

# traffic & parking assessment;

### Planning Proposal for Prospect South Lands

For Office of Strategic Lands 15 March 2018 parking; traffic; civil design; communication; **ptC.** 

### **Document Control**

Planning Proposal for Prospect South Lands, Traffic & parking assessment

| Issue | Date       | Issue Details               | Author | Reviewed |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|--------|----------|
| 1     | 29/11/2017 | Draft Issue                 | HL     | AU       |
| 2     | 20/02/2018 | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Issue | HL     | AU       |
| 3     | 15/03/2018 | Final Issue                 | HL     | AU       |
| 4     | 15/03/2018 | Final Issue (Revised)       | HL     | AU       |

### Contact

Abdullah Uddin

+61 2 8920 0800 +61 425 478 650 Abdullah.uddin@ptcconsultants.co

COMMERCIAL IN CONFIDENCE

The information contained in this document, including any intellectual property rights arising from designs developed and documents created, is confidential and proprietary to **ptc.** 

This document may only be used by the person/organisation to whom it is addressed for the stated purpose for which it is provided and must not be imparted to or reproduced, in whole or in part, by any third person without the prior written approval of a **ptc.** authorised representative. **ptc.** reserves all legal rights and remedies in relation to any infringement of its rights in respect of its intellectual property and/or confidential information.

© 2017

**ptc.** Suite 102, 506 Miller Street Cammeray NSW 2062 info@ptcconsultants.co t + 61 2 8920 0800 ptcconsultants.co

| 1.<br>2.                            | Executive<br>Introducti  |  | 1<br>2   |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2.1<br>2.2                          | Project S<br>Purpose   | ummary<br>of this Report   | 2<br>3   |
| 3.                                  | Proposal   |  | 4  |
| 3.1<br>3.2<br>3.3<br>3.3.7<br>3.3.2 | l Prospect   |  | 4<br>5<br>6<br>7                                   |
| 4.                                  | Existing T   | ransport Facilities  | 9  |
| 4.1<br>4.2<br>4.3<br>4.3.7<br>4.4   | Public Tra   | ouble Truck Routes<br>ansport<br>ces   | 9<br>12<br>12<br>12<br>12<br>13                    |
| 5.                                  | Traffic Im   | pact Assessment  | 15   |
|                                     | Existing T<br>Proposed<br>Traffic Me<br>Traffic Di<br>SIDRA Ca<br>Prospect<br>Prospect | stribution   | 15<br>16<br>16<br>16<br>16<br>17<br>19<br>19<br>20 |
| 6.                                  | Parking P  | rovision   | 21   |
| 6.1<br>6.1.7<br>6.2<br>6.3          | l Parking R  | ng Planning Policy<br>Requirement<br>arking Planning Policy  | 21<br>21<br>23<br>23                               |
| 7.<br>8.                            | Access an<br>Conclusio   | d Car Park Assessment<br>n   | 24<br>25   |
| Attach<br>Attach<br>Attach          | ament 1<br>ament 2<br>ament 3<br>ament 4<br>ament 5                                    | Council Planning Proposal Requirements<br>Prospect Masterplan<br>SIDRA Results – Existing Scenario<br>SIDRA Results – Post Development Scenario<br>TCS Plans (Existing & Proposed) | 26<br>27<br>28<br>29<br>30                         |
| Figure<br>Figure                    | 3 – Aerial V   | cation<br>and Use Map (Source: NSW Planning Viewer)<br>View of Subject Site & Surrounds (Source: Nearmap)<br>ct Highway Upgrade Proposal (Source: RMS, 2017)                       | 2<br>4<br>6<br>7                                   |

Planning Proposal for Prospect South Lands; Office of Strategic Lands; 15 March 2018; © Copyright; **ptc.** 

## ptc.

| Figure 5 - Alternative Access Option<br>Figure 6 – Road Hierarchy (RMS Road Hierarchy Review)  | 8<br>9 |
|--|--------|
| Figure 7 – Western Motorway – Eastbound  | 10     |
| Figure 8 – Great Western Highway (A44) - Eastbound   | 10     |
| Figure 9 – Prospect Highway – Northbound   | 11     |
| Figure 10 – Reservoir Road – Westbound   | 11     |
| Figure 11 - NSW Approved B-double Route Map (Source: RMS Combined Higher Mass Limits (HML) and |        |
| Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) Map  | 12     |
| Figure 12 - Local Bus Stops  | 13     |
| Figure 13 – Local Bicycle Network (Source: SydneyCycleWays, Nov 2017)                          | 14     |
| Figure 14 – Traffic Count Surveyed Intersections   | 15     |
| Figure 15 – Traffic Distribution for Post Development Subject Site                             | 17     |
| Table 1 – Bus Service Summary  | 13     |
| Table 2 – Proposed Traffic Generation  | 16     |
| Table 3 – Level of Service (LoS) Definitions by RMS  | 18     |
| Table 4 – SIDRA Results Summary  | 19     |
| Table 5 - Car Parking Provision Summary  | 22     |

### 1. Executive Summary

**ptc.** has been engaged by the Office of Strategic Lands (on behalf of Minister for Planning) to provide a Traffic Impact Assessment to accompany the Planning Proposal for the rezoning of land comprising a total of 16 properties totalling an area of approximately 12.2 Ha in Prospect.

With reference to the most recent RMS survey data, a review of the potential traffic generation of the site revealed that the development will lead to a net traffic generation of 336 trips during the peak hour. In order to assess the traffic circumstances associated with the proposal, intersection surveys and traffic modelling using SIDRA Intersection have been undertaken.

Overall, the SIDRA analysis indicates that the existing operation of the Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange and Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road are operating at capacity. However, the Prospect Highway Upgrade is anticipated to improve the performance of these intersections by the introduction of additional throughlanes to support the growing Prospect South Lands Precinct.

Based on the analysis, the intersections of Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange and Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road will operate at a reasonable level of service during both the AM and PM peaks with acceptable delays and spare capacity, despite the additional 336 trips during the peak hour generated by the proposal.

In accordance with the Blacktown DCP, the required parking provision rate associated with warehouses with associated office premises have been applied to the Masterplan concept proposal. Following this, a minimum car parking provision of 735 parking spaces applies to the subject development site. Further assessment of the parking provisions, as well as servicing requirements is to be undertaken during the submission of future Development Applications.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable and supportable in the context of traffic.

### 2. Introduction

### 2.1 Project Summary

**ptc.** has been engaged by the Office of Strategic Lands (OSL) to prepare a Traffic and Parking Assessment to accompany a Planning Proposal to Blacktown City Council for the rezoning of land in the vicinity of the Prospect Reservoir (See Figure 1).



Figure 1 – Site Location

### 2.2 Purpose of this Report

This report presents the following considerations in relation to the Traffic and Parking assessment of the Proposal:

| Section 2 | A description of the project;   |
|-----------|---|
| Section 3 | Establishment of the site context and development proposal;   |
| Section 4 | A description of the road network serving the development property, the surrounding public traffic options, and the existing active traffic facilities;   |
| Section 5 | A description of the existing traffic volumes through key local intersections, determination of the traffic activity associated with the development proposal, and the adequacy of the surrounding road network;        |
| Section 6 | A description of parking provision in the context of the relevant planning control requirements; and  |
| Section 7 | The requirements in regards to the car park, vehicular access and internal circulation arrangements, in relation to the relevant standards and Council policies, will need to be assessed in a later development stage. |

### 3. Proposal

### 3.1 Site Context

The subject site lies on land which is currently zoned for primary production small lots (RU4), situated to the south of the Western Motorway. Key features surrounding the site include:

- To the north lies a business development zone (B5) which accommodates retail outlets and restaurants;
- To the south lie numerous warehouses zoned for general industrial (IN1) and light industrial (IN2) use;
- To the south-west lies the Prospect Reservoir and Prospect;
- To the west lies Wet 'n' Wild Sydney, within a 750m walking distance; and
- The greater residential and industrial precinct of Prospect, comprising typically of low-density residential (R2) and general industrial (IN1) land uses.



Figure 2 – Local Land Use Map (Source: NSW Planning Viewer)

### 3.2 Development Site

The proposal relates to the subject site comprising the following lots of land:

- Lot 3 / DP 1192514 (64,990m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 10 / DP 448744 (3,945m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 11 / DP 448744 (3,970m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 12 / DP 448744 (4,046m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 15 / DP 448744 (2,402m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 18 / DP 802753 (6,555m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 24 / DP 801210 (7,772m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 25 / DP 801210 (1,382m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 26 / DP 801210 (14,320m<sup>2</sup>)

A number of adjoining sites are also included in the assessment, which are listed below:

- Lot A / DP 374323 (518.5m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot C / DP 374323 (860m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot D / 374324 (309.8m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 10 / DP 801209 (3,263m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 11 / DP 801209 (7,427m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 10 / DP 374325 (676.6m<sup>2</sup>)
- Lot 17 / DP 802753 (RMS land) (1,124m<sup>2</sup>)

The total site area is approximately 12.2 Ha and comprises land owned by the Minister for Planning (approximately 11Ha) and two parcels of privately-owned land. The area also contains local roads (Reservoir Road and Thornley Road) owned by Blacktown City Council. The roads are subject to possible closure and sale, leaving the possibility of additional land for development.

As can be seen in the aerial view of the subject site in Figure 3, the land is located adjoining the M4 – Western Motorway, between the extension of the Prospect Highway to the west and runs along the M4. The land is accessed directly from the Motorway via the Blacktown turn-off, Prospect Highway and Reservoir Road.

The southern boundary of the site is defined by the Greystanes Release Area of State Environmental Planning Policy 2009 – Western Sydney Employment Lands.

Currently, the site is mostly unoccupied.



Figure 3 - Aerial View of Subject Site & Surrounds (Source: Nearmap)

### 3.3 Development Proposal

The objective of the Project is to submit a Planning Proposal to Blacktown City Council for the rezoning of the subject site for industrial use.

