

PLANNING PROPOSAL FOR A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

TRAFFIC & PARKING IMPACT ASSESSMENT

86 Blenheim Road & 12A-14 Epping Road, North Ryde

FINAL Issue A: 16th June 2015



Address: Shop 7, 720 Old Princes Highway Sutherland NSW 2232 Postal: P.O Box 66 Sutherland NSW 1499

> Telephone: +61 2 8355 2440 Fax: +61 2 9545 1227 Web: www.mclarentraffic.com.au Email: admin@mclarentraffic.com.au

Division of RAMTRANS Australia ABN: 45067491678

Transport Planning, Traffic Impact Assessments, Road Safety Audits, Expert Witness



PLANNING PROPOSAL – MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT 86 BLENHEIM ROAD & 12A-14 EPPING ROAD, NORTH RYDE

NSW 2113

Prepared for: Think Planners Job reference: 2015/286 FINAL issue A: 16th June 2015

Status	Issue	Prepared By	Checked By	Date
Draft	Α	RT	СМ	15th June 2015
Final	А	RT	СМ	16th June 2015

Please be aware that all information and material contained in this report is the property of McLaren Traffic Engineering. The information contained in this document is confidential and intended solely for the use of the client for the purpose for which it has been prepared and no representation is made or if to be implied as being made to any third party. Any third party wishing to distribute this document in whole or in part for personal or commercial use must obtain written confirmation from McLaren Traffic Engineering prior to doing so. Failure to obtain written permission may constitute an infringement of copyright and may be liable for legal action.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INT		1
1.1 1.2 1.3	DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (INFRASTRUCTURE) 2007	1 1 2
2 EX	ISTING TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONDITIONS	3
2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6	Road Hierarchy Traffic & Pedestrian Management Existing Intersection Performance Public Transport Accessibility Future Infrastructure & Development Bicycle Infrastructure	3 3 5 5 6
3 PR	OPOSED DEVELOPMENT	7
3.1 3.2	ZONING DEVELOPMENT SCALE	7 7
4 PA	RKING ASSESSMENT	8
4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	COUNCIL PARKING REQUIREMENT. DISABLED PARKING. BICYCLE & MOTORCYCLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS SERVICING & LOADING PARKING DESIGN COMPLIANCE	8 8 9 9
5 TR	AFFIC ASSESSMENT1	0
5.1 5.2 5.3	TRAFFIC GENERATION 1 TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT 1 TRAFFIC IMPACT 1	0 1 1
6 CO	NCLUSION1	3



1 INTRODUCTION

M^cLaren Traffic Engineering was commissioned by *Think Planners* to provide a traffic and parking impact assessment of a mixed use planning proposal on the site of 86 Blenheim Road & 12A-14 Epping Road, North Ryde NSW. This is a broad scope analysis and a refined scale of development would be required prior to submission of a Development Application (DA) for the development.

1.1 Development Summary

As part of the proposal, a total of three (3) existing residential lots will be amalgamated to accommodate a mixed use residential flat building. The site is proposed to accommodate a total of 95 x 2-bedroom residential apartments and $250m^2$ GFA of commercial space. Adequate on-site parking is to be provided to accommodate the parking demand of the proposed development.

1.2 Site Location and Context

The site is located within a LOCAL cul-de-sac road, at the northern end of Blenheim Road, North Ryde. It has a frontage of approximately 48m to Epping Road and borders Blenheim Park on its western and south boundaries, as shown in **Figures 1 & 2**.

The three (3) existing residential lots on the site are legally identified as follows:

- Lot C DP410408
- Lot D DP410408
- Lot E DP410408



SITE LOCATION

FIGURE 1: AERIAL LOCATION





1.3 State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007

The proposed development does not qualify as a traffic generating development with relevant size and/or capacity under Clause 104 of the SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007. Accordingly, formal referral to the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) is not necessary and City of Ryde Council officers can determine this proposal accordingly.



