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Ground floor 20 Chandos Street

PO Box 21
St Leonards NSW 1590
0294939500
www.emmconsulting.com.au

9 September 2022

Anna Johnston
FPD Pty Ltd
PO BOX H219
Australia Square
NSW 1215

## Re: Traffic assessment for the planning proposal at 776 \& 792-794 Botany Road and 33-37 Henry Kendall Crescent, Mascot

Dear Anna,
This letter responds to the traffic related matters raised by Cardno, on behalf of Bayside Council, in the form of an agency submission ${ }^{1}$ for the subject planning proposal.

## 1 Background

The initial proposal for this site was considered in late 2017 and EMM Consulting (EMM), on behalf of NSW Land and Housing Corporation, prepared the traffic impact assessment ( $\mathrm{TIA}^{2}$ ) to accompany the planning proposal to Bayside Council.

Following submission of the proposal, a number of urban design, planning and traffic related issues were raised by council which has resulted amendment of the land use and design. In addition, EMM's traffic report was independently reviewed by Bayside Council's appointed consultant Bitzios Consulting. Bitzios has made a number of traffic and parking related comments. A letter ${ }^{3}$ was prepared by EMM in response to the issues raised by Bitzios.

Subsequently EMM's letter and SIDRA files have been reviewed by a council appointed traffic consultant, Cardno, who has raised further traffic related matters for this development. This letter responds to Cardno's traffic related matters.

[^0]
## 2 Intersection survey

Cardno has suggested to validate the queue length for Botany Road/Coward Street intersection SIDRA model. As the traffic count data is currently over five years old and the traffic on the road network is now back to a new (post Covid) normal, a new set of traffic counts was organised on Tuesday, 16 August 2022 (non-school holiday period) between the following peak hours:

- $\quad 6$ to 9 am
- 3 to 6 pm

Concurrent to the survey, the intersection queuing was observed in both the AM and PM peak hours. The peak hour periods are determined to be 8:00 am to 9:00 am and 4:45 pm to 5:45 pm respectively. The peak hour traffic volumes are presented in Figure 2.1.


Figure 2.1 AM and PM peak intersection count data for Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

Bus traffic volumes were collected separately from heavy vehicle traffic volumes. Bus traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak hour are presented in Figure 2.2.


Figure 2.2 Bus volumes in the AM and PM peak for Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

The traffic volumes at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection from Tuesday 16 August 2022 are compared with the traffic volumes from Thursday 18 May 2017. The results are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

| Year | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Peak hour | Total peak hour traffic <br> volume | Peak hour | Total peak hour traffic <br> volume |
| 2017 | $7: 45 \mathrm{am}-8: 45 \mathrm{am}$ | 2,866 | $4: 30 \mathrm{pm}-5: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ | 2,848 |
| 2022 | $8: 00 \mathrm{am}-9: 00 \mathrm{am}$ | 2,695 | $4: 45 \mathrm{pm}-5: 45 \mathrm{pm}$ | 2,683 |

It should be noted that on 16 August 2022, Greater Sydney was not subject to any COVID restrictions that may have impacted the level of traffic. Hence, the current traffic conditions are considered the new normal, but may still be subject to future variations due to new regional transport infrastructure, such as the M8 Motorway.

It can be observed from Table 2.1 that there was a $6 \%$ reduction in traffic in the AM and PM peak hour in 2022 when compared to 2017 levels. This can be attributed to the M8 opening on 5 July 2020, which has reduced traffic volumes in the Mascot area.

## 3 Proposed driveway

The site driveway access is proposed to be retained on Botany Road due to the following reasons:

- Currently with the existing site footprint there are four driveways on Botany Road. It is proposed that the four driveways will be consolidated to one single left-in/left-out driveway on Botany Road, however, if the ambulance use is retained on site, the ambulance driveway could be separated from the residential driveway. The reduced number of driveways will improve traffic safety on Botany Road.
- The traffic volumes in the locality, including Botany Road, is decreasing which will continue over the next decade due to a number of major transport infrastructure projects in the area. This has been discussed in subsequent sections of this letter. The reduced traffic volumes along Botany Road would have less safety impact in the future, compared to the current situation of four driveways with higher traffic volumes in Botany Road.
- The traffic speed along Botany Road, at the site frontage, has been restricted to $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in recent years. This reduced traffic speed would minimise any rear end type of crashes for the entering vehicles onto the site driveway. Furthermore, the minimum sight distance for the driveway access will be achieved as stipulated in AS2890.1 (Figure 3.1).


| Frontage road speed (Note 4) km/h | Distance $(Y)$ along frontage road m |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Access driveways other than domestic (Note 5) |  | Domestic property access (Note 6) |
|  | Desirable 5 s gap | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minimum } \\ & \text { SSD } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 40 | 55 | 35 | 30 |
| 50 | 69 | 45 | 40 |
| 60 | 83 | 65 | 55 |
| 70 | 97 | 85 | 70 |
| 80 | 111 | 105 | 95 |
| 90 | 125 | 130 | Use values from $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ columns |
| 100 | 139 | 160 |  |
| 110 | 153 | 190 |  |

Figure 3.1 Site distance requirements for access driveways

- During the detailed design stage, the driveway width could be minimised as much as possible, based on the swept path assessments, to minimise pedestrian/vehicular conflicts at the driveway. The turning traffic would be aware of the presence of pedestrians on the footpath. However, to improve visibility, the proposed driveway could be line marked (hatching). This would alert both motorists and pedestrians to the presence of this driveway.
- During the detailed design, the sightlines of the driveway will be specified to comply with the pedestrian sight triangles as stipulated in AS2890.1.


DIMENSIONS IN METRES

Figure 3.2 Minimum sightlines for pedestrian safety

- The existing residential amenity would potentially be compromised by any alternative Henry Kendall Crescent access driveway due to increased vehicular activity and the operation of heavy vehicles, eg waste collection and removalist vehicles.
- If the proposed driveway is provided in Henry Kendall Crescent, the traffic congestion at both accesses of Henry Kendall Crescent with Coward Street would be increased in the future. During the site inspections, vehicles on Coward Street were frequently observed to queue across these intersections resulting in significant access difficulty for the existing Henry Kendall Crescent residents. On one occasion a vehicle was observed to take nearly five minutes to turn right from Henry Kendall Crescent to Coward Street due to the queued vehicles along Coward Street. This situation is likely to worsen for the existing residents and the future occupants of this site if the vehicular access was to be provided via Henry Kendall Crescent.