As the site directly adjoins the Greystanes Industrial area (within the Western Sydney Employment Area), the subject land could potentially be seen as a northern extension of this area that takes advantage of the good accessibility and infrastructure available in this location. Initial meetings with Council have been supportive and Council have provided advice in terms of requirements for a Planning Proposal (refer to **Attachment 1**).

It is the intention of the Office of Strategic Lands (OSL) to seek approval for the rezoning of the parcels of land stated previously, for light and general industrial uses to match the adjoining zoning. In light of this, the OSL has contacted adjoining landowners who have indicated their willingness to participate in a Planning Proposal to Blacktown City Council.

#### 3.3.1 Prospect Highway Upgrade

Although not directly linked to the proposal, there are already approved plans to upgrade the intersection of Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange (see Figure 4). In addition to this, widening of the Prospect Hwy (southbound) up to the intersection Prospect Hwy /M4 Interchange by one additional lane has been approved. Furthermore, the existing roundabout configuration of Prospect Hwy/Reservoir Rd will be converted into a four-arm signalised intersection with additional lanes provided in each approach. The

Traffic Signal Control (TCS) plans detailing the existing and proposed intersection configurations are included as **Attachment 5**.

These changes will be beneficial to the proposed land use development on the subject site.



Figure 4 - Prospect Highway Upgrade Proposal (Source: RMS, 2017)

#### 3.3.2 Proposed Vehicular Access

The Project Planner, Urbis, is currently exploring options in regards to the proposed access to the site. The Prospect South Masterplan illustrating the proposed access arrangement is presented in **Attachment 1**. The access arrangement will retain the existing access via Thorney Road, and allow circulation of vehicles in a ring-road configuration along the perimeter of each building. It is noted that the Prospect Masterplan does not yet illustrate the proposed signalised intersection layout for Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road.

Given the close proximity of Thornley Road to the intersection of Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road, vehicles exiting the site via Thornley Road will need to cross the right turn lane to enter the kerbside lane on Reservoir Road. Therefore, vehicles intending to travel south along Prospect Highway or continue west along Reservoir Road will need to wait for a sufficient gap in the right-turn lane in order to merge with the left or through-lane traffic.

In order to mitigate the potential for queuing along Thornley Road, an alternative access option involving the closure or partial closure of Thornley Road could be considered in due course, subject to discussion with RMS. This option may involve the construction of a new access (public or private) to be provided at a suitable distance from the new signalised intersection (see Figure 5), to be resolved after rezoning at any future DA submission.



Figure 5 - Alternative Access Option

### 4. Existing Transport Facilities

### 4.1 Road Hierarchy

The subject site is located in the suburb of Prospect, and is primarily serviced by the State Roads such as the Great Western Highway (A44) and the Western Motorway (M4) as well as Regional Roads including Blacktown Road and Toongabbie Road. The site is also serviced by local roads managed by Council.



Figure 6 – Road Hierarchy (RMS Road Hierarchy Review)

The NSW administrative road hierarchy comprises the following road classifications, which align with the generic road hierarchy as follows:

| State Roads    | - Freeways and Primary Arterials (RMS Managed)                           |
|----------------|--|
| Regional Roads | - Secondary or sub arterials (Council Managed, Part funded by the State) |
| Local Roads    | - Collector and local access roads (Council Managed)                     |

| Western  | Motorway (M4 | .) |
|----------|--------------|----|
| Road Cla | ssification  |    |

| Road Classification | State Road                |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Alignment           | East - West               |  |
| Number of Lanes     | 3 lanes in each direction |  |
| Carriageway Type    | Divided                   |  |
| Carriageway Width   | 30m                       |  |
| Speed Limit         | 90 km/h                   |  |
| School Zone         | No                        |  |
| Parking Controls    | N/A                       |  |
| Forms Site Frontage | Yes                       |  |



Figure 7 – Western Motorway – Eastbound

| Great Western Highway (A44) |                           |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Road Classification         | State Road                |
| Alignment                   | East - West               |
| Number of Lanes             | 3 lanes in each direction |
| Carriageway Type            | Divided                   |
| Carriageway Width           | 35m                       |
| Speed Limit                 | 80 km/h                   |
| School Zone                 | No                        |
| Parking Controls            | No Parking                |
| Forms Site Frontage         | No                        |



Figure 8 – Great Western Highway (A44) - Eastbound

| Prospect Highway    |                                    |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Road Classification | State Road                         |
| Alignment           | North – South                      |
| Number of Lanes     | 2 lanes in each direction (varies) |
| Carriageway Туре    | Divided                            |
| Carriageway Width   | 15m (varies)                       |
| Speed Limit         | 60 km/h                            |
| School Zone         | No                                 |
| Parking Controls    | No Stopping                        |
| Forms Site Frontage | Yes                                |



Figure 9 – Prospect Highway – Northbound

| Reservoir Road      |                          |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Road Classification | Local Road               |
| Alignment           | East - West              |
| Number of Lanes     | 1 lane in each direction |
| Carriageway Type    | Undivided                |
| Carriageway Width   | 12.5m                    |
| Speed Limit         | 60 km/h                  |
| School Zone         | No                       |
| Parking Controls    | No Stopping              |
| Forms Site Frontage | Yes                      |



Figure 10 – Reservoir Road – Westbound

### 4.2 NSW B-double Truck Routes

The RMS Combined Higher Mass Limits (HML) and Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) Map presents the NSW roads which are approved for access by B-double trucks of lengths varying between 19m and 26m. A map of the B-double (up to 26m length) road network within the vicinity of the site is shown in Figure 11.

For B-double access outside of the approved network, a B-double permit application will need to be lodged with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator (NHVR). This would include both Reservoir and Thornley Roads, however, given the proposed land use and road upgrades, it is not anticipated to be a major issue in the future.



Figure 11 - NSW Approved B-double Route Map (Source: RMS Combined Higher Mass Limits (HML) and Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) Map

### 4.3 Public Transport

The locality was assessed in the context of available forms of public transport that may be utilised by prospective workers and customers. When defining accessibility, the NSW Guidelines to Walking & Cycling (2004) suggest that 400m-800m is a comfortable walking distance.

#### 4.3.1 Bus Services

A review of the bus services operating within the immediate vicinity of the site has been undertaken. Currently, the closest bus stop is located within a 10 minute walk (750m) on Prospect Highway. Another three bus stops are located approximately 500m to 800m away from the subject site; however, currently there is no footpath to connect these with the development area. Three bus services were identified to be operating in the surroundings, with the bus stop locations shown in Figure 12. A summary of the new services applicable from 26 November 2017 is shown in Table 1.



Figure 12 - Local Bus Stops

| Table | 1 – | Bus | Service | Summary |
|-------|-----|-----|---------|---------|
|-------|-----|-----|---------|---------|

| Route No. | Frequency (approximate)   | Coverage  |
|-----------|---|---|
| 800       | Mon-Fri: 15-30 minute intervals, between 5:39am and 8:32pm<br>Sat & Sun: 30 minute intervals, between 6:29am and 7:54pm | Blacktown to Fairfield via<br>Wetherill Park      |
| 810X      | Mon-Fri: 5 services in morning peak, between 6:10am and 7:49am<br>2 services in afternoon peak, at 4:00pm and 5:20pm    | Merrylands to Parramatta via<br>Great Western Hwy |
| 812       | Mon-Fri: every 30 minutes during peak periods only, between 5:40am and 9:23am & between 2:59pm and 8:56pm.              | Fairfield to Blacktown                            |

In light of the above, the subject site is relatively well located in terms of access to public transport services.

### 4.4 Active Travel

In addition to public transport, the locality was also assessed for its active transport potential.

In terms of public infrastructure, the local road network offers a relatively good level of amenity and safety for pedestrians, providing separated footpaths on at least one side of the carriageway, pedestrian crossings, supporting signage and appropriate lighting throughout the locality. It is noted, however, that pedestrian crossings are not provided at the Prospect Hwy/Reservoir Road roundabout.

A review of the local cycling network identifies a number of dedicated on-road and off-road shared cycle paths within the vicinity of the site. Particularly the link to the north towards Blacktown is well established, offering an off-road shared path. The path along Prospect Road, southbound of the subject site provides a link to the southern residential area. A map of the local cycling infrastructure is presented in Figure 13.



Figure 13 – Local Bicycle Network (Source: SydneyCycleWays, Nov 2017)

### 5. Traffic Impact Assessment

The potential traffic generation of the proposed development has been estimated with reference to the following:

- RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments 2002 (RMS Guide)
- Technical Direction TDT 2013/04

The technical direction contains the most recent RMS survey data for various land uses.

### 5.1 Existing Traffic Conditions

In order to determine the existing traffic conditions within the road network serving the subject site, traffic count surveys were undertaken at the following intersections (see Figure 14):

- 1. Prospect Hwy / Reservoir Rd (roundabout); and
- 2. Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange (both ramps south of M4) (signalised).



Figure 14 – Traffic Count Surveyed Intersections

The surveys were undertaken on Tuesday, 14 November 2017 in the morning and evening peak hour periods at 7am-9am and 4pm-6pm (non-school holiday period). Due to the surrounding industrial land use,

light and heavy vehicles were recorded separately in the survey. A summary of the SIDRA calculations can be found in **Attachment 1**.

### 5.2 Existing Traffic Generation

Currently, the site is mostly unoccupied and thus does not generate any traffic.

### 5.3 Proposed Traffic Generation

In the course of the proposed rezoning and the following development, the entire land area is planned to be used for industrial purposes. As it is the intention of the OSL to match the adjoining land use, for the purpose of this report, the traffic generation rates of warehouses are adopted in order to calculate the future traffic generation (section 3.10.2 of the RMS Guide).

It should be noted that the traffic generation can vary significantly depending on particular businesses operating in the area. For example, according to the RMS Guide, warehouses where retailing from the site is permitted or with a major manufacturing system, the traffic generation rates increase.

In order to calculate the future traffic generation, the gross floor area (GFA) of the site is required. It is noted that only conceptual plans are available at this stage; the plans illustrate approximately 55,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA which is equivalent to 45% of the total 12.2 Ha site area. **ptc.** has included an additional 10% buffer, adopting 55% of the total site area as the GFA for a conservative approach when assessing the potential traffic activity. Following this, the total GFA adopted is 67,100m<sup>2</sup> (12.2 Ha x 55%).