2 EXISTING TRAFFIC AND PARKING CONDITIONS

2.1 Road Hierarchy

Epping Road has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- RMS Classified STATE Road
- Approximately 30m wide two-way carriageway with four westbound lanes and five eastbound lanes
- Signposted 70km/h speed limit
- "No Stopping" and Clearway restrictions apply along both sides of the road

Blenheim Road has the following characteristics within close proximity to the site:

- Unclassified LOCAL Road
- Approximately 8m wide two-way carriageway with a cul-de-sac arrangement at the end of the street
- No signposted speed limit, 50km/h applies
- Generally unrestricted kerbside parking along both sides of the road

2.2 Traffic & Pedestrian Management

The surrounding traffic and pedestrian management controls include the following:

- Give Way T-junction at the intersection of Blenheim Road / cul-de-sac
- Give Way T-junction at the intersection of Blenheim Road / Pittwater Road
- Cul-de-sac arrangement at end of Blenheim Road (No Through Road)

2.3 Existing Intersection Performance

Intersection surveys were carried out between 7-9am and 4-6pm on Tuesday the 18th October 2011 at the intersections of Blenheim Road / cul-de-sac and Blenheim Road / Pittwater Road. Survey data is reproduced in **Annexure B** for reference and a summary of results is presented below. The intersection performance has been assessed using *SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1* with **Table 1** below summarising the performance output.



Intersection	ersection Peak Degree of Hour Saturation ⁽¹⁾ Average (Sec/vehicle)		Level of Service ⁽³⁾	Control Type	Worst Movement	
		EXIS	TING PERFOR	MANCE		
Blenheim Rd	AM	1.00	10.9 (>70)	A (Worst: F)	Give	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Rd	PM	>1.00	69.5 (>70)	F (Worst: F)	Way	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Blenheim Rd	AM	0.17	0.8 (6.9)	A (Worst: A)	Give	Right turn from the cul- de-sac
/ Cul-de-sac	PM	0.30 0.5 (8.9)		A (Worst: A)	Way	Right turn from the cul- de-sac

TABLE 1: EXISTING INTERSECTION PERFORMANCES (SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1)

NOTES:

(1) Degree of Saturation is the ratio of demand to capacity for the most disadvantaged movement.

(2) Average delay is the delay experienced on average by all vehicles. The value in brackets represents the delay to the most disadvantaged movement.

(3) Level of Service is a qualitative measure of performance describing operational conditions. There are six levels of service, designated from A to F, with A representing the best operational condition and level of service F the worst. The LoS of the intersection is shown in bold, and the LoS of the most disadvantaged movement is shown in brackets.

As shown in **Table 1**, the intersections of Blenheim Road with the cul-de-sac currently experience good levels of service throughout the day (A/A for AM/PM). The intersection of Blenheim Road with Pittwater Road currently has levels of service A/F for AM/PM. Although the right turn movement from Pittwater Road (North) has been assessed as LoS F, operationally this would not be apparent given that there are traffic lights at the nearby intersection of Epping Road / Pittwater Road, and that "KEEP CLEAR" is clearly marked to allow vehicles to turn right from Pittwater Road.



2.4 Public Transport Accessibility

The subject site is located approximately 550m walking distance from North Ryde Railway Station which provides regular and frequent services along the T1 line, including Chatswood, Sydney CBD, Epping and Hornsby at a minimum frequency of one service every 15 minutes throughout the day, and additional services during the peak hour. In addition, there are numerous bus routes surrounding the site that provide regular servicing throughout the day to nearby urban centres and areas less accessible by train such as Ryde and Lane Cove. Therefore, it can be concluded that the site is well accessed via public transport and the residents, commuters and visitors associated with the proposed development will not be disadvantaged in terms of public transport.



★ Site Location

2.5 Future Infrastructure & Development

From City of Ryde Council's Development Application tracker and website, it appears that there is no future planned road or public transport changes that will affect traffic conditions within the immediate vicinity of the subject site.