Due to the above reasons, the proposed vehicular access to the site is preferred on Botany Road, over Henry Kendall Crescent.

## 4 Trip distribution

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data from the Census of Population and Housing 2016 is published on home.id.com.au (ID). In our traffic impact assessment, ID data has been used to determine the trip distribution, based on the employment locations of residents from Bayside Local Government Area (LGA). The route selection for each journey is taken as the fastest route between the site and the destination.

Based on the ID data, the following trip distribution has been devised for the general distribution of traffic at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection for a person resident in the Bayside LGA during the AM peak:

- $45.3 \%$ of traffic will be travelling north along Botany Road.
- $\quad 23.5 \%$ of traffic will be travelling west along Coward Street.
- $27.8 \%$ of traffic will be travelling south along Botany Road.
- $3.3 \%$ of traffic will be travelling east along Coward Street.

It is assumed that these traffic flows will be reversed in the PM peak.
It is noted that the revised percentages all differ from the original estimates by no more than $10 \%$ (the original TIA estimates were $40 \%, 30 \%, 20 \%$ and $10 \%$ respectively). Hence, for this project, any net trip generation for any lane turning movement will only differ by a maximum of 1 vehicle per hour, which will have negligible impacts on the assessed intersection performance. Nevertheless, the latest revised trip distributions have been used for this analysis.

The TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments Updated Traffic Surveys (2013) suggests the following traffic generation rates for high density residential developments, which is used to generate Table 4.1:

- $\quad 0.19$ trips per unit in the AM peak hour;
- $\quad 0.15$ trips per unit in the PM peak hour; and
- $\quad 1.52$ daily trips per unit.

Table 4.1 Trip generation
\(\left.\begin{array}{llll}Period \& Trip generation rate \& \begin{array}{l}Proposed trip generation (152 <br>

units)\end{array} \& Net trip generation\end{array}\right]\)| AM peak hour | 0.19 | 28.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PM peak hour | 0.15 | 22.8 |
| Daily | 1.52 | 231.1 |

The proportion of inbound and outbound traffic movements for each type of land use is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Inbound and outbound movement proportion during peak hours

| Land use | AM peak hour | PM peak hour |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Residential | $20 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $20 \%$ |

To analyse the trip distribution, $80 \%$ of the hourly trip movements are assumed to be outbound movements in the AM peak and $80 \%$ inbound movements in the PM peak hour as this is a residential development.

### 4.1 Traffic Distribution

The traffic distribution has been analysed based on the residential driveway access via Botany Road. Ambulances will also access Botany Road via a separate driveway.

All the site exiting traffic will be turning left and travelling in the northbound direction. All the site entering traffic will pass through the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection and turn left into the driveway.

In the AM and PM peak, the following trip distribution in Figure 4.1 is estimated based on ID data, which is used to calculate the number of vehicles per approach. The inbound movements that will pass through the Botany

Road/Coward Street intersection will account for only 20\% of trip movements in the AM peak, hence the total number of net additional trips travelling via the intersection is 5 ( $20 \%$ of 24.1 total net trips). The inbound site movements that pass through the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection will account for $80 \%$ of trip movements in the PM peak, hence the total number of net trips travelling via the intersection is 15 ( $80 \%$ of 19.0 total net trips).


1. $\%=$ proportion of total trips generated to and from the site during the AM or PM peak.
2. Due to rounding, 1 vehicle has been added to the Coward Street (east) approach during the AM peak to ensure that the total nu mber of trip movements equals to 5 .
3. Due to rounding, the total percentage does not add up to $20 \%$ and $80 \%$ in the $A M$ and $P M$ peaks respectively

Figure 4.1 Peak hour net trip generation at Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

## 5 Cumulative traffic impact assessment

This project is anticipated to be completed in Q1 2026. The following sections highlight other projects that will affect the traffic volumes at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection.

### 5.1 Mascot Commercial and Civic Precinct

The site is located at the north-east corner of Botany Road/Coward Street (997-1005 Botany Road \& 124-128 Coward Street, Roseberry) which is proposed to be a part of the Mascot Commercial and Civic Precinct.

Searches for the development application on this project yielded no results, so as a conservative measure, the highest net traffic volumes from a previous traffic impact assessment is used to model the cumulative scenario. In both the morning and afternoon peak hours, the net additional traffic from 997-1005 Botany Road \& 124-128 Coward Street, Roseberry is forecast to be a maximum of 288 vehicle trips, generally travelling inbound in the AM peak hour and outbound in the PM peak hour.

Based on the ID data, the following trip distribution has been devised for the general distribution of traffic at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection for a worker employed in the Bayside LGA during the AM peak:

- $50.3 \%$ of traffic will be travelling from the south on Botany Road.
- $22.5 \%$ of traffic will be travelling from the west on Coward Street.
- $24.9 \%$ of traffic will be travelling from the north on Botany Road.
- $2.2 \%$ of traffic will be travelling from the east on Coward Street.

It is assumed that these traffic flows will be reversed in the PM peak.
Based on the distribution of 100\% inbound traffic during the AM peak and 100\% outbound traffic during the PM peak for commercial trip generation movements, the peak hour net trip generation from 997-1005 Botany Road \& 124-128 Coward Street, Roseberry is shown in Figure 5.1.


Figure 5.1 997-1005 Botany Road \& 124-128 Coward Street, Roseberry peak hour net trip generation

### 5.2 Planned development in Mascot

Other current development in the Mascot area is focused further west in the area near the Mascot Rail Station (Bourke Road/Coward Street intersection) so there is only limited future development potential in the Botany Road locality. Consequently, the requirements for assessing cumulative traffic impacts from other developments are minimal.

### 5.3 Major infrastructure projects

The following major road projects will be opened ahead of the anticipated completion date of this project and will be part of any cumulative scenario:

- M4-M5 link and the Rozelle Interchange planned for completion in 2023;
- Sydney Gateway planned for completion in Q4 2023;
- M6 Stage 1 planned for completion in Q4 2024; and
- Western Harbour Tunnel planned for completion in Q1 2026.