Based on the above, the future traffic activity is calculated in Table 2.

Table 2 – Proposed Traffic Generation

| Component | Period                   | Vehicle Trip Rate           | GFA                  | Proposed Trips |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Warehouse | Morning Peak Hourly (AM) | 0.5 / 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA | 67.100m <sup>2</sup> | 336 (335.5)    |
|           | Daily                    | 4 / 100m² GFA               | 07,10011             | 2684           |

### 5.4 Traffic Modelling

#### 5.4.1 Traffic Distribution

In regards to traffic distribution, the following assumptions for the AM / PM peak hourly flows were made:

- AM peak hour: 80% of trips inbound;
  - 20% of trips outbound;
- PM peak hour: 30% of trips inbound;

70% of trips outbound.

The following trip assignment is proposed for all vehicles arriving and departing from the subject site in the morning and evening peak hour, respectively (see Figure 15):

- 0% west onto Reservoir Rd. This road is not constructed for heavy vehicles and thus should be closed off for such traffic;
- 40% south onto Prospect Hwy, towards Wetherill Park, Liverpool, Bankstown;

- 60% north onto Prospect Hwy, towards M4 and Bankstown;
- 18% west onto M4, towards Penrith;
- 42% north, of which:
  - o 18% turn right onto M4, towards Parramatta and Sydney;
  - $\circ$  24% continue north towards Blacktown.



Figure 15 - Traffic Distribution for Post Development Subject Site

#### 5.4.2 SIDRA Calculations

Typically, there are three performance indicators used to summarise the performance of an intersection, being:

- Degree of Saturation (DoS) The total usage of the intersection expressed as a factor of 1 with 1 representing 100% vehicles/capacity (v/c). (e.g. 0.8=80% saturation)
- Average Delay The average delay encountered by all vehicles passing through the intersection. It is often important to review the average delay of each approach as a side road could have a long delay time, while the large free flowing major traffic will provide an overall low average delay.
- Level of Service (LoS) This is a categorisation of average delay, intended for simple reference. The RMS adopts the following bands:

| LoS | Average Delay<br>(secs/vehicle) | Traffic Signals<br>Roundabout  | Give Way &<br>Stop Signs   |
|-----|---------------------------------|--|--|
| А   | <14                             | Good operation   | Good operation   |
| В   | 15 to 28                        | Good with acceptable delays and spare capacity   | Acceptable delays & spare capacity                                 |
| С   | 29 to 42                        | Satisfactory   | Satisfactory, but accident study required                          |
| D   | 43 to 56                        | Operating near capacity  | Near capacity and accident study required                          |
| E   | 57 to 70                        | At capacity. At signals, incidents will<br>cause excessive delays. Roundabouts<br>require other control mode | At capacity, requires other control mode                           |
| F   | >70                             | Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing.<br>Requires additional capacity                                       | Unsatisfactory with excessive queuing; requires other control mode |

Table 3 – Level of Service (LoS) Definitions by RMS

The RMS Guide gives a trip generation rate for warehouses for the morning peak hour only. However, for the purpose of this report, it is assumed that the number of trips occurring in the mornings will remain at a similar level in the evenings. Based on this, the proposed trip generation determined in Table 2 will be used for both the AM and the PM peak hour traffic calculation.

As the proposed land use will be either light or general industrial, a relatively high rate of heavy vehicles is to be expected. For the purpose of this report the following ratio is adopted:

- 60% light vehicles;
- 40% heavy vehicles.

The AM and PM peak hour periods adopted for the traffic modelling are 7:00am – 8:00am and 4:00pm – 5:00pm, respectively.

It should be noted that a redevelopment of the intersection Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange has been approved and will occur in the near future. For this reason, the post development SIDRA calculations were undertaken in consideration of the new intersection layout.

The SIDRA results for both intersections are summarised in Table 4 which shows the lane Level of Service for both the AM and the PM peak hours. A more detailed summary of the SIDRA calculations can be found in **Attachment 4.** 

| Intersection<br>Number | Intersection                     | Time    | Period   | Level of<br>Service | Average<br>Delay (s) | Degree of<br>Saturation (%) | 95% Queue<br>Length (m) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|----------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1                      | Prospect Hwy /<br>M4 Interchange | AM Peak | Existing | С                   | 25.0                 | 0.857                       | 146.0                   |
|                        |                                  |         | Future   | С                   | 20.3                 | 0.790                       | 72.8                    |
|                        |                                  | PM Peak | Existing | F                   | 82.7                 | 1.014                       | 552.0                   |
|                        |                                  |         | Future   | С                   | 28.7                 | 0.886                       | 126.6                   |
| 2                      | Prospect Hwy /<br>Reservoir Rd   |         | Existing | F                   | 94.5                 | 1.143                       | 730.9                   |
|                        |                                  | AM Peak |          | E                   | 56.9                 | 0.908                       | 292.2                   |
|                        |                                  | PM Peak | Existing | С                   | 32.5                 | 1.016                       | 485.3                   |
|                        |                                  |         | Future   | D                   | 48.8                 | 0.889                       | 362.9                   |

Table 4 – SIDRA Results Summary

The traffic impacts on each intersection is summarised below:

#### 5.4.3 Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange

In the existing scenario, the intersection of the Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange is currently operating at LOS C in the AM peak with an average vehicle delay of 25 seconds and a 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue length of 146m. In the PM peak, the intersection is operating at capacity (DoS of 1.014) with LOS F, and increased average delay to 82.7 seconds and a queue length of 552.0m. It is noted that the future Prospect Highway Upgrade will assist in improving the traffic conditions at the intersection by the addition of a through-lane to the northern approach arm.

In the future scenario, the geometry of the intersection has been revised to reflect future layout as part of the Prospect Highway Upgrade. In the AM peak period, the intersection is operating at LOS C with an average delay of 20.3 seconds and a queue of 72.8m. The results of the future model indicate a considerable improvement in the operation of the intersection during the PM peak with an average delay of 28.7 seconds and a queue length of 126.6m. In the existing scenario, the intersection is operating at capacity; however, after the widening of the Prospect Highway, the intersection has spare capacity even with the addition of the development generated traffic.

#### 5.4.4 Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road

The existing scenario has been modelled based on the current layout of the Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road as a four-arm, unsignalised roundabout. In the AM peak, the intersection is operating beyond capacity (DoS of 1.143) and an average delay of 94.5 seconds. A queue length of 730.9m associated with the northern Prospect Highway approach arm is observed, which extends north towards Ponds Road. During the PM peak, the intersection is operating at LOS C with an average delay of 32.5 seconds and queue of 485.3m.

As part of the Prospect Highway Upgrade, the roundabout is proposed to be converted into a four-arm signalised intersection with the provision of additional north-south and east-west lanes to improve traffic throughput.

In the future AM peak, the intersection is operating at LOS E with road users experiencing an average delay of 56.9 seconds and queue of 292.2m. This is a significant improvement in the performance of the intersection when compared with the existing scenario with approximately 10% spare capacity.

The future model also indicates similar improvements in the performance of the intersection during the PM peak. The signalised intersection is forecast to operate at LOS D, with an average delay of 48.8 seconds and reduced queue length of 362.9m. It is acknowledged that increased delays are experienced; however, the upgrade to the road infrastructure allows the intersection to operate at an acceptable level of service with 11% spare capacity. As such, this is a notable improvement when compared to the existing performance of the intersection.

### 5.5 Traffic Impact Summary

Overall, the SIDRA analysis indicates that the intersection of Prospect Hwy/M4 Interchange will operate at a good level of service during both the AM and PM peaks with acceptable delays and spare capacity, despite the additional 336 trips during peak hour generated by the proposal. Based on the SIDRA modelling, it has been determined that the new layout of this intersection will lead to a general improvement in the traffic flow in terms of queuing, particularly in the evening peak hour.

The upgrade to the Prospect Highway also has notable improvements on the performance of the Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road. The introduction of additional north-south through lanes has resulted in a significant decrease in queuing along the northern approach arm. Furthermore, additional capacity in the intersection will be achieved as a result of the upgrade, with approximately 10% spare capacity in both the AM and PM peak periods.

### 6. Parking Provision

### 6.1 Car Parking Planning Policy

The proposed development is subject to the parking provision rates stipulated in Part A, Section 6 of the Blacktown Development Control Plan 2015 (BDCP), which are outlined below:

- 1 space per 75m<sup>2</sup> GFA for light, general and heavy industry and warehouse or distribution centre; and
- 1 space per 40m<sup>2</sup> GFA for the office component.

In addition to this, the Building Code of Australia 2016 (BCA) outlines the required parking provisions for people with disabilities. Since the subject site shall be zoned as light or general industrial, it can be assumed that the buildings will carry any of the following classifications:

- Class 5: an office building used for professional or commercial purposes, excluding buildings of Class 6, 7, 8 or 9;
- Class 6: a shop or other building for the sale of goods by retail or the supply of services direct to the public;
- Class 7b: a building which is for storage, or display of goods or produce for sale by wholesale;
- Class 8: a laboratory, or a building in which a handicraft or process for the production, assembling, altering, repairing, packing, finishing, or cleaning of goods or produce is carried on for trade, sale, or gain.

In light of this, the following accessible car parking provision needs to be satisfied:

- 1 space for every 100 car parking spaces or part thereof for building classes 5, 7 and 8;
- 1 space for every 50 car parking spaces or part thereof for building class 6.

It is noted that the BDCP outlines requirements for accessible car parking provision within Part E -Development in Industrial Zones: Section 4.8. The BDCP states that developments providing 50 or more parking spaces must provide at least 2% or part thereof of those spaces for users with a disability. In accordance with this requirement, a minimum of 2% of total car parking provision are to be accessible parking spaces.

