vehicles) and emergency vehicle. Garbage collection would occur within the parking areas, with bins to be wheeled to the kerbside for collection.

It is noted that access one, the existing access one at Ponds Road provides sufficient width for Council's garbage truck to manoeuvre into and out of the site in a forward direction. In addition, the informal parking area in front of the existing Church provides sufficient manoeuvring area for the garbage truck to complete a three-point turn and leave the site in a forward direction.

It is also proposed that all service vehicles for the new facilities to enter and exit via Tarlington Place as shown in Figure 7.1.

The maintenance/ delivery/ trade vehicles which typically include vans, utes or cars, could use the car parking spaces within the proposed car parking facility as part of the cemetery expansion.

## Motorcycle Parking

DCP 2015 does not provide any requirements for motorcycle parking. It is, however, recommended that dedicated motorcycle parking spaces to be provided at the rate of one space per 25 car parking spaces. Based on the peak parking demand of 115 car spaces, the proposed land use is recommended to provide four motorcycle parking spaces. Motorcycle spaces are required to be 2.5 metres long by 1.3 metres wide.

### 7.2 Car Parking Layout

The proposed car park design would be developed as part of any future DA for the site. Car park layout would be designed to be in accordance with the requirements of DCP 2015 and the Australian Standard AS2890.1 (2004) Part 1: Off-street car parking, AS2890.2 (2002) Part 2: Off-street commercial vehicle facilities and AS2890.6 (2009) Part 6: Off-street parking for people with disabilities.

DCP 2015 requires car parking spaces for medium turnover to measure 5.2 metres long by 2.6 metres wide and be accessed via a minimum 7-metre wide aisle.

It is recommended that disabled spaces be measure 5.5 metres long by a minimum of 3.2 metres wide, in accordance with the Australian Standard requirements.

### 7.3 Vehicle Access Review

## Access One (Secondary Access via Ponds Road)

Access one is the westernmost two-way vehicle access to the existing Church and is located around 30 metres east of the priority-controlled intersection of Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road. The site access would technically have a Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) requirement of 65 metres for a posted speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour, in accordance with AS 2890.1:2004. Given the proximity of access one to the Prospect Highway, an adequate sight distance of 65 metres would not be achievable.

Based on the above and the associated traffic queues due to entering traffic from eastbound Ponds Road, a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane proposed as part of the Prospect Highway upgrade will mitigate the inadequate SSD. The proposed 20 -metre right-turn lane can accommodate up to three cars and is considered acceptable for providing access to the existing church. The proposed access arrangements of left-in, left-out and right-in only is shown in Figure 7.2. With the proposed access, right-turning from the site (south) onto Ponds Road is no longer permitted.

Figure 7.2: Proposed access one


Source: MR644 - Prospect Highway from Reservoir Road to Prospect Highway Upgrade 200m North of St Martins Crescent, 100\% Detailed Design, City of Blacktown, Drawings Number RD-0103, RD-0104 and RD-0105, http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/,accessed 05/02/18.

The site access should also serve as a secondary access and be predominantly used for visitor, staff and service vehicles of the existing church only, with the primary accesses to the existing and new cemeteries located to the east via Ponds Road and Tarlington Place.

Overall, access one's location and access arrangements are functional, with an appropriate level of safety for the intended role and use.

### 7.3.1 Access Two (Primary Access via Ponds Road)

Access two is located 140 metres east of access one and would form the primary vehicle access for visitor, staff and service vehicles for the existing cemetery, for vehicles generally arriving from and departing to Prospect Highway. The existing access layout, with all turning movements permitted via Ponds Road, would be maintained.

As discussed, the traffic generated in the peak period will be up to 115 vehicles per hour between 10 am and 3 pm . It is noted that this will occur outside of the road network peak periods.

Considering the low turning volumes into the site during the peak hours, a basic right-turn lane treatment (BAR) intersection is recommended. This will allow through vehicles along Ponds Road to not be obstructed by vehicles turning into the proposed land use.

Site inspections have indicated that adequate sight distances can be provided at this access point. The access arrangement, as shown in Figure 7.3 will be detailed in consultation with Council and RMS.

Figure 7.3: Intersection layout sketch of an Urban Basic Right-turn treatment (BAR)


Source: Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4A: Unsignalised and Signalised Intersections 2017

### 7.3.2 Access Three (Primary access via Tarlington Place)

Access 3 via Tarlington Place would form the primary access for visitor, staff and service vehicles accessing the eastern end of the expanded cemetery (where ancillary facilities, such as an office, café, flower shop and potentially a chapell for vehicles generally arriving and departing from GWH. The existing access layout, with all turning movements permitted via Tarlington Place would also be maintained.

### 7.4 Internal Access Road Review

### 7.4.1 Internal Road Design

Due to the nature of the proposed use, the entering and exiting traffic is expected to be very 'tidal' during peak periods. Most of the traffic will be entering prior to a service and exiting following a service. In the event when two services are to be held in a day, it is noted that there will be around one to two hours between the conclusion of the first service and the commencement of the second service. As such, the likelihood that a vehicle will be required to pass a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction on the internal access road is expected to be low.

As discussed, it is proposed that the internal access road be a minimum of six metres wide to allow two-way traffic movements.

## 8. Sustainable Transport Infrastructure

### 8.1 Public Transport

The site is currently accessible by public transport with a bus stop within 520 metres, located north of the site at the Prospect Highway/ Stoddart Road intersection.

As part of the Prospect Highway upgrade, two new bus stops (northbound and southbound) are proposed adjacent to the intersection of the Prospect Highway/ Reservoir Road/ Reconciliation Road, however this would be around one kilometre from the site.

As such, as part of the PP, it is recommended that one bus stop is be located along the Prospect Highway between the intersections of Prospect Highway/ Ponds Road and Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps. The new bus stop would require the following modifications to the proposed Prospect Highway design, as shown in Figure 8.1:

- Realignment of the proposed shared path west of the Prospect Highway north of the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection.
- Provision of east-west crossing for pedestrian and cyclist on the northern leg of the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection.
- Provision of shared path east of the Prospect Highway north of the Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps intersection to the proposed access one.

Figure 8.1: Recommended new bus stop and associated proposed shared path and crossing along Prospect Highway


Source: MR644 - Prospect Highway from Reservoir Road to Prospect Highway Upgrade 200m North of St Martins Crescent, 100\% Detailed Design, City of Blacktown, Drawings Number RD-0103, RD-0104 and RD-0105, http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/,accessed 05/02/18.

The proposed bus stop along Prospect Highway would be 300 metres from the existing church.
In addition, the proposed bus stop along the Prospect Highway, it is also recommended that a bus stop be located along GWH, about 20 metres west of Tarlington Place.

Such recommendations would require further investigations and consultation with RMS considering their proximity to the intersections of Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps and GWH/ Tarlington Place as well as Transport for NSW and bus operators to ensure there will be sufficient demand for the additional stops.

It is noted that the development of the lands west of the Prospect Highway between GWH and M4 which are currently zoned as $\operatorname{IN} 1$ - General Industrial. The proximity to the recommended bus stops could contribute to increasing the use of public transport (bus only and bus/ rail) by visitors and staff and discourage the use of private motor vehicles.

The recommended bus stop layout will be detailed during the DA stage.

### 8.2 Bicycle and Walking Network

The proposed Prospect Highway upgrade would improve pedestrian and cyclist connectivity and amenity along the Prospect Highway corridor, providing safer crossing provisions at signalised intersections and implementing additional shared user path facilities. The new northbound bridges over the M4 and GWH on the western side of the existing bridge structures, include provision of a shared pedestrian and cyclist path.

Figure 8.1 shows the shared path and crossing to be proposed as part of the bus stops on the Prospect Highway.

If the recommended bus stops are not installed, the proposed shared path and crossing for pedestrians and cyclists could be implemented to provide the missing east-west crossing along the Prospect Highway near the site, as shown in Figure 8.2.

Figure 8.2: Proposed shared path and crossing


[^2] Detailed Design, City of Blacktown, Drawings Number RD-0103, RD-0104 and RD-0105, http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/,accessed 05/02/18.

### 8.3 Bicycle End of Trip Facilities

DCP 2015 does not provide bicycle parking requirement, however, encourages the provision of bicycle parking, with adequate shower and change facilities provided for staff (where appropriate).

In acknowledgement of general changing travel patterns and the increased use of active modes of travel, the potential to incorporate these facilities has been reviewed. As such, reference to the Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling (Department of Planning, 2004) suggests the following bicycle parking provisions for community facilities:

- $\quad$ Staff (long-term use) - rate of three to five per cent of number of staff
- Visitor (short-term use) - rate of five to 10 per cent of visitors.

Applying this to the anticipated number of staff (14 staff) and up to 115 vehicles (and vehicle occupancy of 2.2 visitors per vehicle) per hour between 10 am and 3 pm , the proposed land use could provide a minimum of one and 13 bicycle spaces are provided for staff and visitors respectively.

Bicycle parking spaces would be designed in accordance with relevant Australian Standard (AS2890.3 - Bicycle Parking Facilities). To comply with the Australian Standard, the bicycle parking spaces for visitor bicycle spaces will need to be provided as Class 3 bicycle spaces (such as bicycle racks in public area at 1,200 millimetres centre to centre). Secure racks for use by staff should be provided in a secure location (such as individual locker of secure room/ enclosure).

## 9. Conclusion

The proposed cemetery expansion land has been vacant and unused for over 30 years. The existing cemetery has seen very little regular use since the last Anglican Church service was held in 1967 and the sale of new interment rights ceased in 1972.

The use of the subject land as a cemetery (including ancillary uses such as an office, café, flower shop and potentially a chapel) is likely to:

- Generate a parking demand of up to 115 parking spaces in the peak hour.
- Require the provision of 115 car spaces, two motorcycle spaces and 14 bicycle spaces be provided on site for use by staff and visitors.
- Generate 37 and 32 trips in the AM and PM commuter peak hours, respectively and up to 74 trips during the weekend noon commuter peak hour.
- Generate up to 66 and 115 trips during the cemetery's peak weekday and weekend peak hours, respectively.
- Warrant no more than three access points (two via Ponds Road and one via Tarlington Place.

It is recommended that two bus stops be located on the Prospect Highway and GWH with associated shared path and crossing for pedestrians and cyclists across the Prospect Highway.

Considering a growth rate of 1.2 per cent per annum over the next 10 years and the proposed upgrade of the Prospect Highway, the key intersections near the site are all expected to operate within satisfactory levels of service, with only minor increases in the delay and queue at the intersections of Prospect Highway/ M4 eastbound ramps and GWH/ Tarlington Place.

The additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed cemetery use of the land is not expected to compromise the safety and function of the surrounding road network.