The combination of all these projects is expected to significantly drop traffic on Botany Road and therefore improve any future intersection performance at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection.

According to the M4-M5 link Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), overall traffic on Botany Road is forecast to be $9 \%$ lower in the 2023 cumulative scenario compared to the 2023 baseline scenario. Overall traffic is still forecast to be 1\% lower in the 2033 cumulative scenario compared to the 2023 baseline scenario. The 2023 baseline scenario is defined as the traffic conditions that would occur without the M4-M5 link.

The Sydney Gateway EIS also highlights that Botany Road would handle 25 to 30 per cent less traffic in 2036 than it would without the Sydney Gateway project.

Overall, it can be seen that due to the planned substantial improvements to the road network in the surrounding area beyond 2023, there will almost certainly be a further substantial drop in background traffic volumes at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection.

With substantial drops to the baseline traffic in the future, any modelling of a cumulative traffic scenario would only see improvements to the current intersection performance. Similarly, a sensitivity test in the 5 to 10 year horizon may not be accurate due to the forecast drop in background traffic on Botany Road, as mentioned previously.

## 6 SIDRA analysis

SIDRA analyses at the Botany Road/Coward Street have been performed on the following scenarios:

- Existing traffic volumes in 2022; and
- Existing and development traffic volumes in 2026.

As highlighted in Section 5.3, traffic volumes near the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection are expected to drop. Therefore, the usual method of applying a growth rate to background traffic does not apply. However to perform a conservative SIDRA analysis, the development scenarios will maintain the existing 2022 levels of traffic.

Cumulative scenarios and sensitivity tests have not been performed due to the forecast drop in traffic mentioned previously.

The SIDRA results for the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection are shown in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 SIDRA results for the existing and development scenarios at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

| Peak hour | Scenario | Intersection <br> volumes | DOS | LOS | DEL (s) | Q95 (m) | Q95 <br> approach <br> (direction) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AM | Existing | 2,695 | 0.891 | D | 44.3 | 320.5 | South (LT and <br> TH) |
| PM | Existing | 2,682 | 0.900 | D | 43.6 | 221.0 | North (TH) |
| AM | With | 2,700 | 0.892 | D | 44.4 | 321.3 | South (LT and |
| PM | With | 2,697 | 0.915 | D |  | 44.0 | 221.0 |

[^1]The above SIDRA results show the model parameters will marginally increase (eg DOS and 95\%ile queue) due to the proposed development, but there will be no change of LOS. Therefore, the net traffic impact at Botany Road/Coward Street intersection due to this development would be marginal.

## 7 SIDRA model validation

Model validation is the term used to describe the independent verification process used to demonstrate that a model has been calibrated to a sufficient extent to accurately reproduce on-street conditions.

As shown in Table 7.1 and Table 7.2, the queue lengths and phase timing for the survey and model are compared.

Table 7.1 Queue lengths for Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

| Approach | AM |  | PM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Observed queue (m) | Modelled queue (m) | Observed queue (m) | Modelled queue (m) |
| Botany Road (north <br> approach) | 55 | 63.1 | 210 | 221.0 |
| Coward Street (east <br> approach) | 95 | 113.6 | 60 | 86.4 |
| Botany Road (south <br> approach) | 335 | 320.5 | 110 | 125.8 |
| Coward Street (west <br> approach) | 180 | 159.9 | 150 | 163.9 |

Table 7.2 Phase time for Botany Road/Coward Street intersection

| Phase | AM |  | PM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Observed phase time (s) | Modelled phase time (s) | Observed phase time (s) |
| A | 60 | 56 | 41 |
| M | 25 | 26 | 23 |
| E | 28 | 36 | 27 |
| F | 17 | 12 | 14 |
| Total cycle <br> time | 130 |  | 104 |

The observed queue lengths of the signalised intersection have been recorded for the 2022 survey period. The observed queue and the modelled queue lengths at the signalised intersection are found to be generally consistent. The photographs of the queue lengths on each surveyed period are attached in Appendix C.

The observed and modelled phase times are also found to be generally consistent.

## 8 <br> Response table

Cardno comments and EMM responses are summarised in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1 Cardno comments and EMM responses
Item Item summary Cardno comments
no.

1 It is proposed that the four driveways will be consolidated to one single driveway on Botany Road which will improve traffic safety on Botany Road.

Cardno supports TfNSW's concerns for the proposed Refer to Section 3. singular vehicle access located off Botany Road (State Road No. 170) for the following reasons:
$>\quad$ As per Clause 2(a) in Section 101 of the NSW State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, "where practicable and safe, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road." Considering that an access driveway off Henry Kendall Crescent is feasible and already proposed, an access driveway off Botany Road should not be provided.
> As per Part 3A3.1 of the Botany Bay DCP
2013, Control C 15(i) states that "vehicle access points of the property should not be located in places with high traffic volumes, such as classified or arterial roads", and Control C17 states that "Parking and servicing areas shall be provided from a secondary street frontage or rear lane where possible". The Council DCP further supports the legal requirement outlined above.
$>\quad$ As per the NSW Ambulance Vehicle Access Specifications, "ambulance driveways should be exclusive to ambulance vehicles"1. A single shared driveway off Botany Road between ambulances and future residents is not safe, as ambulances require unimpeded access to and from the ambulance station.
> An access driveway off a classified road is
likely to be considered less safe than off a local road. Drivers accessing the site are at more risk of being rear-ended when slowing down due to the higher traffic volumes on classified roads.
$>\quad$ The DCP nominates Botany Road as the active frontage. Providing vehicular access for the majority of generated traffic off Botany Road would result in poor pedestrian outcomes along Botany Road.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the applicant consider a single driveway off Botany Road for ambulances only, and that the residential flat building only be accessible from Henry Kendall Crescent.