#### 6.1.1 Parking Requirement

The Prospect Masterplan (see **Attachment 2**) presents a concept development proposal. Based on the parking provision rates stipulated in Part A – Section 6 of the BDCP and GFA for each land use, the number of parking spaces required is outlined in the following table:

| Table 5 | - Car | Parking  | Provision  | Summary |
|---------|-------|----------|------------|---------|
| Tuble 5 | Cui   | i unking | 1101131011 | Sannary |

| Building<br>No.         | Land Use Component                                    | GFA                   | BDCP Minimum<br>Parking Rate | BDCP Minimum<br>Parking Provision<br>Requirement | Proposed<br>Parking Provision |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Building 1              | Light or general<br>industry (including<br>warehouse) | 7,228m²               | 1 space / 75m²<br>GFA        | 96.4   |                               |
|                         | Office Component                                      | 900 m <sup>2</sup>    | 1 space / 40m²<br>GFA        | 22.5   | 130                           |
|                         |   |                       | Total Building 1             | 119 <i>(118.9</i> )                              |                               |
| Building 2              | Light or general<br>industry (including<br>warehouse) | 11,900m <sup>2</sup>  | 1 space / 75m²<br>GFA        | 158.7  |                               |
|                         | Office Component                                      | 1,000 m <sup>2</sup>  | 1 space / 40m²<br>GFA        | 25   | 173                           |
|                         |   |                       | Total Building 2             | 184 <i>(183.7)</i>                               |                               |
| Building 3              | Light or general<br>industry (including<br>warehouse) | 30,230 m <sup>2</sup> | 1 space / 75m²<br>GFA        | 403.1  |                               |
|                         | Office Component                                      | 1,150 m <sup>2</sup>  | 1 space / 40m²<br>GFA        | 28.8   | 436                           |
|                         |   |                       | Total Building 3             | 432 <i>(431.9)</i>                               |                               |
| Total Parking Provision |   |                       |                              | 735  | 739                           |

Given the conceptual nature of the Masterplan being indicative only, the detailed parking provision requirements (including accessible parking provisions) can be finalised during detailed design stage.

### 6.2 Bicycle Parking Planning Policy

Blacktown Council promotes cycling as a healthy transport alternative and as such states the following in the BDCP:

"Applicants are encouraged to incorporate, in the design of their buildings, safe storage/parking areas for bicycles, with adequate shower and change facilities provided for staff (where appropriate)."

### 6.3 Servicing

In terms of service vehicle areas, the BDCP provides the following information:

"Service vehicle areas should be provided off-street with convenient access. In larger developments, service areas should operate independently of other parking areas. This includes access for inspections and cleaning of integrated water cycle management and water sensitive urban design measures incorporated into roadways."

An assessment of the bicycle and servicing requirements is to be undertaken at a later stage once further details of the proposal are determined.

### 7. Access and Car Park Assessment

All parking spaces of new developments need to comply with Australian standards, such as:

- AS2890.1:2004 (Off-street car parking);
- AS2890.2: 2002 (Off-street commercial vehicle facilities)
- AS2890.3:2015 (Bicycle Parking);
- AS2890.6: 2009 (Parking facilities Off-street parking for people with disabilities).

In order to submit a development application to Council, a detailed access and car park assessment needs to be prepared. For the purpose of this report such an assessment is not required, but will be necessary in a later stage.

The assessment will require a discussion and examination of the following:

- Vehicular access & circulation;
- Sight distance;
- Car park arrangement for cars, motorcycles and bicycles.

### 8. Conclusion

**ptc.** has been engaged by the Office of Strategic Lands (on behalf of Minister for Planning) to provide a Traffic Impact Assessment to accompany the Planning Proposal for the rezoning of land comprising a total of 16 properties totalling an area of approximately 12.2 Ha in Prospect.

A review of the proposed infrastructure upgrades within the vicinity of the subject site indicated that the NSW Government is planning a 3.6km upgrade of Prospect Highway, between Reservoir Road, Prospect and St Martin's Crescent, Blacktown. The Prospect Highway Upgrade will support the growth of the region benefit future employees and visitors to meet the future needs of Western Sydney.

The Prospect Masterplan presents the proposed vehicular access arrangements to the site which allows access via Thornley Road and Reservoir Road. An internal ring-road configuration has also been adopted to allow circulation of vehicles around the perimeter of each building. An alternative access option has also been identified to mitigate potential for queuing along Thornley Road due to the close proximity of the Thornley Road access from the intersection of Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road. It is acknowledged that the potential for a new access (public or private) at a suitable distance from the future signalised intersection of Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road is to be resolved at any future Development Application.

With reference to the most recent RMS survey data, a review of the potential traffic generation of the site revealed that the development will lead to a net traffic generation of 336 trips during the peak hour. In order to assess the traffic circumstances associated with the proposal, intersection surveys and traffic modelling using SIDRA Intersection have been undertaken.

Overall, the SIDRA analysis indicates that the existing operation of the Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange and Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road are operating at capacity. However, the Prospect Highway Upgrade is anticipated to improve the performance of these intersections by the introduction of additional throughlanes to support the growing Prospect South Lands Precinct.

Based on the analysis, the intersections of Prospect Highway/M4 Interchange and Prospect Highway/Reservoir Road will operate at a reasonable level of service during both the AM and PM peaks with acceptable delays and spare capacity, despite the additional 336 trips during the peak hour generated by the proposal.

In accordance with the Blacktown DCP, the required parking provision rate associated with warehouses with associated office premises have been applied to the Masterplan concept proposal. Following this, a minimum car parking provision of 735 parking spaces applies to the subject development site. Further assessment of the parking provisions, as well as servicing requirements is to be undertaken during the submission of future Development Applications.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered acceptable and supportable in the context of traffic.

Attachment 1 Council Planning Proposal Requirements



File no:

F17/678

17 March 2017

Mr Jeffery Lord DBL Property Pty Limited Suite 2, Upper Ground Floor 437 Kent Street Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Sir,

### Request for a Planning Proposal to rezone land in the vicinity of Thornley Road, Reservoir Road and Tarlington Place, Prospect

I am writing to you in response to our meeting on 16 February 2017 in which you outlined your proposal on behalf of the Office of Strategic Lands, to request an amendment to the *Blacktown Local Environmental Plan 2015* (BLEP 2015). We understand it is your request to change the zone from RU4 Rural Small Holdings to IN1 General Industrial or IN2 Light Industrial under BLEP 2015.

There are a number of matters that will need to be carefully considered in our assessment of your request. The attachment to this letter outlines the minimum information that we require to be submitted to enable us to consider your proposal.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Team Leader Release Areas Fiona McDermott on 9839 6117.

Yours faithfully,

Chris Shannon Manager Strategic Planning

Council Chambers • 62 Flushcombe Road • Blacktown NSW 2148 Telephone: (02) 9839 6000 • Facsimile: (02) 9831-1961 • DX 8117 Blacktown Email: council@blacktown.nsw.gov.au • Website: www.blacktown.nsw.gov.au All correspondence to: The General Manager • PO Box 63 • Blacktown NSW 2148

# Required information to be submitted to amend an environmental planning instrument

#### Proposal

• Amendment to *Blacktown Local Environmental Plan 2015* (BLEP 2015) to rezone land from RU4 Rural Small Holdings to IN1 General Industrial or IN2 Light Industrial

#### Location

Land in the vicinity of Thornley Road, Reservoir Road, and Tarlington Place, Prospect

#### 1. Documentation

We require a letter formally requesting the proposed amendments. We also require 3 paper copies and 1 electronic copy of all plans and documentation that is relevant to your request on either CD or USB.

#### 2. Application Fee

Outlined below are our lodgement fees based on our current 2016/2017 Goods & Services Pricing Schedule. Should we proceed to consider and advertise the proposal, regardless of the outcome of this consideration, there will be no refund.

Application to amend environmental planning instrument \$100,000

#### 3. Owner's consent

We require a signed letter of consent from all affected landowners to any formal request to us to consider your proposal.

#### 4. Planning report

We require a report that provides an overview of the proposal that addresses the following matters:

- a. a description of the proposal and explanation of the changes relevant environmental planning instruments
- b. detailed analysis of the site and surrounding locality identifying all issues that need to be addressed (eg. site constraints and development barriers)
- c. potential employment yield as a result of the proposal
- d. explanation of intended development on the site if the proposal is successful
- e. relevant plans, concept drawings, and / or photomontages demonstrating development that could occur as a result of the proposed amendment



- f. explanation of potential impacts of the proposal and how these will be addressed
- g. any proposed offer to enter into a voluntary planning agreement
- h. any other relevant miscellaneous studies and/or documentation, including any correspondence from council to any pre-lodgement meeting.

#### 5. Request for a planning proposal

We require an amendable version of a draft planning proposal prepared in accordance with the latest edition of the State Government's *Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals* and *Guide to Preparing Local Environmental Plans*, detailing:

- a. a statement of the objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed instrument
- b. an explanation of the provisions that are to be included in the proposed instrument
- c. the justification for those objectives, outcomes and the process for their implementation, including:
  - i. the need for the planning proposal
  - ii. relationship to strategic planning framework
  - iii. environmental, social and economic impact
  - iv. State and Commonwealth interests
- d. maps, where relevant, to identify the intent of the planning proposal and the area to which it applies
- e. proposed community consultation, including consultation with government agencies
- f. details of the public benefit that would result from the planning proposal.

#### 6. Relevant supporting environmental impact studies

We understand you have undertaken previous investigations in this area. We require you to provide the following up to date environmental impact studies:

- a. infrastructure services report demonstrating that there is sufficient capacity to service the area in terms of water, sewer and power
- b. watercycle management strategy (drainage)
- c. traffic and transport assessment
- d. biodiversity assessment covering flora, fauna and riparian corridors
- e. Aboriginal archaeology and European heritage
- f. contamination and salinity.

#### 7. Maps

(11)

PDF and GIS 'Shape' files for any proposed mapping amendment to an environmental planning instrument. The pdf and 'shape files' must meet the State Government's standard technical requirements for spatial datasets and maps.

3

#### 8. Consideration

Should we proceed and Council resolves to prepare a planning proposal and we receive a Gateway Determination from the Department of Planning and Environment, this does not imply whatsoever that the planning proposal will ultimately be supported. We can vary or not proceed with the planning proposal at any time during our consideration of your proposal. Our final determination of your request will occur when Council has resolved to adopt the planning proposal and to forward it to the Minister for Planning to be made.