2.6 Bicycle Infrastructure

The subject site is also located within good bicycle infrastructure, with a shared offroad bike path located along the site frontage on Epping Road. The bike path along Epping Road connects to numerous other bike paths and nearby urban centres, such as:

- Macquarie University (approximately 3km)
- Ryde (approximately 4km)
- Chatswood (approximately 6km)
- Artarmon (approximately 6km)
- Sydney CBD (approximately 13km)

Figure 3 below shows designated bicycle paths and walking trails close to the site.



***** SITE LOCATION





3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Zoning

The existing site is located within the R2 – Low Density Residential zone with an existing maximum FSR of 0.5:1 and maximum building height of 9.5m under the *Ryde Local Environmental* Plan (LEP) 2014. As part of the proposal, the applicant seeks to increase the FSR to 4.3:1 as well as the maximum building height.

3.2 Development Scale

The proposed mixed use development, represented by the conceptual plans in **Annexure A**, will include the construction of a mixed use residential / commercial building. Details of the proposal are as follows:

- 95 x 2 bedroom residential apartments
- 250m² Commercial GFA
- Basement level car parking

The vehicular access to the site will be via Blenheim Road only, and therefore two driveways along Epping Road will be closed. This will greatly improve the safety and traffic flow of vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians along Epping Road.

This is a broad scope analysis and a refined scale of development would be required prior to submission of a Development Application (DA) for the development. Conceptual plans of the proposal are reproduced in **Annexure A**.



4 PARKING ASSESSMENT

4.1 Council Parking Requirement

Reference is made to City of Ryde Council's *Development Control Plan (DCP) 2014* – *Part 9.3: Parking Controls* which designate the following parking requirements applicable to the subject development:

Residential Development 0.9 to 1.2 spaces / two bedroom dwelling 1 visitor space / 5 dwellings

Office and Business Premises 1 space / 40m² of GFA

Table 2 below summarises Council's above car parking requirement

Land Use	Туре	Scale	Rate	Spaces Required			
				Min	Мах		
Desidential	2 bedroom	95	0.9 to 1.2 spaces per unit	85.5	114		
Residential	Visitor	95	1 space per 5 dwellings or part thereof	1	9		
Non- Residential	Commercial	250m ²	1 space per 40m ² GFA	6.	3		
Total				111	139		

TABLE 2: COUNCIL DCP CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS

As shown above, strict application of the DCP requires a total of **111-139** car parking spaces for the current development proposal. These parking requirements outlined in Council's DCP shall be met by the development within the DA and Construction Certificate stages. It is expected that this parking will be accommodated on-site in the form of underground basement parking, subject to detailed design.

4.2 Disabled Parking

The required disabled parking should comply with those requirements set out in Council's DCP and the Building Code of Australia (BCA).

4.3 Bicycle & Motorcycle Parking Requirements

Council's DCP specifies that *in every new building, where the floor space exceeds* 600m2 GFA provide bicycle parking equivalent to 10% of the required car spaces or part thereof. Therefore, given that the current development proposal requires 111-139 car parking spaces, 11-14 bicycle spaces are required. These are to be designed in accordance with AS 2890.3:1993



4.4 Servicing & Loading

Council's DCP does not specify any loading facility requirements for residential flat buildings with access from the local road network. As such, it is understood that waste collection and loading will be conducted on-street.

4.5 Parking Design Compliance

Compliance assessments of vehicular access arrangements and internal parking layouts are subject to detailed design assessments at DA stages. The submitted concept plans appear to generally comply with AS2890.1, AS2890.6 and AS4299 where applicable. Further there is opportunity to comply with these standards and it is assumed that a compliant parking layout will be achieved at the DA stage.



5 TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT

The impacts of the expected traffic generation levels associated with the subject proposal are discussed in the following sub-sections.