Table 8.1 Cardno comments and EMM responses

| Item <br> no. | Cardno comments | EMM responses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 8.1

| Item no. | Item summary | Cardno comments | EMM responses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Net peak hourly traffic generation. | Further to the above item, no information has been provided to explain the trip distribution assumptions, including which site access driveway vehicles are using (i.e. Henry Kendall Crescent or Botany Road). <br> The majority of vehicles are assumed to originate from Coward Street (west), which appears illogical if Botany Road is a State Road, more heavily trafficked and is the most direct route to and from the Sydney CBD. <br> Consideration should be given to reviewing Journey to Work/ ABS data to identify places of work for residents to improve the accuracy of trip distribution assumptions. | The trip distributions have been revised for the latest analysis. <br> ABS data was used to identify trip distributions, as discussed above. |
| 6 | SIDRA modelling - phasing, cycle times and queue lengths | No information has been provided on how the traffic signal phasing and cycle times were derived, therefore Cardno cannot review the operation of the traffic signals in the SIDRA models. It is possible that the phasing or cycle times in the model may not accurately reflect the site conditions. <br> No queue length data has been provided to assist with validating the queue length results from the SIDRA models. | As stated in Section 2, a site visit was conducted on 16 August 2022 at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection. Traffic signal phasing, cycle times and queue lengths were recorded, which has been used to validate the queue length results from the SIDRA models. |
| 7 | Only traffic from the north would potentially use the Henry Kendall Crescent driveway which equates to six vehicles in an hour, or one in every ten minutes. | It is unclear how the value of 6 veh/h was derived for vehicles originating from a northerly direction. <br> This statement conflicts with Figure 3.2 which shows 0 vehicles originating from a northerly direction in the AM and PM peak hours. | Figure 4.1 has been updated to show the development traffic. |

Table 8.1

| Item no. | Item summary | Cardno comments | EMM responses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | SIDRA Intersection Results | A number of issues have been identified in the SIDRA model, which may be creating inaccurate outputs: | Bus data has been collected separately in the traffic survey from 16 August 2022, which has then input separately in SIDRA. <br> The northern approach lane 1 has been converted to a short lane in parking in the AM peak and consists of a left turn and through movement. <br> Northern approach lane 1 has been converted to a through movement bus lane in the PM peak, with an allowance for general traffic to turn left at the intersection. A southbound lane exclusive to buses in the PM peak has been added after the intersection. <br> The eastern approach lane 1 has been extended to 65 m . <br> Pedestrian movements have been selected as opposing movements. <br> Approach speeds have been updated to match $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit on all roads. |
|  |  | There is no input traffic volume data on buses, which is of particular importance at this |  |
|  |  | location given the southbound Bus Lane on Botany Road. |  |
|  |  | > Northern approach lane 1 is a Bus Lane in the PM Peak, which should be a short lane with parking and have a through movement in addition to |  |
|  |  | the left turn movement. |  |
|  |  | Given the PM Peak southbound Bus Lane, there should be a third through southbound lane exclusive to buses in the PM SIDRA models. |  |
|  |  | Eastern approach lane 1 is a No Parking lane in the AM Peak (approximately 65 m lane length) which is not reflected in the AM SIDRA models. |  |
|  |  | > None of the pedestrian movements have been selected as opposing movements in the |  |
|  |  | Priorities tab and therefore delays as a result of left and/or right turning vehicles is not accounted for. |  |
|  |  | > Approach cruise speeds and exit cruise speeds in SIDRA don't match the $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limits on all roads. |  |

9 Cumulative traffic growth
No consideration has been in regards to the cumulative impact of proposed developments adjacent to or in close proximity to the Subject Site, particularly developments that will impact the Botany Road I Coward Street signalised intersection.
The main development of concern is the Mascot Commercial and Civic Precinct, proposed to be located on the north-eastern corner of Botany Road / Coward Street (997-1005 Botany Road \& 124-128 Coward Street, Roseberry).
It is suggested that the applicant review the relevant Traffic Impact Assessment for this development and model a cumulative development scenario at the Botany Road / Coward Street intersection. Consideration of Sydney Gateway and other major projects in the area should be taken into account.

As mentioned in Section 5.3, traffic volumes are forecast to drop by up to $30 \%$ once the Sydney Gateway and other major projects in the area open.
As a result, a cumulative traffic assessment has not been conducted.

## 9 Conclusions

This letter addresses traffic related matters raised by TfNSW's appointed traffic consultant Cardno. Our further analysis shows that the proposal warrants granting of approval from a traffic and transport perspective based on the intersection modelling at Botany Road/Coward Street, safety assessment of the Coward Street/Henry Kendall Crescent intersections and the proposed site driveway access on Botany Road.

I trust the above information meets your requirements, however, please feel free to call me on 0425478650 if you require any further clarification.

Yours sincerely


Abdullah Uddin
Associate Traffic Engineer
auddin@emmconsulting.com.au

Appendix A
Intersection count data (2022)