We refer you to Section 58 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979:

#### "58 Relevant planning authority may vary proposals or not proceed

- (1) The relevant planning authority may, at any time, vary its proposals as a consequence of its consideration of any submission or report during community consultation or for any other reason
- (2) If it does so, the relevant planning authority is to forward a revised planning proposal to the Minister
- (3) Further community consultation under section 57 is not required unless the Minister so directs in a revised determination under section 56
- (4) The relevant planning authority may also, at any time, request the Minister to determine that the matter not proceed."

#### Scope of Works – Transport & Traffic Consultant

An initial brief Traffic Assessment of the site was carried out by Traffix, Traffic Engineers in 2007. This should be reviewed by the Consultant.

The Project Architect will prepare an initial scheme for the site and the consultant should allow to liaise with the Project Architect and Project Team to refine and develop the site plan.

The Consultant should then allow to:

- Review and advise on the traffic, transport and access requirement or the development of the site;
- Liaise and obtain BCC/RMS requirements for access and traffic arrangements in the local area and provide advice to the Project Team on required road widths, intersection arrangements;
- Outline any external intersection improvements that might be required as a result of the development of the site;
- Prepare a draft and final report outlining the final resolution of all traffic, access, and public transport issues for the site and coordinate that input with the Project Architect and Planner;

The Consultant is required to produce a report and drawings suitable for inclusion as a specialist Appendix to the Planning Proposal.

### Attachment 2 Prospect Masterplan


## prospect masterplan





|                   | BUILDING 1        | BUILDING 2         | BUILDING 3         |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| WAREHOUSE GFA     | 7228M2            | 11900M2            | 30230m2            |
| OFFICE GFA        | 900M2<br>2 STOREY | 1000M2<br>2 STOREY | 1150m2<br>1 STOREY |
| TOTAL GFA         | 8128M2            | 12900M2            | 31380m2            |
| CARSPACE REQUIRED | 119               | 170                | 432                |
| CARSPACE ACHIEVED | 130               | 173                | 436                |

09-02-18 1:1000 arsk0101 -03

4463-00

planning, urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, interior design level 8 15 help street chatswood nsw 2067 t: (02) 8966 6000 f: (02) 8966 6111 e: sydney@dem.com.au

# Attachment 3 SIDRA Results – Existing Scenario

#### Site: 101 [1. Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange - Existing AM]

Existing AM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 60 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Move   | ement Pe   | rformance | - Vehic | les   |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|--------|------------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov    | OD         | Demand    | Flows   | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID     | Mov        | Total     | HV      | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| South  | Droopool   | veh/h     | %       | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
| South  | : Prospect | 3.(,)     |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 1      | L2         | 207       | 56.9    | 0.455 | 22.8    | LOS C    | 4.9      | 50.9     | 0.82   | 0.78      | 39.7    |
| 2      | T1         | 575       | 31.1    | 0.857 | 26.5    | LOS C    | 16.5     | 146.0    | 0.95   | 1.00      | 34.4    |
| Appro  | bach       | 782       | 38.0    | 0.857 | 25.5    | LOS C    | 16.5     | 146.0    | 0.91   | 0.94      | 36.1    |
| East:  | M4 Off-Ra  | mp (E)    |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4      | L2         | 369       | 18.5    | 0.506 | 10.2    | LOS B    | 5.1      | 41.0     | 0.61   | 0.75      | 48.9    |
| 5      | T1         | 1         | 0.0     | 0.854 | 33.2    | LOS C    | 10.2     | 76.9     | 1.00   | 1.00      | 36.7    |
| 6      | R2         | 591       | 8.7     | 0.854 | 38.8    | LOS D    | 10.2     | 76.9     | 1.00   | 1.00      | 31.3    |
| Appro  | bach       | 961       | 12.5    | 0.854 | 27.8    | LOS C    | 10.2     | 76.9     | 0.85   | 0.91      | 36.8    |
| North  | : Prospect | Hwy (N)   |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 8      | T1         | 553       | 13.9    | 0.515 | 7.5     | LOS A    | 9.4      | 73.9     | 0.62   | 0.55      | 49.5    |
| 9      | R2         | 437       | 11.3    | 0.847 | 40.2    | LOS D    | 7.5      | 57.7     | 1.00   | 1.00      | 31.2    |
| Appro  | bach       | 989       | 12.8    | 0.847 | 21.9    | LOS C    | 9.4      | 73.9     | 0.79   | 0.75      | 38.2    |
| All Ve | hicles     | 2733      | 19.9    | 0.857 | 25.0    | LOS C    | 16.5     | 146.0    | 0.85   | 0.86      | 37.0    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move   | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |        |         |         |              |          |        |           |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|--------------|----------|--------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mov    | Description                        | Demand | Average |         | Average Back |          | Prop.  | Effective |  |  |  |  |  |
| ID     | Description                        | Flow   | Delay   | Service | Pedestrian   | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
|        |                                    | ped/h  | sec     |         | ped          | m        |        | per ped   |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1S    | South Slip/Bypass Lane             | 53     | 10.2    | LOS B   | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.58   | 0.58      |  |  |  |  |  |
|        | Crossing                           |        |         |         |              |          |        |           |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4     | West Full Crossing                 | 53     | 16.2    | LOS B   | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.73   | 0.73      |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe | destrians                          | 105    | 13.2    | LOS B   |              |          | 0.66   | 0.66      |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Tuesday, 28 November 2017 1:50:58 PM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171128 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Existing.sip7

# Site: 102 [2. Prospect Hwy / Reservoir Rd - Existing AM]

Existing AM Peak Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |           |          |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov                             | OD        | Demano   |       | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back |          | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID                              | Mov       | Total    | HV    | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| South                           | : Prospec | veh/h    | %     | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
| 30uui<br>1                      | L2        | 134      | 20.5  | 0.734 | 5.7     | LOS A    | 9.6      | 87.2     | 0.69   | 0.54      | 50.8    |
| -                               |           |          |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 2                               | T1        | 736      | 36.5  | 0.734 | 6.3     | LOSA     | 9.6      | 87.2     | 0.69   | 0.54      | 50.3    |
| 3                               | R2        | 7        | 57.1  | 0.734 | 11.1    | LOS B    | 9.6      | 87.2     | 0.69   | 0.54      | 48.7    |
| Appro                           | ach       | 877      | 34.2  | 0.734 | 6.2     | LOS A    | 9.6      | 87.2     | 0.69   | 0.54      | 50.4    |
| East:                           | Reservoir | Rd (E)   |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4                               | L2        | 4        | 100.0 | 0.136 | 29.9    | LOS C    | 0.8      | 9.9      | 0.95   | 0.98      | 35.1    |
| 5                               | T1        | 5        | 80.0  | 0.136 | 28.3    | LOS C    | 0.8      | 9.9      | 0.95   | 0.98      | 37.9    |
| 6                               | R2        | 15       | 78.6  | 0.136 | 32.6    | LOS C    | 0.8      | 9.9      | 0.95   | 0.98      | 34.0    |
| Appro                           | ach       | 24       | 82.6  | 0.136 | 30.7    | LOS C    | 0.8      | 9.9      | 0.95   | 0.98      | 35.1    |
| North                           | Prospect  | Hwy (N)  |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 7                               | L2        | 15       | 21.4  | 1.143 | 150.6   | LOS F    | 91.2     | 730.9    | 1.00   | 3.85      | 13.2    |
| 8                               | T1        | 787      | 17.6  | 1.143 | 150.7   | LOS F    | 91.2     | 730.9    | 1.00   | 3.85      | 13.7    |
| 9                               | R2        | 91       | 9.3   | 1.143 | 154.6   | LOS F    | 91.2     | 730.9    | 1.00   | 3.85      | 15.3    |
| Appro                           | ach       | 893      | 16.9  | 1.143 | 151.1   | LOS F    | 91.2     | 730.9    | 1.00   | 3.85      | 13.8    |
| West:                           | Reservoir | r Rd (W) |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 10                              | L2        | 57       | 20.4  | 1.100 | 139.4   | LOS F    | 56.8     | 439.0    | 1.00   | 3.10      | 16.0    |
| 11                              | T1        | 14       | 38.5  | 1.100 | 140.9   | LOS F    | 56.8     | 439.0    | 1.00   | 3.10      | 16.3    |
| 12                              | R2        | 517      | 10.6  | 1.100 | 143.4   | LOS F    | 56.8     | 439.0    | 1.00   | 3.10      | 16.7    |
| Appro                           | ach       | 587      | 12.2  | 1.100 | 142.9   | LOS F    | 56.8     | 439.0    | 1.00   | 3.10      | 16.6    |
| All Ve                          | hicles    | 2381     | 22.8  | 1.143 | 94.5    | LOS F    | 91.2     | 730.9    | 0.89   | 2.42      | 20.0    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: SIDRA Roundabout LOS.