The assessment of traffic volumes generated by the development option has been conducted in accordance with the RMS *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments* (October 2002) and more recent supplements. The assessment takes the view that the overall Level of Service (LoS) of nearby critical intersections should be maintained whilst some increase in delay for individual movements could be tolerated, particularly for non-critical movements.

Additionally, along with the performance of the nearby critical intersections of Blenheim Road with Pittwater Road and the cul-de-sac, due consideration is to be given to the local area's road safety, traffic flow efficiency and local amenity.

5.1 Traffic Generation

As outlined above, the traffic generation rates have been based upon those specified in the RMS *Guide to Traffic Generating Developments* (October 2002). Updated data from the RMS (RMS Technical Direction TDT 2013/04) outlines reduced trip rates for high density residential developments compared to those found in 2002. Further sensitivity is included by not discounting the existing traffic generation of the residential dwellings on the site. **Table 3** hence outlines reasonable worst case traffic generation for the proposed development scale.

العم	Scalo	Poak Hour Pato	Peak Hour	Peak Hour Split			
036	Scale Peak Hour Rate		Generation	AM	РМ		
		PROPOSED FUTUR	RE TRAFFIC				
Residential	95 units	0.19 per unit ⁽¹⁾	18	4 in	14 in		
				14 OUT	4 OUT		
Office	250m ²	2 per $100m^{2(2)}$	5	4 in	1 in		
Onice	GFA		Ŭ	1 out	4 out		
Total			00	8 in	15 in		
rotal	-	-	23	15 out	8 out		

TABLE 3: ESTIMATED TRAFFIC GENERATION

Notes: (1) Assumes 20% inbound & 80% outbound during AM peak: Vice versa for PM. (2) Assumes 80% inbound & 20% outbound during AM peak: Vice versa for PM.

As shown above, the maximum traffic generation associated with the proposed development is in the order of 23 vehicle trips (AM - 8 inbound and 15 outbound; PM - 15 inbound and 8 outbound) for the site above the existing traffic generation. This equates to approximately 1 vehicle every 2.5 minutes, which is a relatively low level of traffic generation when considering the existing traffic volumes on both Pittwater Road and Epping Road.

In addition, no concession has been made for the traffic generation of the existing sites.



5.2 Traffic Assignment

Given the location of the site, all traffic generation of the site is assumed to travel to and from Epping Road via Pittwater Road.

5.3 Traffic Impact

The traffic generation outlined in **Section 5.1 & 5.2** above has been added to the existing traffic volumes recorded. SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1 was used to assess the intersections performance. The purpose of this assessment is to compare the existing intersection operations to the future scenario under the increased traffic load. The results of this assessment are shown in **Table 4** below:

Intersection	Peak Hour	Degree of Saturation ⁽¹⁾	Average Delay ⁽²⁾ (sec/vehicle)	Level of Service ⁽³⁾	Control Type	Worst Movement
		EXIS	TING PERFOR	MANCE	L	
Blenheim Rd	AM	1.00	10.9 (>70)	A (Worst: F)	Give	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Rd	PM	>1.00	69.5 (>70)	F (Worst: F)	Way	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Blenheim Rd	AM	0.17 0.8 (6.9)		A (Worst: A)	Give	Right turn from the cul- de-sac
/ Cul-de-sac	PM	0.30	0.5 (8.9)	A (Worst: A)	Way	Right turn from the cul- de-sac
		FUTURE PERI	ent)			
Blenheim Rd / Pittwater	AM	1.00	10.8 (>70)	A (Worst: F)	Give	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Rd	PM	>1.00	>70 (>70)	F (Worst: F)	Way	Right turn from Pittwater Road North
Blenheim Rd	AM	0.17	1.0 (6.9)	A (Worst: A)	Give	Right turn from the cul- de-sac
/ Cul-de-sac	PM	0.31	0.6 (9.1)	A (Worst: A)	Way	Right turn from the cul- de-sac

TABLE 4: FUTURE INTERSECTION PERFORMANCES (SIDRA INTERSECTION 6.1)

NOTES:

(1) Degree of Saturation is the ratio of demand to capacity for the most disadvantaged movement.