## Appendix A

## Adjoining Roads

Figure A.1: GWH (looking east from Tarlington Place)


Figure A.2: GWH (looking west towards Tarlington Place)


Figure A.3: Prospect Highway (looking south towards Ponds Road)


Figure A.4: Prospect Highway (looking north towards Ponds Road)


Figure A.5: Ponds Road (looking east from Prospect Highway)


Figure A.6: Ponds Road (looking west towards Prospect Highway)


Figure A.7: M4 (looking east from Prospect Highway)


Figure A.8: M4 (looking west towards Prospect Highway)


Figure A.9: Tarlington Place (from Ponds Road towards the cemetery)


Figure A.10: St Bartholomew's Place (from Ponds Road towards the cemetery)
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## Appendix B

Survey Results

> Location: Prospect Hwy \& Ponds Rd

Suburb: Prospect
Date: Tuesday, 12 December 2017
Survey Duration: $0700-1000 \quad \& \quad$ AM Peak: 0715-0815
Weather: Fine
PM Peak: 1600-1700
Notes:

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Time } \\ \hline 15 \mathrm{~min} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Southern Approach: Prospect Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eastern Approach: Ponds Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Northern Approach: Prospect Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Straight Souther |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTur | total | Cyce | Peds | Left |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTur | total | cyde | Peds | Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | UTum | TOTAL | cyce |  |
| time start | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Heavy | Truck | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle: |  |  |  |  | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  |
| 7:00 | 300 | 38 | 0 | 338 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 12 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 182 | 23 | 1 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 0 |  |
| 7:15 | 341 | 40 | 0 | 381 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 401 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 7 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 20 | 1 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 |  |
| 7:30 | 332 | 32 | 1 | 365 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 3 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 164 | 20 | 0 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 |  |
| 7:45 | 358 | 26 | 0 | 384 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 395 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 4 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 145 | 23 | 1 | 169 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 |  |
| 8:00 | 311 | 37 | 1 | 349 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 119 | 27 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 |  |
| 8:15 | 329 | 44 | 0 | 373 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 161 | 30 | 1 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 0 |  |
| 8:30 | 299 | 36 | 1 | 336 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 10 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 154 | 31 | 0 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 0 |  |
| 8:45 | 272 | 34 | 0 | 306 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 325 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 5 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 176 | 25 | 1 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 0 |  |
| 9:00 | 249 | 35 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 13 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 125 | 33 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 0 |  |
| 9:15 | 231 | 43 | 0 | 274 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 158 | 37 | 4 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 |  |
| 9:30 | 229 | 40 | 0 | 269 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 15 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 141 | 35 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 |  |
| 9:45 | 216 | 38 | 0 | 254 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 259 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 6 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 163 | 29 | 1 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 0 |  |
| TOTAL | 3467 | 443 | 3 | 3913 | 0 | 152 | 16 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 4081 | 0 | 0 | 646 | 92 | 0 | 738 | 0 | 63 | 16 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 817 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 16 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 1867 | 333 | 10 | 2210 | 0 | 0 | 2306 | 0 |  |
| AM Peak | 1331 | 136 | 1 | 1468 | 0 | 52 | 3 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 1523 | 0 | 0 | 230 | 26 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 670 | 86 | 3 | 759 | 0 | 0 | 779 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15:00 | 297 | 29 | 1 | 327 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 10 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 153 | 24 | 1 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 |  |
| 15:15 | 293 | 34 | 0 | 327 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 10 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 121 | 18 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 |  |
| 15:30 | 299 | 27 | 1 | 327 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 336 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 10 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 114 | 22 | 1 | 137 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 |  |
| 15:45 | 318 | 34 | 0 | 352 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 6 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 137 | 26 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 |  |
| 16:00 | 363 | 18 | 1 | 382 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 12 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 107 | 22 | 1 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 |  |
| 16:15 | 395 | 23 | 1 | 419 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 433 | 。 | 0 | 62 | 7 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 140 | 20 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 |  |
| 16:30 | 342 | 19 | 1 | 362 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 384 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 161 | 18 | 1 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 |  |
| 16:45 | 351 | 17 | 0 | 368 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 5 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 146 | 22 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 |  |
| 17:00 | 291 | 20 | 0 | 311 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 328 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 7 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 191 | 15 | 1 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 0 |  |
| 17:15 | 361 | 17 | 1 | 379 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 390 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 4 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 173 | 13 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 0 |  |
| 17:30 | 354 | 8 | 1 | 363 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 372 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 8 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 178 | 18 | 1 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 0 |  |
| 17:45 | 348 | 16 | 0 | 364 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 378 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 5 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 218 | 20 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 |  |
| 18:00 | 342 | 8 | 1 | 351 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 218 | 14 | 1 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 0 |  |
| 18:15 | 317 | 13 | 0 | 330 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 6 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 208 | 20 | 2 | 230 | 0 | 0 | 242 | 0 |  |
| 18:30 | 249 | 12 | 1 | 262 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 189 | 11 | 1 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 0 |  |
| 18:45 | 273 | 10 | 0 | 283 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 183 | 9 | 2 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 |  |
| TOTAL | 5193 | 305 | 9 | 5507 | 0 | 174 | 21 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 5702 | 0 | 0 | 949 | 102 | 0 | 1051 | 0 | 189 | 6 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 1246 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 21 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 2637 | 292 | 12 | 2941 | 0 | 0 | 3144 | 0 |  |
| PM Peak | 1405 | 49 | 3 | 1457 | 0 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 1498 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 17 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 787 | 65 | 2 | 854 | 0 | 0 | 911 | 0 |  |

## TTM Data

TTM Reference: 17SYD0166
Location: Prospect Hwy \& M4 Eastbound Ramps
Suburb: Prospect

Survey Duration: 0700-1000 \& 1500-180
Weather: Fine
AM Peak: 0715-0815
AM Peak: 0715-0815
PM Peak: $1600-1700$
Notes:

| Time | Northern Approach: Prospect Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Southern Approach: Prospect Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 min | Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | U Turn | total | Cycle | Peds | Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTurn | TOTAL | Cycle | Peds |
| time start | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  |
| 7:00 | 77 | 8 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 145 | 26 | 1 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 29 | 0 | 213 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 4 | 258 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 | 69 | 10 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 153 | 19 | 1 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 31 | 0 | 223 | 0 | 31 | 22 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 8 | 284 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 | 68 | 11 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 157 | 13 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 23 | 1 | 239 | 0 | 30 | 21 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 9 | 299 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 | 61 | 3 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 158 | 23 | 1 | 182 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 20 | 0 | 268 | 0 | 33 | 17 | 1 | 51 | 0 | 3 | 322 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 | 45 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 139 | 24 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 | 31 | 1 | 238 | 0 | 29 | 22 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 6 | 295 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 | 86 | 10 | 1 | 97 | 0 | 129 | 24 | 1 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 198 | 32 | 0 | 230 | 0 | 36 | 20 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 3 | 289 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 | 61 | 13 | 0 | 74 | 0 | 165 | 28 | 0 | 193 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 | 32 | 2 | 244 | 0 | 33 | 15 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 3 | 295 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 | 77 | 3 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 148 | 25 | 2 | 175 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 24 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 2 | 253 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:00 | 55 | 15 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 115 | 32 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 21 | 0 | 190 | 0 | 24 | 34 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 250 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:15 | 60 | 15 | 1 | 76 | 0 | 132 | 26 | 2 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 243 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 33 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 35 | 16 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 2 | 215 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:30 | 52 | 12 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 132 | 30 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 26 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 1 | 224 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:45 | 70 | 11 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 125 | 25 | 1 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 24 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 27 | 9 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 3 | 206 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 781 | 120 | 2 | 903 | 0 | 1698 | 295 | 9 | 2002 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 2930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2224 | 326 | 4 | 2554 | 0 | 353 | 236 | 1 | 590 | 0 | 46 | 3190 | 0 | 0 |
| AM Peak | 243 | 33 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 607 | 79 | 2 | 688 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 971 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 861 | 105 | 2 | 968 | 0 | 123 | 82 | 1 | 206 | 0 | 26 | 1200 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15:00 | 51 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 145 | 29 | 1 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 18 | 1 | 232 | 0 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 43 | 4 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 153 | 23 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 223 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 28 | 0 | 225 | 0 | 72 | 14 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 1 | 312 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 157 | 21 | 1 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 19 | 1 | 236 | - | 72 | 12 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 320 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 38 | 7 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 182 | 20 | 0 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 15 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 46 | 9 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 271 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 143 | 26 | 1 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 | 9 | 0 | 227 | 0 | 84 | 4 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 33 | 348 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 170 | 21 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 227 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 13 | , | 262 | 0 | 71 | 4 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 44 | 381 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 43 | 5 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 181 | 21 | 1 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 17 | 1 | 280 | 0 | 73 | 2 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 53 | 408 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 36 | 5 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 181 | 20 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 248 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 10 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 64 | 5 | 0 | 69 | , | 54 | 383 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 183 | 22 | 1 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 15 | 0 | 232 | 0 | 83 | 5 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 7 | 327 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 58 | 4 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 200 | 9 | 0 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 274 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 12 | 1 | 254 | 0 | 83 | 9 | 0 | 92 | $\stackrel{0}{ }$ | 6 | 352 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 181 | 19 | 1 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 262 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 8 | - | 265 | 0 | 90 | 7 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 2 | 364 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 61 | 3 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 189 | 17 | 0 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 275 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 255 | 18 | 0 | 273 | 0 | 63 | 5 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 1 | 342 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 873 | 66 | 1 | 940 | 0 | 2652 | 299 | 9 | 2960 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 3953 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3685 | 217 | 8 | 3910 | 0 | 1014 | 105 | 1 | 1120 | 0 | 208 | 5238 | 0 | 0 |
| PM Peak | 144 | 19 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 675 | 88 | 2 | 765 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 947 | 0. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 978 | 49 | 2 | 1029 | 0 | 292 | 15 | 0 | 307 | 0 | 184 | 1520 | 0 | 0 |

## TTM Data

TTM Reference: 17SYD0166
Location: Prospect Hwy \& M4 Eastbound Ramps
Suburb: Prospect
tłm
Survey Duration: 0700-1000 \& 1500-1800
Weather: Fine
AM Peak: 0715-0815
Weather: Fine
PM Peak: 1600-1700
Notes:

| Time | Eastern Approach: ${ }^{\text {M4 Entry Ramp }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 min | Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTurn | TOTAL | cyce: | Peds |
| time start | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  |
| 7:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AM Peak | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PM Peak | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Western Approach: ${ }^{\text {M4 Exit Ramp }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTurn | total | Cyce | Peds |
| Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle |  |  |  |  |
| 137 | 9 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 |
| 147 | 6 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 11 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 211 | 0 | 0 |
| 144 | 8 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 11 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 0 |
| 132 | 7 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 32 | 14 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 |
| 139 | 9 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 13 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 |
| 149 | 11 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 11 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 0 |
| 110 | 7 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 |
| 108 | 12 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| 89 | 12 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 22 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 |
| 109 | 13 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 0 |
| 94 | 18 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 18 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| 79 | 14 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 |
| 1437 | 126 | 0 | 1563 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 425 | 173 | 0 | 598 | 0 | 0 | 2167 | 0 | 0 |
| 562 | 30 | 0 | 592 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 168 | 49 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 811 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 102 | 14 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 32 | 30 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 |
| 101 | 20 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 27 | 21 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 0 |
| 111 | 10 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 |
| 150 | 15 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 38 | 27 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 0 |
| 164 | 9 | 1 | 174 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 0 |
| 129 | 12 | 0 | 141 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 0 |
| 106 | 4 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 11 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 |
| 118 | 7 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 14 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| 91 | 6 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 13 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 | 0 |
| 129 | 9 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 15 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 0 |
| 102 | 4 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 0 |
| 103 | 3 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 12 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 148 | d | 0 |
| 1726 | 127 | 1 | 1854 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 408 | 260 | 0 | 668 | 0 | 0 | 2565 | 0 | 0 |
| 517 | 32 | 1 | 550 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 129 | 76 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 768 | 0 | 0 |