## TRANS TRAFFIC SURVEY



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Wentemenat comess |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{1,15}$ |  |  |  | 。 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 退 615 | ${ }^{60}$ | － | － | － | 2 | － | － | 4 | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － |  | － | ${ }^{8}$ |  |
| G45 | ${ }^{700}$ | － | － | － | － | － | － | ${ }^{4}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | 3 | － | － | － | 2 | ${ }^{75}$ |  |
| 700 | 7.15 | － | － | － |  | － | 2 | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 5 |  | 3 | － |  |  |  | ＂ |  |
| ${ }_{7}^{2,18}$ | ${ }_{\substack{238 \\ 7 \\ \hline \\ \hline}}$ | ： | ： | － | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | ： | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ${ }_{6}^{68}$ | $\vdots$ |  | 4 |  | ， |  |  | ${ }_{7}^{81}$ |  |
| ${ }_{7} 78$ | 80 | － | 2 | － |  | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | ， | － | 3 | － | 5 | 。 |  | \％ |  |
| 800 | ${ }_{8}^{8.15}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ： | $\therefore$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | ${ }^{2}$ | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 7 | － | 2 | $\frac{2}{4 n}$ |  |
| 880 | ${ }_{\text {820 }}^{8.5}$ | ！ | ！ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{3}{\circ}$ |  | i | ${ }_{\text {\％}}$ | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | $\vdots$ | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | ${ }_{106}^{106}$ |  |
| 845 | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － |  |  | 2 | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 106 |  |
| ${ }_{\substack{1500 \\ 1555}}^{1}$ |  | ！ | $\stackrel{\square}{3}$ | ！ | ！ | $\bigcirc$ | ！ | ${ }^{82}$ | ${ }_{5}^{5}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | ${ }_{70}^{76}$ |  |
| 1530 | ${ }^{1345}$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |  | ， | － |  | 8 | 3 |  |  | － |  |  |  | ${ }^{8}$ |  |
| $\underset{\substack{1545 \\ 150}}{\text { 150 }}$ | ${ }^{1680}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{15}$ | 5 | ： | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | － | 2 | － | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{19}$ |  |
| 1845 | ${ }_{1030}$ | － | ， | － | ， | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\because$ | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | － | ${ }^{3}$ | － | 3 | － | ， | ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| 1280 | ${ }^{1045}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\pi$ | － |  | ， | － |  |  |  | ${ }^{6}$ |  |
| ${ }_{\text {cose }}$ | ${ }^{1720}$ | － | ！ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | ${ }^{4}$ | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {ltem }}$ | ${ }_{\text {lita }}^{1720}$ | ！ | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | ${ }_{105}^{105}$ | 5 | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ | ， | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | － | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{104}^{109}$ |  |
| ${ }^{123}$ | ${ }^{17265}$ | － | ． |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| ${ }^{17} 45$ | ${ }^{180}$ | 。 | 2 | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | － |  | $\%$ |  |  | 3 | － |  |  | 3 | ${ }^{5}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Henovventem |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{0.15}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{615}$ | －20 | － | － | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{1}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | 3 |  |
| 645 | ${ }_{7}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | － | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | $\bigcirc$ | 3 |  |
|  | 7：15 |  |  |  | － |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| $c275730$ | ${ }^{230}$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $3_{3}$ |  | $\div$ | － | $\div$ | － | － |  | 3 | $\bigcirc$ |
| 745 | ${ }^{80}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\cdots$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － |  |  | 2 |  |
| 800 | ${ }_{8}^{815}$ | ！ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ＋ | ！ | $\bigcirc$ | ！ | $\bigcirc$ | ！ |  | ！ |  |  |
| 830 | \％ | ： | － | ： | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| ${ }_{1500}$ | ${ }_{1815}$ | － | － | － | － | － | － | ${ }^{3}$ | 。 | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |
| ${ }_{15,5}$ | 1350 |  | ： | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1350}$ | ${ }^{13,56}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{15} 15$ | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{10}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － |  |
|  | ${ }^{1830}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | ， |  |
| ${ }_{1} 1845$ | ${ }^{1720}$ | － | － | － | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － | － |  | － | － |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|:\|c\|} \hline 1720 \\ \hline 120 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1780}$ | ${ }_{\text {lize }}^{17}$ | $\div$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{1}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － |  | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ |  |
| ${ }_{1745}$ | ${ }^{180}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ， |  |  |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | － | － | － |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | \％ |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{615}$ | ${ }^{6.05}$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{3}$ | $\div$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\div$ | 3 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | ${ }_{20}^{20}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | － | － |  | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{27}^{2,15}$ | ${ }^{20}$ | － | － | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{2}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | － | － | 3 |  |
| $\xrightarrow{7380}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { res } \\ \text { Res }}}^{\text {en }}$ | ： | － | ： | $\bigcirc$ | $\therefore$ | $\div$ | ${ }_{3}^{3}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{3}$ | － |
| 800 | 8.15 | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | 3. | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 2 | － |
| ${ }^{815}$ | ${ }^{830}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $3^{3}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{8}^{880}$ | ${ }_{\substack{\text { as }}}^{\text {am }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | $\stackrel{2}{4}$ | ！ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ． |  | － | ¢ |  |
| ${ }_{\substack{1580 \\ 1555}}$ | 1845 |  | － | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | 2 | $\bigcirc$ |  | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | 3 |  |
| （1538 | ${ }_{\substack{1385 \\ 185}}^{1}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | － |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| 15.45 | ${ }^{180}$ | － | 。 | － | － | － | － | － | － |  | $\bigcirc$ | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{180}$ | ${ }_{1845}$ | － | 。 | － | － | － | － | 5 | － |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |
| （1250 | ${ }^{1025}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $5_{5}^{5}$ | － |  | － | ： |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\xrightarrow{1245}$ | ${ }^{17200}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | 。 | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{ }{4}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | － | － | － |  | － |  |  |
| ¢1720 |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{2}{3}$ |  |  | $\div$ | － | $\div$ | － | $\because$ | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ |  |
|  | ${ }^{1724}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{1830}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{6015}$ | ${ }^{630}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\therefore$ | $\bigcirc$ | $1 \cdot$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | － | 3 |  |
|  | ${ }_{7}^{645}$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{2}^{2}$ | $\div$ | $\div$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\div$ | 5 | ！ |
|  | 27.5 | 。 | 。 | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | ， | 。 |  | － | － |  |  | － | ${ }^{\text {}}$ |  |
| ${ }^{275}$ | ${ }^{2} 8$ | － | 。 | ＋ | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | ． |  | $\bigcirc$ | 7 | － |
| － | 8 | － | － | － | － |  |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢000 | ${ }^{815}$ | － | － | － | － | － | － | 5 | － | － | － | － | 。 |  | － | $3^{3}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{0}$ | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | 。 | － | 3 |  |
| （esm | $0 \times$ | － | 。 | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | － | 。 |  |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | ${ }^{1315}$ | － | － | － | － | 。 |  | 2 | － |  | － | ： |  |  |  | ． |  |
| （1585 | ${ }_{15}^{15.5}$ | － | － | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ${ }_{2}$ | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ＋ | － | － | 2 |  |
| （158 | ${ }_{1800}$ | － | 。 | － | － |  |  | 4 | － |  | － | $\bigcirc$ | ． |  | ． | 2 |  |
| （1800 | 183 | － | 。 | － | － | － | － | 2 | ， |  | － | － | － |  | 。 |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{1645}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\vdots$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | － | \＆ |  |
| （188 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1215}$ | － |  | ！ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | － | ！ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | － |  | － | 2 |  |
| $\xrightarrow{1717}$ | ${ }^{1723}$ | ． | $\bigcirc$ | ： | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | 3 |  |  | － | － | － |  | 。 | 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix B
SIDRA modelling results

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## 目 Site: 101 [Botany Road/Coward Street Ex AM Peak (Site

Folder: Existing)]
Existing Intersection
Site Category: (None)
Signals - EQUISAT (Fixed-Time/SCATS) Coordinated Cycle Time $=130$ seconds (Site Practical Cycle Time)
Variable Sequence Analysis applied. The results are given for the selected output sequence.