- (2) Average delay is the delay experienced on average by all vehicles. The value in brackets represents the delay to the most disadvantaged movement.
- (3) Level of Service is a qualitative measure of performance describing operational conditions. There are six levels of service, designated from A to F, with A representing the best operational condition and level of service F the worst. The LoS of the intersection is shown in bold, and the LoS of the most disadvantaged movement is shown in brackets.

As shown in **Table 4** above, the intersections of Blenheim Road with Pittwater Road and the cul-de-sac maintain their overall Levels of Service (LoS) when compared to the existing intersection performances. The additional delays due to the proposed development are minimal and therefore will have little to no impact on the surrounding traffic environment. Furthermore, the traffic generation of the proposed development has been analysed as a worst case scenario, such as by not discounting existing uses on the site and additional traffic is hence likely to be lower than what was analysed. Residential amenity is not strictly applicable given the close proximity to Epping Road, an RMS classified STATE road, though in any case is unlikely to be affected by the proposed development.



6 CONCLUSION

In summary, the planning proposal at 86 Blenheim Road & 12A-14 Epping Road, North Ryde for 95 residential units and 250m² GFA of commercial space has been assessed on its traffic and parking impacts.

The result of the parking assessment has shown that the development proposal should provide 111-139 car parking spaces in a basement car park in order for strict compliance with Council's DCP. Bicycle parking in the order of 11-14 parking spaces and service/loading bay provision can be determined during Development Application.

The traffic generation associated with the planning proposal is low with respect to the existing traffic volumes on surrounding streets, namely Pittwater Road and Epping Road. Although the analysis shows additional delays, these are considered minimal and will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding traffic environment.

In view of the foregoing, the planning proposal at 86 Blenheim Road & 12A-14 Epping Road, North Ryde for 95 residential units and 250m² GFA of commercial space is supportable on traffic and parking grounds.



ANNEXURE A: TRAFFIC SURVEYS (Sheet 1 of 2)

Curtis Traffic Surveys	1	Turning	movemei	nt count				222	ノ 287						
Loh:			ncl			Peak Hour Volumes	335					N			
Day data	T,					Voluneo	0					↑			
Day, date		0/10/11					0	-	T 1200						
Location:	1	rittwater	Ka & Blenn	ieim Ka				0	1280						
Weather:	F	ine													
Client:	1	McLarer	n Traffic E	ngineeri	ng										
	F	rom Pittw	ater Rd no	orth		From Blen	heim Rd			From Pittw	ater Rd so	outh			
	٦	Through	1	Right		Left	1	Right		Left		Through			
Time Devied	C	Other	Buses	Other	Buees	Other	Buses	Other	Bueee	Other	Bueee	Other	Buses		
	Ť	0.0	0	10.10.00		10.110.000	4	1	0	2	0	154	0	344	
07.00 10 07.13		00	0	23		72	7	1	0	2	0	130	0	421	
07:15 to 07:30		76	0	36	5 ⊿	97	4	0	0	2	0	212	0	431	<u> </u>
07:30 to 07:45	-	91	0	52	2 4	78	7	0	0	0	0	404	0	636	peak
07:45 to 08:00	-	54	0	27	/ 3	46	6	1	0	1	0	284	0	422	
08:00 to 08:15	_	65	2	47	' 3	78	4	0	0	0	0	352	0	551	
08:15 to 08:30	_	52	1	44	F 5	69	6	0	0	0	0	253	1	431	
08:30 to 08:45	_	91	1	57	4	82	5	0	0	0	0	391	1	632	
08:45 to 09:00		74	1	58	3 4	87	4	0	0	0	0	281		510	
Total		588	5	346	25	629	40	2	0	6	0	2333	3		
Hourly summary															
07:00 to 08:00		306	0	140) 9	313	21	2	0	6	0	1056	0	1853	
07:15 to 08:15		286	2	164	F 12	299	21	1	0	3	0	1252	0	2040	
07:30 to 08:30		262	3	170) 15	271	23	1	0	I	0	1293	1	2040	
07:45 to 08:45		262	4	175	5 15	275	21	1	0	1	0	1280	2	2036	
08:00 to 09:00		282	5	206	5 16	316	19	0	0	0	0	1277	3	2124	hour