TTM Data
TM Reference: 17SYD0166
Location: Great Western Hwy \& Tarlington PI
Suburb: Prospect
tłm
Survey Duration: Tuesday, 12 December 2017
Weath: $0700-1000$ \& 1500-1900
AM Peak: 0715-0815
PM Peak: 1600-1700
Weather: Fin
Notes:

| Time | Western Approach:\|Great Western Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Southern Approach: Tarlington PI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eastern Approach: Great Western Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 min | Straight |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTurn | total | cyce | Peds | Left |  |  |  |  | Right |  |  |  |  | UTum | TOTAL | crace | Peds | Left |  |  |  |  | Straight |  |  |  |  | UTum | total | Crye | Pds |
| time start | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cyce: |  |  |  |  | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle: | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle: |  |  |  |  | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle | Light | Heavy | Bus | Total | Cycle: |  |  |  |  |
| 7:00 | 418 | 16 | 0 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 26 | 0 | 251 | 0 | 0 | 251 | . | 0 |
| 7:15 | 397 | 18 | 3 | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 419 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 | 30 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 | 377 | 24 | 0 | 401 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 401 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 307 | 35 | 0 | 342 | 0 | - | 342 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 | 408 | 12 | 2 | 422 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 423 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 | 18 | 1 | 364 | 0 | 0 | 364 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 | 399 | 14 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 325 | 31 | 2 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 358 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 | 389 | 17 | 3 | 409 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 410 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 20 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 | 391 | 18 | 4 | 413 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 414 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 24 | 2 | 344 | 0 | 0 | 344 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 | 371 | 15 | 2 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 0 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 294 | 20 | 1 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:00 | 255 | 32 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 21 | 0 | 287 | 0 | - | 287 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:15 | 254 | 31 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 19 | 0 | 302 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 302 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:30 | 219 | 19 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 29 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:45 | 208 | 25 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 23 | 0 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 4086 | 241 | 14 | 4341 | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4345 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3370 | 296 | 6 | 3672 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 3672 | 0 | 0 |
| AM Peak | 1581 | 68 | 5 | 1654 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. | 2 | 1656 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1256 | 114 | 3 | 1373 | 0 | 0 | 1373 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15:00 | 232 | 22 | 2 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 453 | 14 | 0 | 467 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 467 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15 | 238 | 23 | 2 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 482 | 20 | 0 | 502 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 235 | 13 | 0 | 248 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 583 | 32 | 1 | 616 | 0 | 1 | 618 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:45 | 265 | 18 | 2 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 551 | 32 | 1 | 584 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 584 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00 | 277 | 24 | , | 302 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 614 | 28 | 0 | 642 | 0 | 0 | 643 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15 | 270 | 11 | 0 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 635 | 33 | 0 | 668 | 0 | 0 | 669 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 283 | 7 | 1 | 291 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 607 | 32 | 0 | 639 | 0 | 0 | 641 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45 | 281 | 9 |  | 291 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 569 | 29 | 0 | 598 | 0 | 0 | 598 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00 | 262 | 3 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 592 | 26 | 1 | 619 | 0 | 0 | 620 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15 | 240 | 10 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 617 | 21 | 0 | 638 | 0 | 0 | 639 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30 | 267 | 5 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 559 | 36 | 1 | 596 | 0 | 0 | 597 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45 | 224 | 12 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 545 | 22 | 0 | 567 | 0 | 0 | 568 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00 | 214 | 6 | 2 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 224 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 16 | 0 | 520 | 0 | 0 | 520 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:15 | 208 | 6 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 214 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 14 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:30 | 169 | 8 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 311 | 7 | 0 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:45 | 204 | 7 | 0 | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 221 | 12 | 0 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 3869 | 184 | 11 | 4064 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4073 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 8208 | 374 | 4 | 8586 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 8597 | 0 | 0 |
| PM Peak | 1111 | 51 | 3 | 1165 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1170 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2425 | 122 | 0 | 2547 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 2551 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |


|  | Approa |  | detector(s)... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Approach | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 13 |  |
| 00:15 | Approach | 1 | 7 | 21 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 17 | 10 | 27 | 5 | 106 |
| 00:30 | Approach | 1 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 24 | 6 | 99 |
| 00:45 | Approach | 1 | 12 | 20 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 28 | 8 | 105 |
| 01:00 | Approach | 1 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 73 |
| 01:15 | Approach | 1 | 9 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 3 | 83 |
| 01:30 | Approach | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 16 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 73 |
| 01:45 | Approach | 1 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 58 |
| 02:00 | Approach | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 57 |
| 02:15 | Approach | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 13 | 2 | 56 |
| 02:30 | Approach | 1 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 51 |
| 02:45 | Approach | 1 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 58 |
| 03:00 | Approach | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 52 |
| 03:15 | Approach | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 58 |
| 03:30 | Approach | 1 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 28 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 81 |
| 03:45 | Approach | 1 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 36 | 6 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 104 |
| 04:00 | Approach | 1 | 9 | 12 | 5 | 43 | 6 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 16 | 122 |
| 04:15 | Approach | 1 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 31 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 89 |
| 04:30 | Approach | 1 | 6 | 13 | 10 | 51 | 6 | 18 | 7 | 10 | 20 | 141 |
| 04:45 | Approach | 1 | 11 | 14 | 18 | 92 | 11 | 40 | 8 | 14 | 23 | 231 |
| 05:00 | Approach | 1 | 13 | 15 | 10 | 90 | 18 | 29 | 10 | 24 | 33 | 242 |
| 05:15 | Approach | 1 | 19 | 41 | 15 | 103 | 13 | 30 | 9 | 15 | 27 | 272 |
| 05:30 | Approach | 1 | 29 | 45 | 25 | 136 | 14 | 50 | 15 | 26 | 35 | 375 |
| 05:45 | Approach | 1 | 36 | 50 | 37 | 168 | 23 | 58 | 27 | 49 | 66 | 514 |
| 06:00 | Approach | 1 | 43 | 41 | 34 | 169 | 32 | 66 | 28 | 54 | 74 | 541 |
| 06:15 | Approach | 1 | 55 | 68 | 36 | 126 | 25 | 49 | 32 | 42 | 63 | 496 |
| 06:30 | Approach | 1 | 63 | 72 | 42 | 137 | 35 | 72 | 50 | 70 | 89 | 630 |
| 06:45 | Approach | 1 | 66 | 62 | 50 | 146 | 33 | 68 | 60 | 85 | 82 | 652 |
| 07:00 | Approach | 1 | 78 | 64 | 36 | 145 | 27 | 59 | 62 | 81 | 67 | 619 |
| 07:15 | Approach | 1 | 62 | 69 | 58 | 140 | 18 | 62 | 57 | 75 | 75 | 616 |
| 07:30 | Approach | 1 | 70 | 76 | 49 | 125 | 28 | 68 | 53 | 84 | 95 | 648 |
| 07:45 | Approach | 1 | 75 | 81 | 33 | 127 | 29 | 78 | 57 | 74 | 86 | 640 |
| 08:00 | Approach | 1 | 63 | 73 | 54 | 129 | 29 | 69 | 69 | 101 | 88 | 675 |
| 08:15 | Approach | 1 | 68 | 75 | 58 | 123 | 36 | 72 | 61 | 96 | 76 | 665 |
| 08:30 | Approach | 1 | 61 | 79 | 47 | 105 | 30 | 61 | 46 | 73 | 72 | 574 |
| 08:45 | Approach | 1 | 67 | 78 | 38 | 122 | 30 | 67 | 60 | 88 | 86 | 636 |
| 09:00 | Approach | 1 | 63 | 68 | 41 | 144 | 28 | 59 | 45 | 69 | 67 | 584 |
| 09:15 | Approach | 1 | 51 | 71 | 38 | 114 | 30 | 64 | 46 | 74 | 74 | 562 |
| 09:30 | Approach | 1 | 50 | 61 | 52 | 131 | 27 | 67 | 32 | 60 | 53 | 533 |
| 09:45 | Approach | 1 | 45 | 64 | 53 | 125 | 22 | 72 | 38 | 68 | 59 | 546 |
| 10:00 | Approach | 1 | 41 | 63 | 47 | 116 | 29 | 66 | 36 | 59 | 74 | 531 |
| 10:15 | Approach | 1 | 29 | 65 | 64 | 104 | 23 | 60 | 34 | 55 | 61 | 495 |
| 10:30 | Approach | 1 | 49 | 75 | 55 | 111 | 26 | 62 | 41 | 68 | 66 | 553 |
| 10:45 | Approach | 1 | 52 | 72 | 49 | 89 | 28 | 54 | 40 | 61 | 50 | 495 |
| 11:00 | Approach | 1 | 46 | 61 | 45 | 108 | 30 | 51 | 45 | 59 | 74 | 519 |
| 11:15 | Approach | 1 | 41 | 71 | 50 | 101 | 32 | 56 | 36 | 58 | 51 | 496 |
| 11:30 | Approach | 1 | 54 | 77 | 43 | 100 | 30 | 68 | 39 | 58 | 64 | 533 |
| 11:45 | Approach | 1 | 52 | 74 | 45 | 115 | 28 | 67 | 44 | 71 | 54 | 550 |
| 12:00 | Approach | 1 | 52 | 75 | 58 | 98 | 27 | 57 | 36 | 59 | 52 | 514 |