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID | $\begin{array}{r} \text { IN } \\ \text { VOL } \\ \text { [ Total } \\ \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ | UT <br> MES HV ] veh/h |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { NS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay $\qquad$ sec | Level of Service | $95 \% \text { B }$ QU <br> [ Veh. veh | CK OF <br> UE <br> Dist ] <br> m | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. Speed <br> km/h |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 95 | 14 | 100 | 14.7 | * 0.891 | 59.8 | LOS E | 42.2 | 320.5 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.15 | 28.3 |
| 2 T1 | 1053 | 79 | 1108 | 7.5 | * 0.891 | 52.6 | LOS D | 42.2 | 320.5 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 1.14 | 29.0 |
| 3 R2 | 125 | 1 | 132 | 0.8 | * 0.374 | 28.2 | LOS B | 5.1 | 36.2 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 36.0 |
| Approach | 1273 | 94 | 1340 | 7.4 | 0.891 | 50.7 | LOS D | 42.2 | 320.5 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 1.10 | 29.5 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 42 | 0 | 44 | 0.0 | 0.176 | 30.5 | LOS C | 1.8 | 12.5 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.86 | 35.4 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 168 | 1 | 177 | 0.6 | * 0.853 | 53.6 | LOS D | 16.1 | 113.6 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 28.6 |
| 6 R2 | 80 | 1 | 84 | 1.3 | 0.853 | 60.0 | LOS E | 16.1 | 113.6 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.12 | 28.2 |
| Approach | 290 | 2 | 305 | 0.7 | 0.853 | 52.0 | LOS D | 16.1 | 113.6 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 1.07 | 29.3 |
| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 67 | 0 | 71 | 0.0 | 0.157 | 30.8 | LOS C | 3.6 | 30.3 | 0.63 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 35.6 |
| 8 T1 | 510 | 72 | 537 | 14.1 | 0.391 | 18.2 | LOS B | 8.3 | 63.1 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.51 | 40.0 |
| 9 R2 | 86 | 4 | 91 | 4.7 | 0.589 | 37.9 | LOS C | 3.5 | 25.2 | 0.99 | 0.78 | 1.01 | 32.7 |
| Approach | 663 | 76 | 698 | 11.5 | 0.589 | 22.0 | LOS B | 8.3 | 63.1 | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.58 | 38.4 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 145 | 4 | 153 | 2.8 | 0.294 | 43.5 | LOS D | 7.5 | 54.0 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 31.1 |
| 11 T1 | 204 | 1 | 215 | 0.5 | 0.821 | 56.2 | LOS D | 22.0 | 159.9 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.12 | 28.0 |
| 12 R 2 | 120 | 14 | 126 | 11.7 | 0.821 | 60.8 | LOS E | 22.0 | 159.9 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.12 | 27.9 |
| Approach | 469 | 19 | 494 | 4.1 | 0.821 | 53.5 | LOS D | 22.0 | 159.9 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 1.03 | 28.9 |
| All <br> Vehicles | 2695 | 191 | 2837 | 7.1 | 0.891 | 44.3 | LOS D | 42.2 | 320.5 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.96 | 31.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA Standard.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

* Critical Movement (Signal Timing)

| Pedestrian Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & { }_{\text {ID }} \end{aligned}$ | Input Vol. <br> ped/h | Dem. Flow <br> ped/h | Aver. Delay sec $\qquad$ | Level of Service |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACK OF } \\ & \text { JE } \\ & \text { Dist ] } \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Travel Time <br> sec | Travel Dist. $\qquad$ | Aver. Speed <br> $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1 Full | 58 | 61 | 59.3 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 93.0 | 43.8 | 0.47 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P2 Full | 23 | 24 | 31.2 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 58.3 | 35.2 |  |


| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P3 | Full | 66 | 69 | 52.8 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 86.5 | 43.8 |
| West: Coward | Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4 | Full | 28 | 29 | 31.2 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 58.3 | 35.2 |
| All | 175 | 184 | 48.7 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 80.4 | 41.3 | 0.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

## 目 Site: 101 [Botany Road/Coward Street Ex PM Peak (Site

Folder: Existing)]
Existing Intersection
Site Category: (None)
Signals - EQUISAT (Fixed-Time/SCATS) Coordinated Cycle Time $=110$ seconds (Site Practical Cycle Time)
Variable Sequence Analysis applied. The results are given for the selected output sequence.

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INP } \\ & \text { VOLU } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { veh/h } \end{aligned}$ | JT <br> MES HV ] veh/h | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { DEM } \\ \text { FLO } \\ \text { [ Total } \\ \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { VS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service |  | CK OF UE Dist ] m | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate |  | Aver. Speed <br> km/h |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 134 | 16 | 141 | 11.9 | 0.606 | 36.6 | LOS C | 15.1 | 117.3 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 34.2 |
| 2 T1 | 578 | 46 | 608 | 8.0 | 0.606 | 32.2 | LOS C | 17.3 | 125.8 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 34.5 |
| 3 R2 | 83 | 0 | 87 | 0.0 | 0.442 | 31.3 | LOS C | 3.0 | 20.7 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.94 | 34.9 |
| Approach | 795 | 62 | 837 | 7.8 | 0.606 | 32.9 | LOS C | 17.3 | 125.8 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 34.5 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 44 | 0 | 46 | 0.0 | 0.172 | 25.0 | LOS B | 1.6 | 11.2 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.83 | 37.5 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 166 | 1 | 175 | 0.6 | * 0.833 | 41.9 | LOS C | 12.3 | 86.4 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 1.05 | 31.4 |
| 6 R2 | 74 | 1 | 78 | 1.4 | 0.833 | 48.5 | LOS D | 12.3 | 86.4 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 1.07 | 30.9 |
| Approach | 284 | 2 | 299 | 0.7 | 0.833 | 41.0 | LOS C | 12.3 | 86.4 | 0.93 | 0.84 | 1.02 | 32.1 |
| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 75 | 0 | 79 | 0.0 | 0.164 | 32.6 | LOS C | 2.6 | 20.2 | 0.74 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 34.7 |
| 8 T1 | 967 | 49 | 1018 | 5.1 | * 0.900 | 50.2 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.96 | 1.05 | 1.22 | 29.7 |
| 9 R2 | 131 | 0 | 138 | 0.0 | * 0.540 | 29.6 | LOS C | 4.8 | 33.9 | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 35.3 |
| Approach | 1173 | 49 | 1235 | 4.2 | 0.900 | 46.7 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 30.5 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 47 | 0 | 49 | 0.0 | 0.213 | 41.1 | LOS C | 4.0 | 28.0 | 0.84 | 0.71 | 0.84 | 32.4 |
| 11 T1 | 220 | 1 | 232 | 0.5 | * 0.899 | 54.9 | LOS D | 22.5 | 163.9 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.23 | 28.2 |
| 12 R2 | 163 | 16 | 172 | 9.8 | 0.899 | 63.5 | LOS E | 22.5 | 163.9 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.31 | 27.2 |
| Approach | 430 | 17 | 453 | 4.0 | 0.899 | 56.7 | LOS E | 22.5 | 163.9 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 1.22 | 28.2 |
| All <br> Vehicles | 2682 | 130 | 2823 | 4.8 | 0.900 | 43.6 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 1.07 | 31.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA Standard.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