Curtis Traff	ic Survey	s	Turning	moveme	nt count		Dealettere		14	2						
J ob:		Ī.	111004r	ncl			Volumes	24	ť	^	22		N			
Day, date	5		18/10/11					314	÷	+	200		1			
Location:			Blenheim	Rd & dead	end											
Weather:			Fine										1			
Client:			McLarer	n Traffic E	ngineeri	ng										
			From Bler	nheim Rd ea	ast		From dea	d end			From Blen	heim Rd w	est			
		_	Through		Right		Left		Right		Left		Through			
Time Pa	eriod		Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses		
07:00 to	07:15	Ĺ	26	0	0) (0 0	0	0	() 0	0	93	4	123	
07:15 to	07:30		40	2	. 0) (0	0	Ì) 4	Í	97	4	149	
07:30 to	07:45		50	4	2	2 0) I	0	0		2 6	2	77	7	151	
07:45 to	08:00		26	3	2	. c	2	0	2) 6	0	45	6	92	
08:00 to	08:15		41	1	6	5 2	6	1	3	() 4	1	72	3	140	
08:15 to	08:30		40	5	4	ł C	4	1	2) 3	1	65	5	130	
08:30 to	08:45		54	3	3	5 I	3	1	5	() 6	0	79	4	159	
08:45 to	09:00		53	3	5	i I	4	1	3		8	1	83	3	166	peak
Total			330	21	22	2 4	20	4	16	3	37	6	611	36		
Hourly sum	nma ry															
07:00 to	08:00		142	9	· 4	ł C	3	0	3	:	2 16	3	312	21	515	
07:15 to	08:15		157	10	10) 2	9	1	6	. :	2 20	4	291	20	532	
07:30 to	08:30	L	157	13	14	+ 2	. 13	2	7	1	2 19	4	259	21	513	
07:45 to	08:45		161	12	. 15	; 3	15	3	12) 19	2	261	18	521	poar
08:00 to	09:00		188	12	. 18	3 4	17	4	13		21	3	299	15	595	hour



ANNEXURE A: TRAFFIC SURVEYS (Sheet 2 of 2)

Curtis Traffi	ic Surveys	5	Turning	moveme	ent count				56	ノ 902						
J ob:		Γ	111004r	ncl			Volumes	207		•			N			
Day, date	2		18/10/11					6	~	. ▲			1			
Location:			Pittw a te r	Rd & Blen	heim Rd				8	458						
Weather:			Fine										1			
Client:			McLarei	n Traffic	Engineeri	ng										
			From Pitty	vater Rd r	orth		From Blen	heim Rd			From Pitty	ater Rd s	outh			
		_	Through		Right		Left		Right		Left		Through			
Time Pe	eriod		Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses		
16:00 to	16:15		106		0 62	2 3	23	2	0	0	1	0	61	0	258	
16:15 to	16:30		262		0 134	4 3	63	5	0	0	3	0	105	0	575	peak
16:30 to	16:45		188		0 97	7 3	50	2	0	0	1	0	99	0	440	
16:45 to	17:00		206		0 127	7 3	58	2	0	0	2	0	105	0	503	
17:00 to	17:15		249		0 132	2 5	40	5	0	0	2	0	124	0	557	
17:15 to	17:30		219		0 157	7 I	50	3	4	0	2	0	116	3	555	
17:30 to	17:45		228		0 140) 4	46	3	2	0	2	0	110	0	535	
17:45 to	18:00		225		0 133	3 5	54	1	0	0	2	0	69	0	489	
Total		_	1683		982	2 27	384	23	6	0	15	0	789	3		
Hourly sum	nma ry															
16:00 to	17:00		762		0 420) 12	. 194	11	0	0	7	0	370	0	1776	
16:15 to	17:15		905		0 490) 14	211	14	0	0	8	0	433	0	2075	
16:30 to	17:30		862		0 513	3 12	198	12	4	0	7	0	444	3	2055	poar
16:45 to	17:45		902		0 556	5 13	194	13	6	0	8	0	455	3	2150	hour
17:00 to	18:00		921		0 562	2 15	190	12	6	0	8	0	419	3	2136	