|  |  | 4523 Tuesday 1212 17.txt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:15 | Approach | 1 | 51 | 75 | 51 | 108 | 25 | 57 | 32 | 48 | 52 | 499 |
| 12:30 | Approach | 1 | 71 | 81 | 55 | 101 | 36 | 64 | 31 | 59 | 60 | 558 |
| 12:45 | Approach | 1 | 49 | 68 | 55 | 129 | 21 | 54 | 36 | 54 | 53 | 519 |
| 13:00 | Approach | 1 | 49 | 66 | 45 | 129 | 26 | 63 | 38 | 62 | 54 | 532 |
| 13:15 | Approach | 1 | 47 | 74 | 69 | 113 | 31 | 68 | 38 | 64 | 56 | 560 |
| 13:30 | Approach | 1 | 54 | 78 | 74 | 116 | 27 | 81 | 39 | 61 | 63 | 593 |
| 13:45 | Approach | 1 | 54 | 69 | 61 | 116 | 42 | 67 | 44 | 71 | 61 | 585 |
| 14:00 | Approach | 1 | 50 | 65 | 70 | 132 | 40 | 70 | 36 | 62 | 68 | 593 |
| 14:15 | Approach | 1 | 72 | 91 | 85 | 118 | 34 | 70 | 47 | 73 | 57 | 647 |
| 14:30 | Approach | 1 | 77 | 91 | 67 | 100 | 35 | 83 | 50 | 66 | 54 | 623 |
| 14:45 | Approach | 1 | 75 | 86 | 93 | 116 | 33 | 76 | 50 | 85 | 68 | 682 |
| 15:00 | Approach | 1 | 78 | 106 | 98 | 105 | 40 | 76 | 55 | 67 | 49 | 674 |
| 15:15 | Approach | 1 | 69 | 93 | 81 | 112 | 37 | 69 | 49 | 79 | 42 | 631 |
| 15:30 | Approach | 1 | 78 | 98 | 97 | 111 | 49 | 75 | 45 | 69 | 45 | 667 |
| 15:45 | Approach | 1 | 77 | 112 | 81 | 101 | 40 | 77 | 40 | 57 | 28 | 613 |
| 16:00 | Approach | 1 | 82 | 87 | 82 | 117 | 57 | 92 | 38 | 64 | 40 | 659 |
| 16:15 | Approach | 1 | 96 | 115 | 105 | 108 | 34 | 87 | 48 | 58 | 43 | 694 |
| 16:30 | Approach | 1 | 84 | 112 | 95 | 121 | 47 | 80 | 41 | 72 | 48 | 700 |
| 16:45 | Approach | 1 | 97 | 110 | 75 | 92 | 51 | 88 | 69 | 74 | 45 | 701 |
| 17:00 | Approach | 1 | 72 | 108 | 80 | 98 | 50 | 90 | 70 | 76 | 48 | 692 |
| 17:15 | Approach | 1 | 77 | 99 | 75 | 99 | 51 | 95 | 54 | 73 | 47 | 670 |
| 17:30 | Approach | 1 | 92 | 96 | 80 | 76 | 59 | 104 | 68 | 85 | 37 | 697 |
| 17:45 | Approach | 1 | 86 | 114 | 68 | 94 | 46 | 91 | 63 | 88 | 47 | 697 |
| 18:00 | Approach | 1 | 93 | 106 | 66 | 102 | 50 | 83 | 61 | 79 | 36 | 676 |
| 18:15 | Approach | 1 | 78 | 86 | 56 | 85 | 42 | 65 | 66 | 81 | 56 | 615 |
| 18:30 | Approach | 1 | 62 | 63 | 39 | 88 | 45 | 89 | 72 | 84 | 31 | 573 |
| 18:45 | Approach | 1 | 39 | 47 | 44 | 62 | 20 | 82 | 66 | 87 | 28 | 475 |
| 19:00 | Approach | 1 | 44 | 51 | 28 | 62 | 28 | 64 | 65 | 79 | 36 | 457 |
| 19:15 | Approach | 1 | 47 | 56 | 37 | 59 | 28 | 55 | 43 | 71 | 13 | 409 |
| 19:30 | Approach | 1 | 24 | 39 | 20 | 53 | 21 | 68 | 38 | 58 | 16 | 337 |
| 19:45 | Approach | 1 | 25 | 29 | 18 | 39 | 11 | 50 | 29 | 48 | 22 | 271 |
| 20:00 | Approach | 1 | 22 | 35 | 16 | 42 | 14 | 40 | 26 | 52 | 12 | 259 |
| 20:15 | Approach | 1 | 18 | 37 | 28 | 36 | 22 | 48 | 39 | 61 | 14 | 303 |
| 20:30 | Approach | 1 | 18 | 24 | 20 | 37 | 14 | 63 | 35 | 49 | 8 | 268 |
| 20:45 | Approach | 1 | 10 | 18 | 24 | 33 | 18 | 53 | 33 | 57 | 10 | 256 |
| 21:00 | Approach | 1 | 14 | 15 | 20 | 39 | 8 | 52 | 27 | 56 | 12 | 243 |
| 21:15 | Approach | 1 | 16 | 28 | 13 | 30 | 10 | 32 | 25 | 39 | 10 | 203 |
| 21:30 | Approach | 1 | 20 | 26 | 11 | 43 | 22 | 51 | 32 | 41 | 13 | 259 |
| 21:45 | Approach | 1 | 10 | 19 | 15 | 39 | 17 | 48 | 27 | 51 | 15 | 241 |
| 22:00 | Approach | 1 | 15 | 27 | 22 | 34 | 13 | 45 | 24 | 40 | 7 | 227 |
| 22:15 | Approach | 1 | 16 | 24 | 23 | 31 | 15 | 31 | 28 | 43 | 5 | 216 |
| 22:30 | Approach | 1 | 19 | 20 | 13 | 23 | 8 | 27 | 26 | 45 | 5 | 186 |
| 22:45 | Approach | 1 | 16 | 19 | 10 | 30 | 9 | 38 | 20 | 47 | 17 | 206 |
| 23:00 | Approach | 1 | 14 | 23 | 18 | 27 | 6 | 23 | 18 | 37 | 5 | 171 |
| 23:15 | Approach | 1 | 15 | 27 | 26 | 19 | 5 | 22 | 11 | 35 | 9 | 169 |
| 23:30 | Approach | 1 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 11 | 20 | 20 | 33 | 5 | 152 |
| 23:45 | Approach | 1 | 11 | 16 | 13 | 18 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 25 | 11 | 120 |
| 24:00 | Approach | 1 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 41 | 8 | 109 |

Approach 1 AM peak 2628 07:15-08:15 PM peak 2787 16:00-17:00 Daily Total 39290


|  | 怘 | 号 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | 0 | － | 00 | $\bigcirc$ | － 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | \％ | － |  | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － 0 | 0 O | － |  | － | － | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | \＆ | \％ | is | 8 | $\bar{\square}$ | ¢ | ¢ | § ก | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ | \＆ | § | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ | ～ | N |
|  | 5 | 5 | － |  | － | － | － | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | － | － | － |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{c} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\frac{8}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － 0 | － 0 | － | － |  | － | 。 | － |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{ }{\sim}$ | 안 | 안 | N | $\stackrel{9}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | 운 | $\bigcirc$ | F | N | $\stackrel{1}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\circ}$ | \％ | \％ |
|  | $\frac{5}{x}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | － 0 |  | － | 0 | － | － |
|  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － | ～ | － |  | 0 | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\sim$ |  | ＋ |
|  |  | 砢 |  | 앙 | 안 | d | N | $\stackrel{m}{\square}$ | の | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | F | Г | i | ¢ | ช | 8 |
|  |  | $\frac{0}{8}$ | $0$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc \circ$ | 。 | － |  | － | 。 | － |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{y}{\mathrm{~g}} \\ \stackrel{1}{6} \end{array}$ | \％ | \％ | 于 | $\stackrel{\Perp}{\infty}$ | \％ | ก | ₹ | ¢ | \％ 8 | L | ¢ | \％ | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ |
|  | $\pm$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － 0 | － 0 | 0 |  | － | 0 | － |
|  |  |  | $\mathfrak{n}$ | $\sim$ | ल | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | ～ | $\checkmark$ O | 0 m | － |  | ～ | $\sim$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | ¢ | す | $\because$ | i |  |  | N | － |


TTM Data
TTM Reference: 17SYD0166
Reference: 17SYD0166
Location: Prospect Hwy \& M4 Eastbound Ramps
Suburb: Prospect Date: Saturday, 9 December 2017
Survey Duration: 1000-1300 Weather: Fin
Notes:


|  |  | 哭 | - |  | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{3}{6}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | - 0 | - | - 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t}$ | - |  | 00 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\frac{6}{0}$ | . |  |  | - | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 O | - | - 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | \% | - |  | 00 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - |
|  |  |  | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \substack{3 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \stackrel{1}{1} \\ \hline} \end{aligned}$ | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | 苛 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\frac{3}{3}$ | - |  | - 0 | - | - | - | - 0 | - | - 0 | - | - 0 | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | - |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \overline{\mathrm{I}} \\ \stackrel{1}{\circ} \end{gathered}$ | - |  | 00 | - | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  |  | - |  | 0 | - | - |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} n \\ \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ \\ \text { In } \end{array} \end{array}$ | O |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | - |  | - 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | - | - |  | 0 | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\frac{0}{0}$ | - |  | - 0 | - | - 0 | - | - 0 | - | - 0 | - | 0 | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | - |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\square}$ | - |  | 00 | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | - | - |
|  |  | ¢ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | - |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \substack{\mathbb{\pi} \\ \text { ¹ } \\ \hline} \end{gathered}$ | $0$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | - | - |
|  |  | - |  |  | - | 0 | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\stackrel{\sim}{\tau}} \underset{\sim}{\stackrel{\varphi}{=}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\circ} \underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \sum_{<}^{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | - |

TTM Reference: 17 SYDO166
Location: Great Westem Hwy \& Tarlington PI
Suburb: Prospect
Date: Saturdyy, 9 December 2017
Survey Duration: $1000-1300$
Weather: Fine
Notes:


TTM Data



Approach 1 AM peak 1661 11:00-12:00 PM peak 1736 12:00-13:00 Daily Total 25175

## Appendix C

SIDRA INTERSECTION Results

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ site: 1 [Prospect Highway / Ponds Road - Tue (AM)]

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Mov OD } \\ \text { ID } & \text { Mov } \end{array}$ | Demand Total <br> veh/h | Flows HV \% | Arrival Total <br> veh/h | Flows HV \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | erage peed <br> km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 T1 | 1557 | 9.3 | 1557 | 9.3 | 0.846 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.1 |
| 3 R2 | 67 | 4.7 | 67 | 4.7 | 0.103 | 9.9 | LOSA | 0.4 | 2.9 | 0.65 | 0.85 | 44.7 |
| Approach | 1624 | 9.1 | 1624 | 9.1 | 0.846 | 0.5 | NA | 0.4 | 2.9 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 58.3 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 292 | 6.9 | 292 | 6.9 | 0.934 | 37.5 | LOS C | 6.3 | 46.9 | 0.74 | 1.46 | 33.2 |
| 6 R2 | 31 | 24.1 | 31 | 24.1 | 0.126 | 22.0 | LOS B | 0.4 | 3.5 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 49.4 |
| Approach | 322 | 8.5 | 322 | 8.5 | 0.934 | 36.1 | LOS C | 6.3 | 46.9 | 0.75 | 1.41 | 35.2 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 22 | 23.8 | 22 | 23.8 | 0.424 | 5.9 | LOS A | 17.8 | 139.1 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 57.0 |
| 8 T1 | 736 | 13.2 | 736 | 13.2 | 0.424 | 0.1 | LOS A | 17.8 | 139.1 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 59.6 |
| Approach | 758 | 13.5 | 758 | 13.5 | 0.424 | 0.2 | NA | 17.8 | 139.1 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 59.4 |
| All Vehicles | 2704 | 10.2 | 2704 | 10.2 | 0.934 | 4.7 | NA | 17.8 | 139.1 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 54.4 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: $6.4 \%$ Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

[^3]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Tue (AM)]
审官 Network: N101 [AM

Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 6.4 \% Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Tues (AM)]

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: $6.4 \%$
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Back Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 11.8 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 22.1 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 16.9 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