* Critical Movement (Signal Timing)

| Pedestrian Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & { }_{\text {ID }} \end{aligned}$ | Input Vol. <br> ped/h | Dem. Flow <br> ped/h | Aver. Delay sec $\qquad$ | Level of Service |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACK OF } \\ & \text { JE } \\ & \text { Dist ] } \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Travel Time <br> sec | Travel Dist. $\qquad$ | Aver. Speed <br> $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1 Full | 41 | 43 | 49.3 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 82.9 | 43.8 | 0.53 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P2 Full | 23 | 24 | 31.3 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 58.4 | 35.2 |  |


| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P3 | Full | 35 | 37 | 48.3 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 82.0 | 43.8 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4 Full | 31 | 33 | 31.4 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 58.4 | 35.2 | 0.60 |
| All | 130 | 137 | 41.6 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 72.5 | 40.2 | 0.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

## Site: 101 [Botany Road/Coward Street Dev AM Peak (Site

Folder: Development)]
Existing Intersection
Site Category: (None)
Signals - EQUISAT (Fixed-Time/SCATS) Coordinated Cycle Time $=130$ seconds (Site Practical Cycle Time)
Variable Sequence Analysis applied. The results are given for the selected output sequence.

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID |  | UT <br> MES <br> HV ] <br> veh/h | DEM <br> FLO <br> [ Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { VS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn <br> v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service | 95\% B QU [ Veh. veh | CK OF <br> UE <br> Dist ] <br> m | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. Speed <br> km/h |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 95 | 14 | 100 | 14.7 | * 0.892 | 59.9 | LOS E | 42.3 | 321.3 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.15 | 28.2 |
| 2 T1 | 1054 | 79 | 1109 | 7.5 | * 0.892 | 52.7 | LOS D | 42.3 | 321.3 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 1.14 | 29.0 |
| 3 R2 | 125 | 1 | 132 | 0.8 | * 0.374 | 28.2 | LOS B | 5.1 | 36.2 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 36.0 |
| Approach | 1274 | 94 | 1341 | 7.4 | 0.892 | 50.9 | LOS D | 42.3 | 321.3 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 1.10 | 29.5 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 42 | 0 | 44 | 0.0 | 0.177 | 30.5 | LOS C | 1.8 | 12.6 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 0.86 | 35.4 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 168 | 1 | 177 | 0.6 | * 0.856 | 53.8 | LOS D | 16.2 | 114.3 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 1.11 | 28.5 |
| 6 R2 | 81 | 1 | 85 | 1.2 | 0.856 | 60.1 | LOS E | 16.2 | 114.3 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.12 | 28.1 |
| Approach | 291 | 2 | 306 | 0.7 | 0.856 | 52.2 | LOS D | 16.2 | 114.3 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 1.08 | 29.2 |
| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 67 | 0 | 71 | 0.0 | 0.157 | 30.8 | LOS C | 3.6 | 30.3 | 0.63 | 0.66 | 0.63 | 35.6 |
| 8 T1 | 510 | 72 | 537 | 14.1 | 0.391 | 18.2 | LOS B | 8.3 | 63.1 | 0.51 | 0.44 | 0.51 | 40.0 |
| 9 R2 | 86 | 4 | 91 | 4.7 | 0.589 | 37.9 | LOS C | 3.5 | 25.2 | 0.99 | 0.78 | 1.01 | 32.7 |
| Approach | 663 | 76 | 698 | 11.5 | 0.589 | 22.0 | LOS B | 8.3 | 63.1 | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.58 | 38.4 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 148 | 4 | 156 | 2.7 | 0.300 | 43.6 | LOS D | 7.7 | 55.2 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 31.1 |
| 11 T1 | 204 | 1 | 215 | 0.5 | 0.822 | 56.3 | LOS D | 22.0 | 160.0 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.12 | 28.0 |
| 12 R 2 | 120 | 14 | 126 | 11.7 | 0.822 | 60.9 | LOS E | 22.0 | 160.0 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.12 | 27.9 |
| Approach | 472 | 19 | 497 | 4.0 | 0.822 | 53.5 | LOS D | 22.0 | 160.0 | 0.95 | 0.89 | 1.03 | 28.9 |
| All <br> Vehicles | 2700 | 191 | 2842 | 7.1 | 0.892 | 44.4 | LOS D | 42.3 | 321.3 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.96 | 31.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA Standard.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

* Critical Movement (Signal Timing)

| Pedestrian Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \\ & \text { Crossing } \end{aligned}$ | Input Vol. <br> ped/h | Dem. Flow <br> ped/h | Aver. Delay sec $\qquad$ | Level of Service |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACK OF } \\ & \text { JE } \\ & \text { Dist ] } \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Travel Time sec | Travel Dist. $\qquad$ | Aver. <br> Speed <br> $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{sec}$ |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1 Full | 58 | 61 | 59.3 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 93.0 | 43.8 | 0.47 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P2 Full | 23 | 24 | 31.2 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 58.3 | 35.2 |  |


| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P3 | Full | 66 | 69 | 52.8 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 86.5 | 43.8 |
| West: Coward | Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4 | Full | 28 | 29 | 31.2 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 58.3 | 35.2 |
| All | 175 | 184 | 48.7 | LOS E | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 80.4 | 41.3 | 0.51 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

## Site: 101 [Botany Road/Coward Street Dev PM Peak (Site

Folder: Development)]
Existing Intersection
Site Category: (None)
Signals - EQUISAT (Fixed-Time/SCATS) Coordinated Cycle Time $=110$ seconds (Site Practical Cycle Time)
Variable Sequence Analysis applied. The results are given for the selected output sequence.