Curtis Traff	fic Survey	rs	Turning	moveme	nt count		Dealettere		26	IL 8						
J ob:			111004r	ncl			Volumes	13	ر ا	•	10		N			
Day, date	е		18/10/11					200	+	~	575		1			
Location:			Blenheim	Rd & dead	end											
Weather:			Fine													
Client:			McLarer	n Traffic E	ngineeri	ng										
			From Bler	nheim Rd ea	ast		From dea	d end			From Blen	iheim Rd w	est			
		_	Through		Right		Left		Right		Left		Through			
Time Pa	eriod		Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses	Other vehicles	Buses		
16:00 to	16:15	Ť.	61	3	2	2 0	3	0	0	0	2	0	20	2	93	
16:15 to	16:30		135	3	2	2 0	4	0	2	0	6	0	59	5	216	
16:30 to	16:45		96	3	2	2 0	0	0	5	C	2	0	50	2	160	
16:45 to	17:00		127	3	2	. c	0	0	3	C	2	0	58	2	197	
17:00 to	17:15		133	5	1	C	2	0	8	C	8	0	38	5	200	
17:15 to	17:30		156	1	3	; C	2	0	6	0	2	0	52	3	225	peak
17:30 to	17:45		140	4	2	2 C	2	0	6	0	1	0	46	3	204	
17:45 to	18:00		131	5	4	i c	2	0	6	C	2	0	52	. I	203	
Total			979	27	18	3 0	15	0	36	0	25	0	375	23		
Hourly sum	nma ry															
16:00 to	17:00		419	12	8	в с	7	0	10	0	12	0	187		666	
16:15 to	17:15		491	14	7	′ С	6	0	18	0	18	0	205	14	773	
16:30 to	17:30	L	512	12	8	в С) 4	0	22	0	14	0	198	12	782	
16:45 to	17:45		556	13	8	з с	6	0	23	0	13	0	194	13	826	poan
17:00 to	18:00		560	15	10) (8	0	26	0	13	0	188	12	832	hour



ANNEXURE B: SIDRA ANALYSIS (Sheet 1 of 4)

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

♥ Site: EXISTING AM - Blenheim Rd / Pittwater Rd

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Moven	nent Pe	rformance	- Vehi	icles							
Mov ID	ODMo	Demand	Flows	Deg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back	c of Queue	Prop.	Effective	Average
		Total	HV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh			per veh	km/h
South: I	Pittwater	Rd S									
2	T1	1280	0.0	0.219	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	60.0
Approa	ch	1280	0.0	0.219	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	60.0
North: F	Pittwater	Rd N									
8	T1	287	0.0	0.235	3.4	LOS A	1.8	12.4	0.50	0.00	56.8
9	R2	222	0.0	1.000	81.9	LOS F	11.5	80.7	1.00	2.08	24.5
Approa	ch	509	0.0	1.000	37.6	NA	11.5	80.7	0.72	0.91	36.1
West: B	Blenheim	Rd									
10	L2	335	0.0	0.344	11.7	LOS A	1.7	11.6	0.63	0.86	45.4
Approa	ch	335	0.0	0.344	11.7	LOS A	1.7	11.6	0.63	0.86	45.4
All Vehi	cles	2124	0.0	1.000	10.9	NA	11.5	80.7	0.27	0.35	49.6