[^4]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (AM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.261 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.5 |
| 5 | T1 | 1445 | 8.5 | 0.261 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| Appr |  | 1446 | 8.5 | 0.261 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1741 | 4.4 | 0.230 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.012 | 12.5 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 43.1 |
| 12u | U | 2 | 0.0 | 0.012 | 21.7 | LOS B | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 46.8 |
| Appr |  | 1744 | 4.4 | 0.230 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 8.7 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.46 | 0.58 | 54.7 |
| 32a | R1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 6.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.50 | 0.57 | 57.6 |
| Approach |  | 2 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 7.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.48 | 0.57 | 56.1 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3193 | 6.3 | 0.261 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 1 [Prospect Highway / Ponds Road - Tue (PM)]

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand FlowsTotal HV |  | Arrival Flows |  | Deg. <br> Satn | Average Delay | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Queue |  | Prop. Queued | Effective Average |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | HV |  |  |  | Vehicles | Distance |  | Stop | peed |
|  |  |  |  |  | \% | v/c | sec |  |  | m |  | Rate | km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 1612 | 5.2 | 1611 | 5.2 | 0.854 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.0 |
| 3 | R2 | 71 | 7.5 | 70 | 7.5 | 0.104 | 9.6 | LOS A | 0.4 | 3.0 | 0.64 | 0.84 | 44.8 |
| Appr | ach | 1682 | 5.3 | $1681{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.3 | 0.854 | 0.5 | NA | 0.4 | 3.0 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 58.3 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 335 | 10.1 | 335 | 10.1 | 0.987 | 51.7 | LOS D | 10.9 | 83.0 | 0.72 | 1.80 | 26.5 |
| 6 | R2 | 44 | 2.4 | 44 | 2.4 | 0.126 | 16.7 | LOS B | 0.4 | 3.1 | 0.73 | 0.91 | 53.9 |
| Appr | ach | 379 | 9.2 | 379 | 9.2 | 0.987 | 47.6 | LOS D | 10.9 | 83.0 | 0.72 | 1.70 | 29.6 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 56 | 5.7 | 56 | 5.7 | 0.405 | 5.7 | LOS A | 39.2 | 304.2 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 57.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 672 | 13.2 | 672 | 13.2 | 0.405 | 0.1 | LOS A | 39.2 | 304.2 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 59.0 |
| Approach |  | 727 | 12.6 | 727 | 12.6 | 0.405 | 0.5 | NA | 39.2 | 304.2 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 58.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2788 | 7.7 | 2788 | 7.7 | 0.987 | 6.9 | NA | 39.2 | 304.2 | 0.11 | 0.26 | 51.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 9.6 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Tue (PM)]

Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 9.6 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

目 Site： 3 ［Prospect Highway／M4 Western Motorway Westbound－Tues（PM）］

Signals－Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds（User－Given Cycle Time）

| Movement Performance－Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov OD ID Mov | Demand Total veh／h | ows <br> HV <br> \％ | Arrival <br> Total <br> veh／h | ows HV \％ | Deg． <br> Satn <br> v／c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\％Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance <br> m | Prop． Queued | Effective <br> Stop <br> Rate <br> per veh | Average Speed km／h |
| South：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 374 | 5.0 | 374 | 5.0 | 0.521 | 27.8 | LOS B | 12.5 | 91.2 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 40.8 |
| 2 T1 | 836 | 5.0 | 836 | 5.0 | 0.922 | 41.3 | LOS C | 38.1 | 278.0 | 0.95 | 1.05 | 25.6 |
| Approach | 1209 | 5.0 | 1209 | 5.0 | 0.922 | 37.1 | LOS C | 38.1 | 278.0 | 0.90 | 0.97 | 31.1 |
| East：M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 194 | 5.0 | 194 | 5.0 | 0.204 | 7.2 | LOS A | 1.5 | 11.1 | 0.27 | 0.63 | 52.9 |
| 5 T1 | 5 | 5.0 | 5 | 5.0 | 0.894 | 52.3 | LOS D | 14.0 | 101.9 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 30.8 |
| 6 R2 | 529 | 5.0 | 529 | 5.0 | 0.894 | 57.9 | LOS E | 14.0 | 101.9 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 20.9 |
| Approach | 728 | 5.0 | 728 | 5.0 | 0.894 | 44.4 | LOS D | 14.0 | 101.9 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 28.1 |
| North：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 T1 | 441 | 5.0 | 431 | 5.0 | 0.326 | 5.6 | LOS A | 7.2 | 52.9 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 53.6 |
| 9 R2 | 555 | 5.0 | 542 | 5.0 | 0.929 | 45.9 | LOS D | 10.9 | 79.8 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 29.7 |
| Approach | 996 | 5.0 | $973{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.0 | 0.929 | 28.0 | LOS B | 10.9 | 79.8 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 37.0 |
| All Vehicles | 2934 | 5.0 | $2910{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.0 | 0.929 | 35.9 | LOS C | 38.1 | 278.0 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 32.2 |

Site Level of Service（LOS）Method：Delay（RTA NSW）．Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog（Network tab）． Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement．
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements．
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used．Control Delay includes Geometric Delay．
Gap－Acceptance Capacity：SIDRA Standard（Akçelik M3D）．
HV（\％）values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation．
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations： 9.6 \％
Number of Iterations： 10 （maximum specified：10）

N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes．

| Movement Performance－Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped／h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | Queue Distance m | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip／Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 13.9 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 19.4 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.66 | 0.66 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 16.7 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service（LOS）Method：SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method（Based on Average Delay）
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement．
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements．

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (PM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.473 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.5 |
| 5 | T1 | 2681 | 4.8 | 0.473 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| Appro |  | 2685 | 4.8 | 0.473 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1226 | 4.6 | 0.162 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.033 | 15.2 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 36.0 |
| 12u | U | 4 | 0.0 | 0.033 | 32.3 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 40.9 |
| Appro | ch | 1232 | 4.6 | 0.162 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.6 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 8.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.60 | 0.51 | 54.4 |
| 32a | R1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.002 | 8.7 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.69 | 0.66 | 55.0 |
| Approach |  | 3 | 0.0 | 0.002 | 8.5 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.63 | 0.56 | 54.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3920 | 4.7 | 0.473 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: GTA CONSULTANTS | Processed: Monday, 15 January 2018 3:22:32 PM
Project: P:IN14000-14099\N140040 St. Bartholomew's Cemetery, ProspectlModelling\180115-N140040 St. Bartholomews Cemetery Prospect Existing Conditions.sip7

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Arriva Total veh/h | lows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | erage peed <br> km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway 0 en me 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 1122 | 5.0 | 1122 | 5.0 | 0.594 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.8 |
| 3 | R2 | 37 | 5.7 | 37 | 5.7 | 0.114 | 16.1 | LOS B | 0.4 | 2.8 | 0.83 | 0.93 | 39.5 |
| Appro | ach | 1159 | 5.0 | 1159 | 5.0 | 0.594 | 0.5 | NA | 0.4 | 2.8 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 58.8 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 197 | 3.7 | 197 | 3.7 | 0.867 | 37.7 | LOS C | 3.6 | 26.1 | 0.86 | 1.24 | 33.0 |
| 6 | R2 | 63 | 1.7 | 63 | 1.7 | 0.402 | 36.5 | LOS C | 1.4 | 10.0 | 0.92 | 1.01 | 41.7 |
| Appro |  | 260 | 3.2 | 260 | 3.2 | 0.867 | 37.4 | LOS C | 3.6 | 26.1 | 0.88 | 1.18 | 35.9 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 84 | 3.8 | 84 | 3.8 | 0.967 | 8.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 52.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 1018 | 4.4 | 1018 | 4.4 | 0.967 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 53.4 |
| Approach |  | 1102 | 4.4 | 1102 | 4.4 | 0.967 | 3.8 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 53.3 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2521 | 4.6 | 2521 | 4.6 | 0.967 | 5.8 | NA | 3.6 | 26.1 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 52.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 3.4 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

7 Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Sat (noon)]

Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 3.4 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 3.4 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Back Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective <br> Stop Rate per ped |
|  | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 8.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 28.1 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 18.1 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Sat (noon)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.217 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.5 |
| 5 | T1 | 1249 | 2.2 | 0.217 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| Appr |  | 1251 | 2.2 | 0.217 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 938 | 2.1 | 0.122 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| 12b | R3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.013 | 10.9 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.70 | 0.85 | 44.9 |
| 12u | U | 3 | 0.0 | 0.013 | 17.1 | LOS B | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.70 | 0.85 | 48.3 |
| Appr |  | 942 | 2.1 | 0.122 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 8.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.42 | 0.56 | 55.3 |
| 32a | R1 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.43 | 0.54 | 58.1 |
| Approach |  | 2 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 7.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.42 | 0.55 | 56.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2195 | 2.2 | 0.217 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: GTA CONSULTANTS | Processed: Monday, 15 January 2018 3:22:34 PM
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (PM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles $\qquad$ | f Queue Distance $\qquad$ m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 12 | 0.0 | 0.499 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 70.4 |
| 5 | T1 | 2815 | 4.8 | 0.499 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| Appro |  | 2827 | 4.8 | 0.499 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1288 | 4.6 | 0.170 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.049 | 16.9 | LOS B | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 38.6 |
| 12u | U | 4 | 0.0 | 0.049 | 36.8 | LOS C | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 43.1 |
| Appro | ch | 1296 | 4.6 | 0.170 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 79.5 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.006 | 8.7 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 54.3 |
| 32a | R1 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 9.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.71 | 0.76 | 54.2 |
| Approach |  | 14 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 8.9 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.64 | 0.62 | 54.3 |
| All Vehicles |  | 4138 | 4.7 | 0.499 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
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Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | lows <br> HV \% | Arriva Total veh/h | lows HV $\%$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Queue Vehicles Distance veh |  | Prop. Queued |  |  |
| South: Prospect Highway mil 0 der |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 1178 | 5.0 | 1178 | 5.0 | 0.624 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.7 |
| 3 | R2 | 50 | 4.4 | 50 | 4.4 | 0.178 | 18.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.3 | 0.87 | 0.95 | 37.9 |
| Appro |  | 1228 | 5.0 | 1228 | 5.0 | 0.624 | 0.8 | NA | 0.6 | 4.3 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 58.4 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 212 | 3.6 | 212 | 3.6 | 1.234 | 248.3 | LOS F | 28.8 | 207.9 | 1.00 | 3.34 | 6.9 |
| 6 | R2 | 76 | 1.4 | 76 | 1.4 | 0.590 | 51.0 | LOS D | 2.2 | 15.6 | 0.95 | 1.05 | 35.7 |
| Appro |  | 288 | 3.1 | 288 | 3.1 | 1.234 | 196.1 | LOS F | 28.8 | 207.9 | 0.99 | 2.73 | 10.3 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 93 | 3.6 | 93 | 3.6 | 0.615 | 5.7 | LOS A | 8.6 | 62.5 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 57.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 1069 | 4.4 | 1069 | 4.4 | 0.615 | 0.1 | LOS A | 8.6 | 62.5 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 58.9 |
| Appro |  | 1162 | 4.4 | 1162 | 4.4 | 0.615 | 0.6 | NA | 8.6 | 62.5 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 58.7 |
| All Ve | icles | 2678 | 4.5 | 2678 | 4.5 | 1.234 | 21.7 | NA | 28.8 | 207.9 | 0.12 | 0.33 | 37.6 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 30.2 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

[^7]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Sat (noon)]

Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 30.2 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Sat (noon)]

寓官 Network: N101 [Saturday
Network 2028 + Dev ]

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | OD <br> Mov | Demand Total veh/h | ows <br> HV \% | Arrival F Total veh/h | ows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance <br> m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | erage peed <br> km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 145 | 5.3 | 145 | 5.3 | 0.303 | 34.4 | LOS C | 5.1 | 37.6 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 38.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 358 | 4.9 | 358 | 4.9 | 0.592 | 30.7 | LOS C | 11.6 | 84.6 | 0.90 | 0.75 | 30.0 |
| Appro | ach | 503 | 5.1 | 503 | 5.1 | 0.592 | 31.7 | LOS C | 11.6 | 84.6 | 0.89 | 0.76 | 33.2 |
| East: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 96 | 4.6 | 96 | 4.6 | 0.088 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.5 | 0.23 | 0.61 | 53.1 |
| 5 | T1 | 6 | 0.0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.614 | 34.0 | LOS C | 10.3 | 75.4 | 0.95 | 0.83 | 36.4 |
| 6 | R2 | 508 | 5.0 | 508 | 5.0 | 0.614 | 39.6 | LOS C | 10.3 | 75.4 | 0.95 | 0.83 | 26.3 |
| Approach |  | 610 | 4.9 | 610 | 4.9 | 0.614 | 34.4 | LOS C | 10.3 | 75.4 | 0.83 | 0.79 | 30.6 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 313 | 4.9 | 311 | 5.0 | 0.260 | 7.7 | LOS A | 5.9 | 43.1 | 0.47 | 0.41 | 51.5 |
| 9 | R2 | 505 | 5.0 | 502 | 5.0 | 0.600 | 23.2 | LOS B | 5.4 | 39.7 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 39.0 |
| Appro | ach | 818 | 5.0 | $813^{\mathrm{N1}}$ | 5.0 | 0.600 | 17.3 | LOS B | 5.9 | 43.1 | 0.76 | 0.66 | 43.0 |
| All Ve | hicles | 1931 | 5.0 | $1926{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.0 | 0.614 | 26.5 | LOS B | 11.6 | 84.6 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 36.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 30.2 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 8.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 28.1 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 18.1 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Sat (noon)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 19 | 0.0 | 0.231 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 70.0 |
| 5 | T1 | 1312 | 2.2 | 0.231 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.8 |
| Appro |  | 1331 | 2.2 | 0.231 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 985 | 2.1 | 0.128 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| 12b | R3 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.028 | 12.2 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.67 | 0.87 | 49.6 |
| 12u | U | 3 | 0.0 | 0.028 | 19.0 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.67 | 0.87 | 51.9 |
| Appro |  | 997 | 2.1 | 0.128 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 79.5 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 18 | 0.0 | 0.020 | 8.3 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.43 | 0.63 | 55.1 |
| 32a | R1 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.45 | 0.62 | 57.9 |
| Approach |  | 27 | 0.0 | 0.020 | 7.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 56.0 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2354 | 2.1 | 0.231 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 79.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Flows |  | Arrival Flows |  | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Queue Vehicles Distance |  | Prop. Queued | Effective Average Stop Speed |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | HV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  | m |  | Rate | km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | T1 | 1635 | 9.3 | 1634 | 9.3 | 0.889 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 58.7 |
| 3 | R2 | 78 | 4.2 | 78 | 4.2 | 0.129 | 10.5 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.5 | 0.69 | 0.87 | 44.2 |
| Appr |  | 1713 | 9.0 | 1713 | 9.0 | 0.889 | 0.6 | NA | 0.5 | 3.5 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 57.8 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 307 | 6.8 | 307 | 6.8 | 1.054 | 94.1 | LOS F | 17.8 | 132.2 | 1.00 | 2.44 | 16.4 |
| 6 | R2 | 34 | 22.6 | 34 | 22.6 | 0.157 | 24.0 | LOS B | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.82 | 0.94 | 48.2 |
| Appr |  | 342 | 8.4 | 342 | 8.4 | 1.054 | 87.0 | LOS F | 17.8 | 132.2 | 0.98 | 2.29 | 18.7 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 27 | 20.8 | 27 | 20.8 | 0.446 | 5.8 | LOS A | 45.1 | 351.7 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 57.1 |
| 8 | T1 | 773 | 13.2 | 773 | 13.2 | 0.446 | 0.1 | LOS A | 45.1 | 351.7 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 59.5 |
| Approach |  | 799 | 13.4 | 799 | 13.4 | 0.446 | 0.3 | NA | 45.1 | 351.7 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 59.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2854 | 10.2 | $2853{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 10.2 | 1.054 | 10.9 | NA | 45.1 | 351.7 | 0.14 | 0.30 | 46.6 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 15.6 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Tue (AM)]
审官 Network: N101 [AM
Network 2028 + Dev ]

Roundabout


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 15.6 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Tues (AM)]

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 15.6 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 11.3 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 22.8 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 17.0 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (AM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 14 | 0.0 | 0.277 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 70.1 |
| 5 | T1 | 1518 | 8.5 | 0.277 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.8 |
| Appro |  | 1532 | 8.4 | 0.277 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1828 | 4.4 | 0.241 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.026 | 13.9 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 47.5 |
| 12u | U | 2 | 0.0 | 0.026 | 24.4 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 50.3 |
| Appro | ch | 1837 | 4.4 | 0.241 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.007 | 8.8 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.47 | 0.63 | 54.5 |
| 32a | R1 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.003 | 6.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 57.5 |
| Approach |  | 9 | 0.0 | 0.007 | 7.9 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.49 | 0.63 | 55.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3378 | 6.2 | 0.277 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 1 [Prospect Highway / Ponds Road - Tue (PM)]

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Mov } & \text { OD } \\ \text { ID } & \text { Mov } \end{array}$ | Demand Total veh/h | Flows HV \% | Arrival Total <br> veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Verage speed km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 T1 | 1692 | 5.2 | 1690 | 5.2 | 0.896 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 58.6 |
| 3 R 2 | 78 | 7.0 | 78 | 7.1 | 0.124 | 10.1 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.5 | 0.67 | 0.86 | 44.4 |
| Approach | 1771 | 5.3 | $1768{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.3 | 0.896 | 0.6 | NA | 0.5 | 3.5 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 57.8 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 354 | 10.0 | 354 | 10.0 | 1.106 | 129.4 | LOS F | 28.4 | 215.5 | 1.00 | 3.10 | 12.5 |
| 6 R2 | 51 | 2.2 | 51 | 2.2 | 0.160 | 18.0 | LOS B | 0.5 | 3.9 | 0.76 | 0.92 | 52.9 |
| Approach | 405 | 9.0 | 405 | 9.0 | 1.106 | 115.4 | LOS F | 28.4 | 215.5 | 0.97 | 2.83 | 15.0 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 61 | 5.5 | 61 | 5.5 | 0.427 | 5.7 | LOS A | 75.9 | 588.6 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 57.5 |
| 8 T1 | 705 | 13.2 | 705 | 13.2 | 0.427 | 0.1 | LOS A | 75.9 | 588.6 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 59.0 |
| Approach | 766 | 12.6 | 766 | 12.6 | 0.427 | 0.5 | NA | 75.9 | 588.6 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 58.8 |
| All Vehicles | 2941 | 7.7 | $2938{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 7.7 | 1.106 | 16.4 | NA | 75.9 | 588.6 | 0.15 | 0.42 | 41.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 22.5 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

8 Site: 2 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway
Eastbound - Tue (PM)]

Network 2028 + Dev ]

Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{array}$ | Arrival Total veh/h | Fows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles <br> veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | verage peed km/h |
| SouthEast: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23a | R1 | 1141 | 4.9 | 1141 | 4.9 | 0.486 | 7.8 | LOS A | 3.8 | 27.7 | 0.10 | 0.60 | 41.1 |
| 23b | R3 | 339 | 4.9 | 339 | 4.9 | 0.486 | 9.9 | LOS A | 3.8 | 27.7 | 0.10 | 0.63 | 51.1 |
| 23u | U | 203 | 0.0 | 203 | 0.0 | 0.486 | 10.9 | LOS A | 3.8 | 27.7 | 0.10 | 0.63 | 39.9 |
| Appro |  | 1683 | 4.3 | 1683 | 4.3 | 0.486 | 8.6 | LOS A | 3.8 | 28.0 | 0.10 | 0.61 | 44.5 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 180 | 11.7 | 180 | 11.7 | 1.145 | 184.1 | LOS F | 25.9 | 198.8 | 1.00 | 3.96 | 9.8 |
| 7 a | L1 | 848 | 11.7 | 848 | 11.7 | 1.145 | 184.0 | LOS F | 25.9 | 198.8 | 1.00 | 3.96 | 2.0 |
| 9 u | U | 21 | 0.0 | 21 | 0.0 | 1.145 | 190.7 | LOS F | 25.9 | 198.8 | 1.00 | 3.96 | 2.0 |
| Appro |  | 1049 | 11.5 | 1049 | 11.5 | 1.145 | 184.1 | LOS F | 25.9 | 198.8 | 1.00 | 3.96 | 3.5 |
| SouthWest: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30a | L1 | 609 | 6.0 | 609 | 6.0 | 0.589 | 23.1 | LOS B | 8.3 | 61.4 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 44.6 |
| 32a | R1 | 14 | 0.0 | 14 | 0.0 | 0.589 | 26.8 | LOS B | 8.0 | 67.1 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 49.5 |
| 32 | R2 | 227 | 37.1 | 227 | 37.1 | 0.589 | 30.4 | LOS C | 8.0 | 67.1 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 42.4 |
| Approach |  | 850 | 14.2 | 850 | 14.2 | 0.589 | 25.1 | LOS B | 8.3 | 67.1 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 44.1 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3582 | 8.8 | 3582 | 8.8 | 1.145 | 63.9 | LOS E | 25.9 | 198.8 | 0.58 | 1.68 | 16.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 22.5 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Tues (PM)]

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time $=90$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov OD ID Mov | Demand Total veh/h | lows <br> HV <br> \% | Arrival Total veh/h | ows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance <br> m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed <br> km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 392 | 5.1 | 392 | 5.1 | 0.532 | 27.2 | LOS B | 13.0 | 95.2 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 41.1 |
| 2 T1 | 880 | 5.0 | 880 | 5.0 | 0.944 | 46.4 | LOS D | 43.1 | 314.5 | 0.95 | 1.10 | 23.9 |
| Approach | 1272 | 5.0 | 1272 | 5.0 | 0.944 | 40.5 | LOS C | 43.1 | 314.5 | 0.90 | 1.01 | 29.8 |
| East: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 203 | 4.9 | 203 | 4.9 | 0.167 | 6.4 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.8 | 0.19 | 0.60 | 53.4 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 6 | 0.0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.940 | 61.2 | LOS E | 16.1 | 117.4 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 28.7 |
| 6 R2 | 557 | 5.0 | 557 | 5.0 | 0.940 | 66.8 | LOS E | 16.1 | 117.4 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 19.0 |
| Approach | 766 | 4.9 | 766 | 4.9 | 0.940 | 50.7 | LOS D | 16.1 | 117.4 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 26.1 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 T1 | 166 | 4.7 | 152 | 4.8 | 0.114 | 4.6 | LOS A | 2.1 | 15.5 | 0.35 | 0.29 | 54.6 |
| 9 R2 | 584 | 4.9 | 533 | 5.0 | 0.956 | 54.6 | LOS D | 11.7 | 85.6 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 27.2 |
| Approach | 749 | 4.9 | $685{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.0 | 0.956 | 43.5 | LOS D | 11.7 | 85.6 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 30.6 |
| All Vehicles | 2787 | 5.0 | $2723{ }^{\text {N1 }}$ | 5.1 | 0.956 | 44.1 | LOS D | 43.1 | 314.5 | 0.86 | 0.97 | 28.9 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 22.5 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

N1 Arrival Flow value is reduced due to capacity constraint at oversaturated upstream lanes.