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INP } \\ & \text { VOLU } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { veh/h } \end{aligned}$ | JT <br> MES HV ] veh/h | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { DEM } \\ \text { FLO } \\ \text { [ Total } \\ \text { veh/h } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ND } \\ & \text { VS } \\ & \text { HV ] } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Aver. Delay <br> sec | Level of Service |  | CK OF UE Dist ] m | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate |  | Aver. Speed <br> km/h |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 134 | 16 | 141 | 11.9 | 0.609 | 36.7 | LOS C | 15.2 | 118.3 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 34.1 |
| 2 T1 | 582 | 46 | 613 | 7.9 | 0.609 | 32.3 | LOS C | 17.4 | 126.6 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 34.5 |
| 3 R2 | 83 | 0 | 87 | 0.0 | 0.442 | 31.3 | LOS C | 3.0 | 20.7 | 0.94 | 0.76 | 0.94 | 34.9 |
| Approach | 799 | 62 | 841 | 7.8 | 0.609 | 32.9 | LOS C | 17.4 | 126.6 | 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 34.5 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 44 | 0 | 46 | 0.0 | 0.173 | 25.0 | LOS B | 1.6 | 11.2 | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.83 | 37.5 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 166 | 1 | 175 | 0.6 | * 0.837 | 42.0 | LOS C | 12.3 | 86.9 | 0.94 | 0.87 | 1.06 | 31.4 |
| 6 R2 | 75 | 1 | 79 | 1.3 | 0.837 | 48.7 | LOS D | 12.3 | 86.9 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 1.08 | 30.8 |
| Approach | 285 | 2 | 300 | 0.7 | 0.837 | 41.1 | LOS C | 12.3 | 86.9 | 0.93 | 0.84 | 1.03 | 32.0 |
| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 75 | 0 | 79 | 0.0 | 0.164 | 32.6 | LOS C | 2.6 | 20.2 | 0.74 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 34.7 |
| 8 T1 | 967 | 49 | 1018 | 5.1 | * 0.900 | 50.2 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.96 | 1.05 | 1.22 | 29.7 |
| 9 R2 | 131 | 0 | 138 | 0.0 | * 0.543 | 29.6 | LOS C | 4.8 | 33.9 | 0.90 | 0.77 | 0.90 | 35.3 |
| Approach | 1173 | 49 | 1235 | 4.2 | 0.900 | 46.7 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 30.5 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 57 | 0 | 60 | 0.0 | 0.217 | 40.3 | LOS C | 4.1 | 28.9 | 0.84 | 0.72 | 0.84 | 32.5 |
| 11 T1 | 220 | 1 | 232 | 0.5 | * 0.915 | 58.0 | LOS E | 23.6 | 172.0 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 1.27 | 27.5 |
| 12 R 2 | 163 | 16 | 172 | 9.8 | 0.915 | 66.6 | LOS E | 23.6 | 172.0 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.35 | 26.6 |
| Approach | 440 | 17 | 463 | 3.9 | 0.915 | 58.9 | LOS E | 23.6 | 172.0 | 0.97 | 1.02 | 1.25 | 27.7 |
| All <br> Vehicles | 2697 | 130 | 2839 | 4.8 | 0.915 | 44.0 | LOS D | 30.6 | 221.0 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 1.08 | 31.2 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement.
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.
Delay Model: SIDRA Standard (Geometric Delay is included).
Queue Model: SIDRA Standard.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

* Critical Movement (Signal Timing)

| Pedestrian Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & { }_{\text {ID }} \end{aligned}$ | Input Vol. <br> ped/h | Dem. Flow $\mathrm{ped} / \mathrm{h}$ | Aver. Delay sec | Level of AVERAGE BACK OF Service QUEUE |  |  | Prop. Effective Que Stop Rate |  | Travel Time sec | Travel Aver. Dist. Speed m m/sec |  |
| South: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P1 Full | 41 | 43 | 49.3 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 82.9 | 43.8 | 0.53 |
| East: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P2 Full | 23 | 24 | 31.3 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 58.4 | 35.2 |  |


| North: Botany Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P3 | Full | 35 | 37 | 48.3 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 82.0 | 43.8 |
| West: Coward Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| P4 Full | 31 | 33 | 31.4 | LOS D | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 58.4 | 35.2 | 0.60 |
| All | 130 | 137 | 41.6 | LOS E | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 72.5 | 40.2 | 0.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

## C. 1 AM peak queuing



Plate C. 1
North approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during AM peak


Plate C. 2 East approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during AM peak


Plate C. 3
South approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during AM peak


Plate C. 4
West approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during AM peak
C. 2 PM peak queuing


Plate C. $5 \quad$ North approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during PM peak


Plate C. 6 East approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during PM peak


Plate C. 7
South approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during PM peak


Plate C. 8
West approach queuing at the Botany Road/Coward Street intersection during PM peak


[^0]:    1 Bayside Council's email dated 23 June 2022
    2 EMM report dated 28 November 2017
    3 EMM letter dated 14 October 2021

[^1]:    1. $\mathrm{LT}=$ left turning movement
    2. $\mathrm{TH}=$ through movement
    3. $\mathrm{DOS}=$ Degree of Saturation
    4. $L O S=$ Level of Service
    5. DEL = average delay
    6. $\mathrm{Q} 95=95 \%$ ile queue