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 (Akcelik 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: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Tuesday, 28 November 2017 1:51:00 PM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171128 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Existing.sip7

#### Site: 101 [1. Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange - Existing PM]

Existing PM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 150 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Move   | ement Pe    | rformance | - Vehic | les   |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov    | OD          | Demand    | Flows   | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID     | Mov         | Total     | HV      | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| Couth  |             | veh/h     | %       | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
| South  | 1: Prospect | 3.(,)     |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 1      | L2          | 367       | 9.7     | 0.526 | 39.8    | LOS D    | 19.6     | 148.7    | 0.79   | 0.81      | 33.3    |
| 2      | T1          | 872       | 6.9     | 1.002 | 87.7    | LOS F    | 74.5     | 552.0    | 0.94   | 1.12      | 17.3    |
| Appro  | bach        | 1239      | 7.7     | 1.002 | 73.5    | LOS E    | 74.5     | 552.0    | 0.90   | 1.03      | 21.1    |
| East:  | M4 Off-Ra   | mp (E)    |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4      | L2          | 188       | 30.2    | 0.217 | 7.1     | LOS A    | 1.9      | 16.3     | 0.19   | 0.60      | 51.3    |
| 5      | T1          | 3         | 0.0     | 1.001 | 118.7   | LOS F    | 25.6     | 187.0    | 1.00   | 1.08      | 19.7    |
| 6      | R2          | 557       | 4.9     | 1.001 | 122.7   | LOS F    | 31.0     | 226.3    | 1.00   | 1.08      | 16.1    |
| Appro  | bach        | 748       | 11.3    | 1.001 | 93.6    | LOS F    | 31.0     | 226.3    | 0.80   | 0.96      | 19.8    |
| North  | : Prospect  | Hwy (N)   |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 8      | T1          | 355       | 31.2    | 0.293 | 6.5     | LOS A    | 8.2      | 72.7     | 0.35   | 0.31      | 50.8    |
| 9      | R2          | 617       | 6.0     | 1.014 | 131.9   | LOS F    | 33.9     | 249.6    | 1.00   | 1.11      | 15.3    |
| Appro  | bach        | 972       | 15.2    | 1.014 | 86.1    | LOS F    | 33.9     | 249.6    | 0.76   | 0.82      | 19.4    |
| All Ve | hicles      | 2959      | 11.1    | 1.014 | 82.7    | LOS F    | 74.5     | 552.0    | 0.83   | 0.94      | 20.2    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move   | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |               |              |          |                   |               |        |                   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|--------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mov    |                                    | Demand        | Average      | Level of | Average Back      | of Queue      | Prop.  | Effective         |  |  |  |  |  |
| ID     | Description                        | Flow<br>ped/h | Delay<br>sec | Service  | Pedestrian<br>ped | Distance<br>m | Queued | Stop Rate per ped |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1S    | South Slip/Bypass Lane<br>Crossing | 53            | 19.8         | LOS B    | 0.1               | 0.1           | 0.51   | 0.51              |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4     | West Full Crossing                 | 53            | 28.3         | LOS C    | 0.1               | 0.1           | 0.61   | 0.61              |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe | destrians                          | 105           | 24.0         | LOS C    |                   |               | 0.56   | 0.56              |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Tuesday, 28 November 2017 1:50:59 PM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171128 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Existing.sip7

# Site: 102 [2. Prospect Hwy / Reservoir Rd - Existing PM]

Existing PM Peak Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |            |          |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------|-------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov                             | OD         | Demano   |       | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back |          | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID                              | Mov        | Total    | HV    | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| South                           | : Prospec  | veh/h    | %     | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
|                                 |            | , ,      | 0.7   | 1.010 | 24 5    | LOS C    | 64.9     | 405.0    | 1 00   | 1.00      | 26.0    |
| 1                               | L2         | 292      | 9.7   | 1.016 | 34.5    |          | 64.8     | 485.3    | 1.00   | 1.09      | 36.2    |
| 2                               | T1         | 1069     | 7.6   | 1.016 | 34.7    | LOS C    | 64.8     | 485.3    | 1.00   | 1.09      | 33.9    |
| 3                               | R2         | 2        | 100.0 | 1.016 | 43.6    | LOS D    | 64.8     | 485.3    | 1.00   | 1.09      | 33.3    |
| Appro                           | bach       | 1363     | 8.2   | 1.016 | 34.7    | LOS C    | 64.8     | 485.3    | 1.00   | 1.09      | 34.5    |
| East:                           | Reservoir  | Rd (E)   |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4                               | L2         | 6        | 50.0  | 0.060 | 10.6    | LOS B    | 0.4      | 3.3      | 0.75   | 0.71      | 44.8    |
| 5                               | T1         | 7        | 42.9  | 0.060 | 10.5    | LOS B    | 0.4      | 3.3      | 0.75   | 0.71      | 48.1    |
| 6                               | R2         | 25       | 16.7  | 0.060 | 13.9    | LOS B    | 0.4      | 3.3      | 0.75   | 0.71      | 46.2    |
| Appro                           | bach       | 39       | 27.0  | 0.060 | 12.7    | LOS B    | 0.4      | 3.3      | 0.75   | 0.71      | 46.3    |
| North                           | : Prospect | Hwy (N)  |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 7                               | L2         | 17       | 81.2  | 0.497 | 6.8     | LOS A    | 3.8      | 34.0     | 0.47   | 0.55      | 47.0    |
| 8                               | T1         | 427      | 32.5  | 0.497 | 6.1     | LOS A    | 3.8      | 34.0     | 0.47   | 0.55      | 50.9    |
| 9                               | R2         | 102      | 16.5  | 0.497 | 10.0    | LOS B    | 3.8      | 34.0     | 0.47   | 0.55      | 52.0    |
| Appro                           | bach       | 546      | 31.0  | 0.497 | 6.8     | LOS A    | 3.8      | 34.0     | 0.47   | 0.55      | 51.0    |
| West:                           | Reservoi   | r Rd (W) |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 10                              | L2         | 148      | 7.8   | 0.911 | 71.2    | LOS F    | 15.6     | 118.9    | 1.00   | 1.58      | 24.6    |
| 11                              | T1         | 5        | 60.0  | 0.911 | 75.9    | LOS F    | 15.6     | 118.9    | 1.00   | 1.58      | 25.0    |
| 12                              | R2         | 138      | 10.7  | 0.911 | 76.0    | LOS F    | 15.6     | 118.9    | 1.00   | 1.58      | 25.6    |
| Appro                           | bach       | 292      | 10.1  | 0.911 | 73.5    | LOS F    | 15.6     | 118.9    | 1.00   | 1.58      | 25.1    |
| All Ve                          | hicles     | 2240     | 14.3  | 1.016 | 32.5    | LOS C    | 64.8     | 485.3    | 0.87   | 1.02      | 35.4    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: SIDRA Roundabout LOS.

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 (Akcelik 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: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Tuesday, 28 November 2017 1:51:01 PM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171128 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Existing.sip7

# Attachment 4 SIDRA Results – Post Development Scenario

#### Site: 101 [1. Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange - Development AM]

Development AM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 50 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Mov    | ement Pe    | rformance      | - Vehic | les         |              |          |                 |               |        |                      |               |
|--------|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------|--------------|----------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------------------|---------------|
| Mov    | OD          | Demand         | Flows   | Deg.        | Average      | Level of | 95% Back        | of Queue      | Prop.  | Effective            | Average       |
| ID     | Mov         | Total<br>veh/h | HV<br>% | Satn<br>v/c | Delay<br>sec | Service  | Vehicles<br>veh | Distance<br>m | Queued | Stop Rate<br>per veh | Speed<br>km/ł |
| South  | n: Prospect |                | ,,,     | 110         |              |          | Von             |               |        |                      |               |
| 1      | L2          | 220            | 56.0    | 0.701       | 27.8         | LOS C    | 5.6             | 58.0          | 0.97   | 0.91                 | 37.3          |
| 2      | T1          | 604            | 31.5    | 0.790       | 24.1         | LOS C    | 8.2             | 72.8          | 0.99   | 0.99                 | 35.8          |
| Appro  | oach        | 824            | 38.1    | 0.790       | 25.1         | LOS C    | 8.2             | 72.8          | 0.99   | 0.96                 | 36.3          |
| East:  | M4 Off-Ra   | mp (E)         |         |             |              |          |                 |               |        |                      |               |
| 4      | L2          | 420            | 21.1    | 0.571       | 9.4          | LOS A    | 4.9             | 40.5          | 0.65   | 0.76                 | 49.           |
| 5      | T1          | 1              | 0.0     | 0.777       | 24.0         | LOS C    | 7.9             | 59.3          | 1.00   | 0.95                 | 40.4          |
| 6      | R2          | 591            | 8.7     | 0.777       | 29.6         | LOS C    | 7.9             | 59.3          | 1.00   | 0.95                 | 35.2          |
| Appro  | oach        | 1012           | 13.8    | 0.777       | 21.2         | LOS C    | 7.9             | 59.3          | 0.85   | 0.87                 | 40.4          |
| North  | : Prospect  | Hwy (N)        |         |             |              |          |                 |               |        |                      |               |
| 8      | T1          | 672            | 18.5    | 0.410       | 7.2          | LOS A    | 5.6             | 45.8          | 0.61   | 0.53                 | 49.9          |
| 9      | R2          | 437            | 11.3    | 0.706       | 29.4         | LOS C    | 5.6             | 43.2          | 0.99   | 0.88                 | 35.3          |
| Appro  | oach        | 1108           | 15.7    | 0.706       | 15.9         | LOS B    | 5.6             | 45.8          | 0.76   | 0.67                 | 42.0          |
| All Ve | ehicles     | 2944           | 21.3    | 0.790       | 20.3         | LOS C    | 8.2             | 72.8          | 0.85   | 0.82                 | 39.7          |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move      | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |                         |                         |       |                                   |                           |                 |                                   |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Mov<br>ID | Description                        | Demand<br>Flow<br>ped/h | Average<br>Delay<br>sec |       | Average Back<br>Pedestrian<br>ped | of Queue<br>Distance<br>m | Prop.<br>Queued | Effective<br>Stop Rate<br>per ped |  |  |  |  |
| P1S       | South Slip/Bypass Lane<br>Crossing | 53                      | 6.8                     | LOS A | 0.0                               | 0.0                       | 0.52            | 0.52                              |  |  |  |  |
| P4        | West Full Crossing                 | 53                      | 18.5                    | LOS B | 0.1                               | 0.1                       | 0.86            | 0.86                              |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe    | destrians                          | 105                     | 12.7                    | LOS B |                                   |                           | 0.69            | 0.69                              |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Wednesday, 29 November 2017 11:04:31 AM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171129 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Development.sip7