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 14.5 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 18.7 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 16.6 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 2v [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Eastbound - Tue (AM) - Upgrade - 1.2]

审官 Network: N101 [AM Network 2028 + Dev Upgrade

Signals - Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time = 90 seconds (Network Cycle Time - User-Given)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | Flows HV \% | Arrival Total veh/h | =lows HV \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles <br> veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | verage Speed <br> km/h |
| SouthEast: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23a | R1 | 1194 | 10.7 | 1194 | 10.7 | 0.559 | 16.0 | LOS B | 14.2 | 108.3 | 0.58 | 0.74 | 28.9 |
| 23b | R3 | 245 | 40.3 | 245 | 40.3 | 0.674 | 52.4 | LOS D | 7.2 | 67.5 | 1.00 | 0.82 | 26.4 |
| Appr | ach | 1439 | 15.7 | 1439 | 15.7 | 0.674 | 22.2 | LOS B | 14.2 | 108.3 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 27.9 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 327 | 11.9 | 327 | 11.9 | 0.268 | 7.4 | LOS A | 3.3 | 25.4 | 0.33 | 0.65 | 48.1 |
| 7a | L1 | 856 | 11.2 | 856 | 11.2 | 0.679 | 30.7 | LOS C | 16.1 | 123.7 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 9.6 |
| Appr | ach | 1183 | 11.4 | 1183 | 11.4 | 0.679 | 24.2 | LOS B | 16.1 | 123.7 | 0.75 | 0.78 | 21.9 |
| West: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 705 | 5.1 | 705 | 5.1 | 0.877 | 53.2 | LOS D | 17.3 | 126.5 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 26.2 |
| 11 | T1 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.294 | 32.8 | LOS C | 4.6 | 38.3 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 43.4 |
| 12a | R1 | 257 | 22.5 | 257 | 22.5 | 0.294 | 36.3 | LOS C | 4.6 | 38.3 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 34.1 |
| Approach |  | 964 | 9.7 | 964 | 9.7 | 0.877 | 48.6 | LOS D | 17.3 | 126.5 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 28.0 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3586 | 12.7 | 3586 | 12.7 | 0.877 | 30.0 | LOS C | 17.3 | 126.5 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 26.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 2.8 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Back Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 9.4 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| P4S | West Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 8.9 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 9.1 | LOS A |  |  | 0.45 | 0.45 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

日 Site： 3 ［Prospect Highway／M4 Western Motorway Westbound－Tues（AM）－upgrade－1．2］

审官 Network：N101［AM Network 2028 ＋Dev Upgrade

Signals－Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time＝ 90 seconds（Network Cycle Time－User－Given）

| Movement Performance－Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh／h | Flows HV \％ | Arrival Total <br> veh／h | Flows HV \％ | Deg． <br> Satn <br> v／c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\％Back Vehicles <br> veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | verage peed <br> km／h |
| South：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 258 | 16.0 | 258 | 16.0 | 0.536 | 35.3 | LOS C | 9.7 | 77.3 | 0.89 | 0.81 | 37.5 |
| 2 | T1 | 785 | 15.8 | 785 | 15.8 | 0.768 | 34.6 | LOS C | 16.9 | 134.3 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 28.3 |
| Appro |  | 1043 | 15.8 | 1043 | 15.8 | 0.768 | 34.8 | LOS C | 16.9 | 134.3 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 31.3 |
| East：M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 459 | 15.9 | 459 | 15.9 | 0.515 | 8.0 | LOS A | 6.4 | 51.0 | 0.43 | 0.70 | 51.9 |
| 5 | T1 | 8 | 14.3 | 8 | 14.3 | 0.791 | 35.5 | LOS C | 17.5 | 139.5 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 35.9 |
| 6 | R2 | 784 | 15.9 | 784 | 15.9 | 0.791 | 41.3 | LOS C | 17.5 | 139.5 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 25.9 |
| Appro |  | 1251 | 15.9 | 1251 | 15.9 | 0.791 | 29.0 | LOS C | 17.5 | 139.5 | 0.78 | 0.83 | 35.4 |
| North：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 713 | 15.0 | 713 | 15.0 | 0.354 | 6.8 | LOS A | 4.9 | 38.7 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 52.0 |
| 9 | R2 | 545 | 16.0 | 545 | 16.0 | 0.774 | 45.3 | LOS D | 12.0 | 95.3 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 28.8 |
| Approach |  | 1258 | 15.5 | 1258 | 15.5 | 0.774 | 23.5 | LOS B | 12.0 | 95.3 | 0.62 | 0.55 | 38.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3552 | 15.7 | 3552 | 15.7 | 0.791 | 28.8 | LOS C | 17.5 | 139.5 | 0.77 | 0.75 | 35.3 |

Site Level of Service（LOS）Method：Delay（RTA NSW）．Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog（Network tab）． Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement．
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements．
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used．Control Delay includes Geometric Delay．
Gap－Acceptance Capacity：SIDRA Standard（Akçelik M3D）．
HV（\％）values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation．
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations： 2.8 \％
Number of Iterations： 10 （maximum specified：10）

| Movement Performance－Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped／h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Back Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance $\qquad$ | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip／Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 8.9 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 26.5 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 17.7 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service（LOS）Method：SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method（Based on Average Delay）
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement．
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements．

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Mov OD } \\ \text { ID } & \text { Mov } \end{array}$ | Demand Total veh/h | Flows HV $\%$ | Arrival Total veh/h | Flows HV $\%$ | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Queue Vehicles Distance |  | Prop. Queued | Effective Average Stop Speed Rate |  |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 T1 | 1876 | 8.8 | 1876 | 8.8 | 0.509 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.8 |
| Approach | 1876 | 8.8 | 1876 | 8.8 | 0.509 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.8 |
| East: Ponds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 329 | 6.7 | 329 | 6.7 | 0.312 | 12.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.4 | 0.57 | 0.84 | 60.1 |
| Approach | 329 | 6.7 | 329 | 6.7 | 0.312 | 12.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.4 | 0.57 | 0.84 | 60.1 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 28 | 22.2 | 28 | 22.2 | 0.017 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 54.2 |
| 8 T1 | 860 | 12.7 | 860 | 12.7 | 0.219 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.9 |
| Approach | 888 | 13.0 | 888 | 13.0 | 0.219 | 0.2 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 59.5 |
| All Vehicles | 3094 | 9.8 | 3094 | 9.8 | 0.509 | 1.4 | NA | 1.4 | 10.4 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 59.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 2.8 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

[^8]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (AM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 14 | 0.0 | 0.290 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 70.2 |
| 5 | T1 | 1594 | 8.2 | 0.290 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.8 |
| Appro |  | 1607 | 8.1 | 0.290 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1961 | 4.4 | 0.259 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.024 | 14.6 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 48.6 |
| 12u | U | 1 | 0.0 | 0.024 | 26.6 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 51.1 |
| Appro | ch | 1969 | 4.4 | 0.259 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.007 | 9.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.48 | 0.63 | 54.3 |
| 32a | R1 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.003 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.55 | 0.64 | 57.3 |
| Approach |  | 8 | 0.0 | 0.007 | 8.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.51 | 0.64 | 55.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3585 | 6.0 | 0.290 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

审官 Network: N101 [PM Network 2028 + Dev Upgrade

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 3.2 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

日 Site：2v［Prospect Highway／M4 Western Motorway Eastbound－Tue（PM）－Upgrade－1．2］

审官 Network：N101［PM Network 2028 ＋Dev Upgrade

Signals－Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time＝ 90 seconds（Network Cycle Time－User－Given）

| Movement Performance－Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | OD Mov | Demand Total veh／h | Flows HV \％ | Arrival <br> Total <br> veh／h | Flows <br> HV <br> \％ | Deg． Satn <br> v／c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\％Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed $\qquad$ km／h |
| SouthEast：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23a | R1 | 1464 | 4.1 | 1464 | 4.1 | 0.622 | 11.4 | LOS A | 13.1 | 94.8 | 0.44 | 0.68 | 33.9 |
| 23b | R3 | 364 | 4.9 | 364 | 4.9 | 0.819 | 51.9 | LOS D | 10.8 | 79.0 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 27.0 |
| Approad | ach | 1828 | 4.3 | 1828 | 4.3 | 0.819 | 19.5 | LOS B | 13.1 | 94.8 | 0.55 | 0.72 | 30.5 |
| North：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 194 | 11.4 | 194 | 11.4 | 0.163 | 7.9 | LOS A | 2.1 | 15.9 | 0.33 | 0.64 | 47.6 |
| 7a | L1 | 1149 | 9.2 | 1149 | 9.2 | 0.823 | 35.6 | LOS C | 17.3 | 130.6 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 8.4 |
| Approad | ach | 1343 | 9.6 | 1343 | 9.6 | 0.823 | 31.6 | LOS C | 17.3 | 130.6 | 0.87 | 0.89 | 14.6 |
| West：M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 654 | 6.0 | 654 | 6.0 | 0.898 | 58.3 | LOS E | 16.9 | 124.6 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 24.5 |
| 11 | T1 | 16 | 0.0 | 16 | 0.0 | 0.361 | 35.9 | LOS C | 4.9 | 44.3 | 0.88 | 0.79 | 42.0 |
| 12a | R1 | 243 | 37.2 | 243 | 37.2 | 0.361 | 39.8 | LOS C | 4.9 | 44.3 | 0.88 | 0.79 | 32.4 |
| Approach |  | 913 | 14.2 | 913 | 14.2 | 0.898 | 53.0 | LOS D | 16.9 | 124.6 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 26.5 |
| All Vehicles |  | 4084 | 8.2 | 4084 | 8.2 | 0.898 | 31.0 | LOS C | 17.3 | 130.6 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 24.6 |

Site Level of Service（LOS）Method：Delay（RTA NSW）．Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog（Network tab）． Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement．
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements．
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used．Control Delay includes Geometric Delay．
Gap－Acceptance Capacity：SIDRA Standard（Akçelik M3D）．
HV（\％）values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation．
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations： 3.2 \％
Number of Iterations： 10 （maximum specified：10）

| Movement Performance－Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped／h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | Queue Distance $\qquad$ | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 8.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| P4S | West Slip／Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 7.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 7.8 | LOS A |  |  | 0.42 | 0.42 |

Level of Service（LOS）Method：SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method（Based on Average Delay）
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement．
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements．

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Tues (PM) - upgrade - 1.2]

审官 Network: N101 [PM Network 2028 + Dev Upgrade

Signals - Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time = 90 seconds (Network Cycle Time - User-Given)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | lows <br> HV <br> \% | Arrival Total veh/h | lows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | verage Speed km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 421 | 5.0 | 421 | 5.0 | 0.640 | 31.3 | LOS C | 15.4 | 112.7 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 39.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 966 | 4.9 | 966 | 4.9 | 0.697 | 26.3 | LOS B | 18.2 | 132.6 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 32.4 |
| Appro |  | 1387 | 4.9 | 1387 | 4.9 | 0.697 | 27.8 | LOS B | 18.2 | 132.6 | 0.90 | 0.81 | 35.3 |
| East: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 218 | 4.8 | 218 | 4.8 | 0.203 | 6.3 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.8 | 0.18 | 0.60 | 53.4 |
| 5 | T1 | 5 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.889 | 50.6 | LOS D | 15.6 | 113.9 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 31.3 |
| 6 | R2 | 598 | 4.9 | 598 | 4.9 | 0.889 | 56.2 | LOS D | 15.6 | 113.9 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 21.4 |
| Appro |  | 821 | 4.9 | 821 | 4.9 | 0.889 | 42.9 | LOS D | 15.6 | 113.9 | 0.78 | 0.90 | 28.6 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 418 | 2.0 | 418 | 2.0 | 0.160 | 2.3 | LOS A | 1.2 | 8.9 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 57.1 |
| 9 | R2 | 626 | 5.0 | 626 | 5.0 | 0.715 | 40.8 | LOS C | 13.2 | 96.3 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 30.4 |
| Approach |  | 1044 | 3.8 | 1044 | 3.8 | 0.715 | 25.4 | LOS B | 13.2 | 96.3 | 0.64 | 0.57 | 37.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 3253 | 4.6 | 3253 | 4.6 | 0.889 | 30.8 | LOS C | 18.2 | 132.6 | 0.79 | 0.76 | 34.0 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 3.2 \%
Number of Iterations: 10 (maximum specified: 10)

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Back Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 12.3 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 21.4 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 16.9 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Tue (PM)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \text { \% } \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 12 | 0.0 | 0.526 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 70.4 |
| 5 | T1 | 2971 | 4.8 | 0.526 | 0.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| Appr |  | 2982 | 4.8 | 0.526 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1382 | 4.6 | 0.183 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 12b | R3 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.023 | 18.5 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 42.4 |
| 12u | U | 1 | 0.0 | 0.023 | 41.9 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 46.3 |
| Appr |  | 1387 | 4.6 | 0.183 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.7 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.006 | 8.9 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.64 | 0.57 | 54.2 |
| 32a | R1 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 10.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 53.5 |
| Approach |  | 14 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 9.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.67 | 0.63 | 54.0 |
| All Vehicles |  | 4383 | 4.7 | 0.526 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.6 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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日 Site：2v［Prospect Highway／M4 Western Motorway Eastbound－Sat（noon）－Upgrade－1．2］

审官 Network：N101［Sat Network 2028 ＋Dev Upgrade

Signals－Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time＝ 90 seconds（Network Cycle Time－User－Given）

| Movement Performance－Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Flows |  | Arrival Flows |  | Deg． Satn | Average Delay | Level of Service | 95\％Back of Queue Vehicles Distance |  | Prop． Queued | Effective Average |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | HV |  |  |  |  |  | Stop | peed |
|  |  | veh／h | \％ | veh／h | \％ | v／c | sec |  | veh | m |  |  | per veh | km／h |
| SouthEast：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23a | R1 | 1099 | 3.3 | 1099 | 3.3 | 0.401 | 8.8 | LOS A | 7.3 | 52.4 | 0.33 | 0.63 | 37.6 |
| 23b | R3 | 158 | 11.3 | 158 | 11.3 | 0.454 | 50.9 | LOS D | 4.5 | 34.6 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 27.2 |
| Appr | ach | 1257 | 4.3 | 1257 | 4.3 | 0.454 | 14.1 | LOS A | 7.3 | 52.4 | 0.41 | 0.65 | 33.7 |
| North：Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 539 | 3.3 | 539 | 3.3 | 0.379 | 6.6 | LOS A | 4.4 | 31.8 | 0.30 | 0.64 | 49.4 |
| 7 a | L1 | 902 | 3.9 | 902 | 3.9 | 0.464 | 18.4 | LOS B | 12.4 | 89.8 | 0.68 | 0.75 | 14.4 |
| Appr | ach | 1441 | 3.7 | 1441 | 3.7 | 0.464 | 14.0 | LOS A | 12.4 | 89.8 | 0.53 | 0.71 | 32.6 |
| West：M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 437 | 6.0 | 437 | 6.0 | 0.920 | 66.3 | LOS E | 11.9 | 87.5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 22.2 |
| 11 | T1 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.226 | 43.0 | LOS D | 2.1 | 16.9 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 38.7 |
| 12a | R1 | 100 | 18.9 | 100 | 18.9 | 0.226 | 46.5 | LOS D | 2.1 | 16.9 | 0.93 | 0.75 | 28.7 |
| Approach |  | 539 | 8.4 | 539 | 8.4 | 0.920 | 62.5 | LOS E | 11.9 | 87.5 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 23.2 |
| All V | hicles | 3237 | 4.7 | 3237 | 4.7 | 0.920 | 22.1 | LOS B | 12.4 | 89.8 | 0.56 | 0.73 | 29.8 |

Site Level of Service（LOS）Method：Delay（RTA NSW）．Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog（Network tab）． Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement．
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements．
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used．Control Delay includes Geometric Delay．
Gap－Acceptance Capacity：SIDRA Standard（Akçelik M3D）．
HV（\％）values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation．
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations： 1.0 \％
Number of Iterations： 6 （maximum specified：10）

| Movement Performance－Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Description | Demand Flow ped／h | Average Delay sec $\qquad$ | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance $\qquad$ | Prop． Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| P4S | West Slip／Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 4.4 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 4.5 | LOS A |  |  | 0.32 | 0.32 |

Level of Service（LOS）Method：SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method（Based on Average Delay）
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement．
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements．

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

B Site: 3 [Prospect Highway / M4 Western Motorway Westbound - Sat (noon) - upgrade - 1.2]

审官 Network: N101 [Sat Network 2028 + Dev Upgrade

Signals - Fixed Time Coordinated Cycle Time = 90 seconds (Network Cycle Time - User-Given)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Flows |  | Arrival Flows |  | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Queue Vehicles Distance |  | Prop. Queued | Effective Average Stop Speed Rate |  |
|  |  | Total | HV | Total | HV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | veh/h | \% | veh/h | \% |  |  |  | veh | m |  | per veh | km/h |
| South: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 155 | 4.8 | 155 | 4.8 | 0.310 | 33.6 | LOS C | 5.4 | 39.6 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 38.4 |
| 2 | T1 | 449 | 4.2 | 449 | 4.2 | 0.426 | 29.0 | LOS C | 8.2 | 59.3 | 0.87 | 0.72 | 30.9 |
| Appro |  | 604 | 4.4 | 604 | 4.4 | 0.426 | 30.2 | LOS C | 8.2 | 59.3 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 33.6 |
| East: M4 Western Motorway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 103 | 5.1 | 103 | 5.1 | 0.101 | 6.2 | LOS A | 0.4 | 2.8 | 0.17 | 0.59 | 53.5 |
| 5 | T1 | 5 | 0.0 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.920 | 56.7 | LOS E | 15.1 | 110.0 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 29.7 |
| 6 | R2 | 545 | 5.0 | 545 | 5.0 | 0.920 | 62.3 | LOSE | 15.1 | 110.0 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 20.0 |
| Appro |  | 654 | 5.0 | 654 | 5.0 | 0.920 | 53.4 | LOS D | 15.1 | 110.0 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 24.2 |
| North: Prospect Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 465 | 3.6 | 465 | 3.6 | 0.174 | 1.4 | LOS A | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 58.1 |
| 9 | R2 | 542 | 5.0 | 542 | 5.0 | 0.425 | 29.4 | LOS C | 9.1 | 66.4 | 0.81 | 0.80 | 35.0 |
| Approach |  | 1007 | 4.4 | 1007 | 4.4 | 0.425 | 16.5 | LOS B | 9.1 | 66.4 | 0.48 | 0.47 | 42.9 |
| All Ve | icles | 2265 | 4.6 | 2265 | 4.6 | 0.920 | 30.8 | LOS C | 15.1 | 110.0 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 33.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 1.0 \%
Number of Iterations: 6 (maximum specified: 10)

| Movement Performance - Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Description | Demand Flow ped/h | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | Average Bac Pedestrian ped | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per ped |
| P1S | South Slip/Bypass Lane Crossing | 53 | 8.5 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| P4 | West Full Crossing | 53 | 27.3 | LOS C | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.78 | 0.78 |
| All Pedestrians |  | 105 | 17.9 | LOS B |  |  | 0.61 | 0.61 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: SIDRA Pedestrian LOS Method (Based on Average Delay)
Pedestrian movement LOS values are based on average delay per pedestrian movement.
Intersection LOS value for Pedestrians is based on average delay for all pedestrian movements.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 1 [Prospect Highway / Ponds Road - Sat (noon) -
upgrade - 1.2]
审官 Network: N101 [Sat Network 2028 + Dev Upgrade

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)


Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Network Data dialog (Network tab).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
Largest change in Average Back of Queue or Degree of Saturation for any lane during the last three iterations: 1.0 \%
Number of Iterations: 6 (maximum specified: 10)

[^10]
## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: 4 [Great Western Highway / Tarlington Place - Sat (noon)]
Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OD } \\ & \text { Mov } \end{aligned}$ | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate per veh | Average Speed km/h |
| East: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a | L1 | 18 | 0.0 | 0.235 | 6.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 70.0 |
| 5 | T1 | 1337 | 2.2 | 0.235 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.8 |
| Appro |  | 1355 | 2.2 | 0.235 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 79.7 |
| West: Great Western Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 1056 | 2.1 | 0.137 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| 12b | R3 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.019 | 12.5 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.65 | 0.84 | 51.5 |
| 12u | U | 1 | 0.0 | 0.019 | 19.6 | LOS B | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.65 | 0.84 | 53.2 |
| Appro | ch | 1065 | 2.1 | 0.137 | 0.1 | NA | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 79.7 |
| SouthWest: Tarlington Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30b | L3 | 17 | 0.0 | 0.019 | 8.4 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.43 | 0.64 | 55.0 |
| 32a | R1 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.008 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.46 | 0.62 | 57.9 |
| Approach |  | 25 | 0.0 | 0.019 | 7.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 55.9 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2445 | 2.1 | 0.235 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 79.4 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.
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[^0]:    1 Program used under license from Akcelik \& Associates Pty Ltd.

[^1]:    2 Prospect Highway Upgrade Reservoir Road to St Martins Crescent Traffic and Transport Assessment- Contract Number: 13.2592.1599, prepared for NSW RMS, SMEC Australia, dated 11 April 2014

[^2]:    Source: MR644 - Prospect Highway from Reservoir Road to Prospect Highway Upgrade 200m North of St Martins Crescent, 100\%
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