#### Site: 102 [2. Prospect Hwy / Reservoir Rd - Development AM]

Development AM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 150 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |            |          |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|---------------------------------|------------|----------|-------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov                             | OD         | Demand   | Flows | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID                              | Mov        | Total    | HV    | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| Couth                           | December   | veh/h    | %     | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
|                                 | : Prospec  |          | ~~ -  |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 1                               | L2         | 127      | 20.5  | 0.802 | 54.6    | LOS D    | 30.3     | 270.0    | 0.97   | 0.91      | 29.8    |
| 2                               | T1         | 699      | 36.5  | 0.802 | 48.9    | LOS D    | 30.3     | 270.0    | 0.94   | 0.88      | 28.0    |
| 3                               | R2         | 115      | 40.9  | 0.908 | 96.9    | LOS F    | 9.8      | 92.6     | 1.00   | 0.99      | 18.6    |
| Appro                           | ach        | 941      | 34.9  | 0.908 | 55.6    | LOS E    | 30.3     | 270.0    | 0.95   | 0.90      | 26.6    |
| East:                           | Reservoir  | Rd (E)   |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4                               | L2         | 31       | 48.4  | 0.202 | 42.0    | LOS D    | 1.6      | 16.5     | 0.93   | 0.73      | 30.1    |
| 5                               | T1         | 5        | 80.0  | 0.202 | 36.2    | LOS D    | 1.6      | 16.5     | 0.93   | 0.73      | 33.4    |
| 6                               | R2         | 54       | 50.0  | 0.201 | 37.4    | LOS D    | 2.3      | 23.0     | 0.88   | 0.74      | 27.9    |
| Appro                           | ach        | 90       | 51.1  | 0.202 | 38.9    | LOS D    | 2.3      | 23.0     | 0.90   | 0.73      | 29.0    |
| North                           | : Prospect | Hwy (N)  |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 7                               | L2         | 175      | 38.3  | 0.907 | 58.0    | LOS E    | 29.7     | 253.8    | 1.00   | 1.00      | 25.6    |
| 8                               | T1         | 748      | 17.6  | 0.907 | 51.2    | LOS D    | 31.1     | 250.4    | 1.00   | 1.01      | 27.3    |
| 9                               | R2         | 86       | 9.3   | 0.325 | 79.4    | LOS E    | 3.1      | 23.4     | 0.99   | 0.74      | 23.1    |
| Appro                           | ach        | 1009     | 20.5  | 0.907 | 54.8    | LOS D    | 31.1     | 253.8    | 1.00   | 0.99      | 26.6    |
| West:                           | Reservoi   | r Rd (W) |       |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 10                              | L2         | 54       | 20.4  | 0.176 | 37.5    | LOS D    | 3.1      | 25.8     | 0.84   | 0.72      | 32.7    |
| 11                              | T1         | 13       | 38.5  | 0.176 | 31.6    | LOS C    | 3.1      | 25.8     | 0.84   | 0.72      | 35.4    |
| 12                              | R2         | 491      | 10.6  | 0.903 | 69.7    | LOS E    | 38.3     | 292.2    | 0.98   | 0.96      | 25.9    |
| Appro                           | ach        | 558      | 12.2  | 0.903 | 65.7    | LOS E    | 38.3     | 292.2    | 0.96   | 0.93      | 26.6    |
| All Ve                          | hicles     | 2598     | 25.0  | 0.908 | 56.9    | LOS E    | 38.3     | 292.2    | 0.97   | 0.94      | 26.7    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move   | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |        |         |          |              |          |        |           |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|--------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Mov    |                                    | Demand | Average | Level of | Average Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective |  |  |  |  |
| ID     | Description                        | Flow   | Delay   | Service  | Pedestrian   | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate |  |  |  |  |
|        |                                    | ped/h  | sec     |          | ped          | m        |        | per ped   |  |  |  |  |
| P1     | South Full Crossing                | 20     | 69.2    | LOS F    | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.96   | 0.96      |  |  |  |  |
| P4     | West Full Crossing                 | 20     | 41.8    | LOS E    | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.75   | 0.75      |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe | destrians                          | 40     | 55.5    | LOS E    |              |          | 0.85   | 0.85      |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Wednesday, 29 November 2017 11:04:33 AM

Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171129 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy - Development.sip7

#### Site: 101 [1. Prospect Hwy / M4 Interchange - Development PM]

Development PM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 60 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Move   | ement Pe   | rformance    | - Vehic | les   |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|--------|------------|--------------|---------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov    | OD         | Demand       | Flows   | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID     | Mov        | Total        | HV      | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| Cauth  | Dreened    | veh/h        | %       | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
| South  | : Prospect | <b>,</b> ( ) |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 1      | L2         | 412          | 13.0    | 0.777 | 29.7    | LOS C    | 12.4     | 96.6     | 0.97   | 0.93      | 37.3    |
| 2      | T1         | 976          | 10.5    | 0.857 | 29.1    | LOS C    | 16.6     | 126.6    | 1.00   | 1.06      | 33.0    |
| Appro  | ach        | 1387         | 11.2    | 0.857 | 29.3    | LOS C    | 16.6     | 126.6    | 0.99   | 1.02      | 34.5    |
| East:  | M4 Off-Ra  | mp (E)       |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4      | L2         | 207          | 31.0    | 0.254 | 7.2     | LOS A    | 1.2      | 10.7     | 0.33   | 0.64      | 51.2    |
| 5      | T1         | 3            | 0.0     | 0.859 | 34.0    | LOS C    | 9.7      | 70.9     | 1.00   | 1.02      | 36.4    |
| 6      | R2         | 557          | 4.9     | 0.859 | 39.6    | LOS D    | 9.7      | 70.9     | 1.00   | 1.02      | 31.5    |
| Appro  | bach       | 767          | 11.9    | 0.859 | 30.8    | LOS C    | 9.7      | 70.9     | 0.82   | 0.92      | 35.5    |
| North  | : Prospect | Hwy (N)      |         |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 8      | T1         | 400          | 32.1    | 0.231 | 5.5     | LOS A    | 3.0      | 26.9     | 0.47   | 0.39      | 52.0    |
| 9      | R2         | 617          | 6.0     | 0.866 | 39.6    | LOS D    | 10.8     | 79.5     | 1.00   | 1.00      | 31.3    |
| Appro  | bach       | 1017         | 16.3    | 0.866 | 26.1    | LOS C    | 10.8     | 79.5     | 0.79   | 0.76      | 36.1    |
| All Ve | hicles     | 3172         | 13.0    | 0.866 | 28.7    | LOS C    | 16.6     | 126.6    | 0.88   | 0.91      | 35.3    |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move      | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |                         |                         |       |                                   |                           |                 |                                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mov<br>ID | Description                        | Demand<br>Flow<br>ped/h | Average<br>Delay<br>sec |       | Average Back<br>Pedestrian<br>ped | of Queue<br>Distance<br>m | Prop.<br>Queued | Effective<br>Stop Rate<br>per ped |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1S       | South Slip/Bypass Lane<br>Crossing | 53                      | 9.1                     | LOS A | 0.0                               | 0.0                       | 0.55            | 0.55                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4        | West Full Crossing                 | 53                      | 17.7                    | LOS B | 0.1                               | 0.1                       | 0.77            | 0.77                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe    | destrians                          | 105                     | 13.4                    | LOS B |                                   |                           | 0.66            | 0.66                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Wednesday, 29 November 2017 11:04:32 AM Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171129 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy -Development.sip7

#### Site: 102 [2. Prospect Hwy / Reservoir Rd - Development PM]

Development PM Peak

Signals - Fixed Time Isolated Cycle Time = 150 seconds (Practical Cycle Time)

| Move   | ement Pe   | rformance | - Veh <u>ic</u> | les   |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
|--------|------------|-----------|-----------------|-------|---------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|
| Mov    | OD         | Demand    | Flows           | Deg.  | Average | Level of | 95% Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective | Average |
| ID     | Mov        | Total     | HV              | Satn  | Delay   | Service  | Vehicles | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate | Speed   |
| Couth  | Ducoucod   | veh/h     | %               | v/c   | sec     |          | veh      | m        |        | per veh   | km/h    |
|        | : Prospect | , ,       |                 |       |         |          | 40.0     |          | 4 0 0  |           |         |
| 1      | L2         | 277       | 9.7             | 0.889 | 57.8    | LOS E    | 48.3     | 362.9    | 1.00   | 0.99      | 29.1    |
| 2      | T1         | 1016      | 7.6             | 0.889 | 53.0    | LOS D    | 48.3     | 362.9    | 0.98   | 0.98      | 26.8    |
| 3      | R2         | 42        | 42.9            | 0.335 | 78.1    | LOS E    | 3.0      | 28.9     | 0.98   | 0.75      | 21.4    |
| Appro  | bach       | 1335      | 9.1             | 0.889 | 54.8    | LOS D    | 48.3     | 362.9    | 0.99   | 0.97      | 27.1    |
| East:  | Reservoir  | Rd (E)    |                 |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 4      | L2         | 100       | 41.0            | 0.469 | 38.7    | LOS D    | 4.3      | 40.9     | 0.95   | 0.78      | 31.3    |
| 5      | T1         | 7         | 42.9            | 0.469 | 33.0    | LOS C    | 4.3      | 40.9     | 0.95   | 0.78      | 34.6    |
| 6      | R2         | 165       | 36.4            | 0.472 | 39.1    | LOS D    | 7.8      | 71.9     | 0.91   | 0.80      | 28.3    |
| Appro  | bach       | 272       | 38.2            | 0.472 | 38.8    | LOS D    | 7.8      | 71.9     | 0.92   | 0.79      | 29.5    |
| North  | : Prospect | Hwy (N)   |                 |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 7      | L2         | 77        | 48.1            | 0.474 | 34.8    | LOS C    | 10.5     | 97.4     | 0.86   | 0.75      | 33.6    |
| 8      | T1         | 406       | 32.5            | 0.474 | 28.6    | LOS C    | 11.1     | 99.1     | 0.86   | 0.73      | 35.9    |
| 9      | R2         | 97        | 16.5            | 0.704 | 89.9    | LOS F    | 3.8      | 30.7     | 1.00   | 0.81      | 21.3    |
| Appro  | bach       | 580       | 31.9            | 0.704 | 39.7    | LOS D    | 11.1     | 99.1     | 0.88   | 0.75      | 31.5    |
| West:  | Reservoir  | r Rd (W)  |                 |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |
| 10     | L2         | 141       | 7.8             | 0.475 | 50.6    | LOS D    | 7.7      | 58.2     | 0.95   | 0.84      | 29.1    |
| 11     | T1         | 5         | 60.0            | 0.475 | 45.0    | LOS D    | 7.7      | 58.2     | 0.95   | 0.84      | 30.5    |
| 12     | R2         | 131       | 10.7            | 0.239 | 47.2    | LOS D    | 7.1      | 54.2     | 0.79   | 0.76      | 31.6    |
| Appro  | bach       | 277       | 10.1            | 0.475 | 48.9    | LOS D    | 7.7      | 58.2     | 0.87   | 0.80      | 30.3    |
| All Ve | hicles     | 2464      | 17.8            | 0.889 | 48.8    | LOS D    | 48.3     | 362.9    | 0.94   | 0.88      | 28.6    |
|        |            |           |                 |       |         |          |          |          |        |           |         |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (SIDRA). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site 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.

| Move   | Movement Performance - Pedestrians |        |         |          |              |          |        |           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|--------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mov    |                                    | Demand | Average | Level of | Average Back | of Queue | Prop.  | Effective |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ID     | Description                        | Flow   | Delay   | Service  | Pedestrian   | Distance | Queued | Stop Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|        |                                    | ped/h  | sec     |          | ped          | m        |        | per ped   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1     | South Full Crossing                | 20     | 69.2    | LOS F    | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.96   | 0.96      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4     | West Full Crossing                 | 20     | 36.1    | LOS D    | 0.1          | 0.1      | 0.69   | 0.69      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Pe | destrians                          | 40     | 52.6    | LOS E    |              |          | 0.83   | 0.83      |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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.

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2017 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com

Organisation: PARKING AND TRAFFIC CONSULTANTS | Processed: Wednesday, 29 November 2017 11:04:34 AM

Project: Z:\PCI - PROJECT WORK FILES\NSW\DepartmentofPlanning - Prospect South Rezoing\Analysis\171129 - SIDRA - Prospect Hwy - Development.sip7

Attachment 5 TCS Plans (Existing & Proposed)



|        | REFERENCE PLANS                                    | U.B.D. Ref. Map 189 A16                   | DESIGN APPROVAL                               | RMS ACCEPTANCE                 | ROADS AND MARITIME SERVICES EXISTING PROPOSED       |             |
|--------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------|
|        | SYMBOLS/ABBS. VD003-6<br>STD POSIT VD001-5         | I.S.G. E: 292 160<br>CO-ORDS N: 1 257 820 | APPROVED                                      |                                | CADD FILE: \/\/4523_1B.dap                          |             |
|        | PRES. DETECT VC005-17                              | DESIGNED V STANTON                        | dance   | Neil C. Bitch<br>POSITION NOTL |   | ,           |
|        | VEH. GROUP OP TS-TN-019<br>DET. LOGIC OP TS-TN-020 | CHECKED K.IRONSIDE                        |   | DATE04-02-2013                 | TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT                                  | В           |
| í<br>) | PED. MOVEMNT OP TS-TN-021                          | V STANTON                                 | DATE  | ACCEPTED                       |   |             |
|        |  | SITE CHECKED<br>K Ironsick 31-01-2013     | DESIGN PREPARED BY<br>ROAD DESIGN ENGINEERING | POSITIONRN MGR                 |   | 1           |
|        | SURVEYOR: W. CHO   DATE: 04/06/12                  | RECOMMENDED                               | ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY<br>NETWORK MANAGEMENT  | DATE <u>05-03-2013</u>         | DESIGN LAYOUT PROSPECT TCS No 4523 0644.040.VV.4523 | 1           |
|        |  |   |   |                                | © COPYRIGHT ROADS AND MARITIM                       | IME SERVICE |

## DATE IN SERVICE : 01/10/2013



# Transport Roads & Maritime

Services

| POSTS | TYPE | LENGTH | OFFSET | REMARKS    |
|-------|------|--------|--------|------------|
| 1     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 2     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 3     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 4     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.4    | EXISTING   |
| 5     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 6     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 7     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 8     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.1    | EXISTING   |
| 9     | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 10    | 2    | 4.1    | 1.0    | EXISTING   |
| 11    | 9    | -      | 1.0    | EXISTING # |

# POSTS

# Type 9 mast arm with 6.0m outreach

TO WETHERILL PARK

3% Up 2 additional arrows at standard spacing

# SIGNAL GROUP / PHASE CHART

| GNAL | PHASE DU | RING WHICI | H GREEN D | SPLAYED | STANDARD | REMARKS         |
|------|----------|------------|-----------|---------|----------|-----------------|
| ROUP | А        | В          | С         | D       | TABLE    | REIMARKS        |
| V1   | Х        |            |           |         | 1        |                 |
| V2   | Х        | Х          |           | Х       | 3        |                 |
| V3   |          | Х          |           | Х       | 34       | Non-filter.     |
| V4   |          |            | Х         |         | 1        |                 |
| V5   | х        |            |           |         | 1        |                 |
| P1   | Х        |            |           |         | 1        |                 |
| P2   |          | Х          | Х         | х       | 25       | Walk for green. |





| Detector    |       | S       | pecification | S               |              |  |
|-------------|-------|---------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
|             | FN    | A(L)    | A(E2)        |                 |              |  |
| A1          | SG/PS | Ā       | А            |                 |              |  |
|             | DS    | _       | _            |                 |              |  |
|             | FN    | A(L)    | A(E3)        |                 |              |  |
| A2          | SG/PS | Ā       | А            |                 |              |  |
|             | DS    | _       | _            |                 |              |  |
|             | FN    | A(L)    | A(E          | 1)              |              |  |
| A-B-D       | SG/PS | V2      |              | A               |              |  |
|             | DS    | B.D     | B(NEXT)      | ).D(NEXT)       |              |  |
| cont.       | FN    | B(E     | 1)           | D(              | E1)          |  |
| A-B-D       | SG/PS | ł       | 3            | D               |              |  |
|             | DS    | A(NEXT) | .D(NEXT)     | A(NEXT).B(NEXT) |              |  |
|             | FN    | B(L)    | D(L)         | B(E2)           | D(E2)        |  |
| B-D         | SG/PS | V3      | V3           | В               | D            |  |
|             | DS    | —       | Z+           | D(NEXT)         | B(NEXT)      |  |
|             | FN    | C(PR)   | C(E2)        | SEE NOTE 4      |              |  |
| C1          | SG/PS | Ē       | С            |                 |              |  |
|             | DS    | XSF1    | XSF1         | -               |              |  |
|             | FN    | C(L)    | C(E1)        |                 |              |  |
| C2          | SG/PS | ō       | С            |                 |              |  |
|             | DS    | _       | —            |                 |              |  |
|             | FN    | A(I     | PB)          | Reintro         | duce Walk    |  |
| P1<br>P.B.  | SG/PS | P1(V    | /ALK)        | A.P1            | (WALK)       |  |
| F.D.        | DS    | -       | _            | B.              | Ē.D          |  |
| P2          | FN    | B(F     | РВ)          | Auto Intro      | Walk for grn |  |
| P.B.        | SG/PS | A.P2(   | WALK)        | B+C+D           | B+C+D        |  |
| <b>F.D.</b> | DS    | ō       | .D           |                 |              |  |



# DATE IN SERVICE : 00/00/00



# Image: ServicesImage: Services

# SIGNAL GROUP PHASE CHART

| SIGNAL | Р | HAS | E DI | JRIN | IG W | /HICI | h Gf | REE | N IS | DISF | ۶LA | ′ED | STANDARD  |                         |
|--------|---|-----|------|------|------|-------|------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|-----------|-------------------------|
| GROUP  | А | В   | С    | D    | D1   | D2    | Е    | F1  | F2   | G    | G1  | G2  | TABLES    | CONDITIONS              |
| V1     | Х | Х   |      |      |      |       |      |     |      |      | Х   |     | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V2     | Х |     | Х    |      |      |       |      |     |      |      |     | Х   | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V3     |   | Х   |      |      |      |       |      |     |      | Х    | X   |     | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V4     |   |     | Х    |      |      |       |      |     |      | Х    |     | Х   | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V5     |   |     |      |      | Х    |       | Х    | X   |      |      |     |     | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V6     |   |     |      |      |      | х     | Х    |     | х    |      |     |     | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V7     |   |     |      | X    | х    |       |      | X   |      |      |     |     | TS-TN-027 | Timed RA for P2 WALK ** |
| V8     |   |     |      | X    |      | Х     |      |     | х    |      |     |     | TS-TN-027 |                         |
| V9     |   |     |      | Х    | х    |       |      | X   |      |      |     |     | 156       | Timed RA for P1 WALK ^^ |
| V10    |   |     |      | X    |      | Х     |      |     | Х    |      |     |     | 126       |                         |
| V11    |   |     | Х    |      |      |       |      |     |      | х    |     | Х   | 126       |                         |
| V12    |   | Х   |      |      |      |       |      |     |      | Х    | Х   |     | 156       | Timed RA for P2 WALK ** |
| P1     | Х | Х   |      |      |      |       |      |     |      |      | Х   |     | 108       |                         |
| P2     |   |     |      |      |      | х     | Х    |     | Х    |      |     |     | 112       |                         |

\*\* RA protection extended by PB on post 3, subject to timer ^^ RA protection extended by PB on post 5, subject to timer



D1 / F1 PHASE

E PHASE

B / G1 PHASE



D PHASE



D2 / F2 PHASE





MOVEMENTS

| RVICES           |                              | PROPOSED                      |                   |  |
|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| REA              | CADD FILE: VV4724_1A.dgn     |                               |                   |  |
|                  | SCALE 5 0 (1:200)            | 5 10                          |                   |  |
| ICILIATION DR    | FILE SF2015/182674           | SUPERSEDES<br>SHEET/ISSUE -/- | A                 |  |
| D<br>TCS No 4724 | REG NO. <b>DS2015/003013</b> | TCS No. <b>4724</b>           | SHEET 1           |  |
|                  | Revision 1 - August 2014     | © COPYRIGHT ROADS AND         | MARITIME SERVICES |  |