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

V Site: EXISTING AM - Blenheim Rd / Cul-de-sac

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Moven	nent Per	formance	- Vehi	icles							
Mov ID	ODMo	Demand	Flows	Deg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back	of Queue	Prop.	Effective	Average
		Total	HV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh			per veh	km/h
East: Bl	enheim R	Rd E									
5	T1	200	0.0	0.120	0.2	LOS A	0.2	1.3	0.11	0.06	49.4
6	R2	22	0.0	0.120	5.9	LOS A	0.2	1.3	0.11	0.06	48.7
Approa	ch	222	0.0	0.120	0.8	NA	0.2	1.3	0.11	0.06	49.3
North: C	Cul-de-sad	C									
7	L2	21	0.0	0.017	5.6	LOS A	0.1	0.5	0.36	0.54	45.8
9	R2	14	0.0	0.018	6.9	LOS A	0.1	0.4	0.45	0.65	44.9
Approa	ch	35	0.0	0.018	6.1	LOS A	0.1	0.5	0.40	0.59	45.4
West: B	Blenheim F	Rd W									
10	L2	24	0.0	0.174	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.3
11	T1	314	0.0	0.174	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.8
Approa	ch	338	0.0	0.174	0.3	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.7
All Vehi	cles	595	0.0	0.174	0.8	NA	0.2	1.3	0.06	0.08	49.3

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).



ANNEXURE B: SIDRA ANALYSIS (Sheet 2 of 4)

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

V Site: EXISTING PM - Blenheim Rd / Pittwater Rd

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Moven	Novement Performance - Vehicles													
Mov ID	ODMo v	Demand Total	Flows	Deg. Satn	Average Delay	Level of Service	95% Back Vehicles	of Queue	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate	Average Speed			
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh	m		, per veh	km/h			
South: I	Pittwater	Rd S												
1	L2	8	0.0	0.080	5.5	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	58.1			
2	T1	458	0.0	0.080	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	59.9			
Approach 466		0.0	0.080	0.1	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	59.9				
North: F	Pittwater	Rd N												
8	T1	902	0.0	0.470	3.0	LOS A	7.0	49.3	0.68	0.00	57.0			
9	R2	569	0.0	1.127	254.2	LOS F	94.4	661.0	1.00	5.58	11.4			
Approa	ch	1471	0.0	1.127	100.2	NA	94.4	661.0	0.81	2.16	22.3			
West: E	llenheim	Rd												
10	L2	207	0.0	0.194	5.5	LOS A	0.8	5.5	0.31	0.56	47.8			
12	R2	6	0.0	0.194	127.5	LOS F	0.6	4.2	0.91	0.92	27.6			
Approa	ch	213	0.0	0.194	9.0	LOS A	0.8	5.5	0.33	0.57	46.8			
All Vehi	cles	2150	0.0	1.127	69.5	NA	94.4	661.0	0.58	1.53	27.5			

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

✓ Site: EXISTING PM - Blenheim Rd / Cul-de-sac

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Move	Movement Performance - Vehicles													
Mov II	D ODMo	Demand Flows		Deg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back	95% Back of Queue		Effective	Average			
		Total	HV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed			
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh			per veh	km/h			
East: I	Blenheim R	d E												
5	T1	575	0.0	0.302	0.0	LOS A	0.1	0.7	0.02	0.01	49.9			
6	R2	10	0.0	0.302	5.5	LOS A	0.1	0.7	0.02	0.01	49.2			
Approach 585 0.0		0.302	0.1	NA	0.1	0.7	0.02	0.01	49.9					
North:	Cul-de-sac	;												
7	L2	8	0.0	0.006	5.1	LOS A	0.0	0.2	0.28	0.50	46.0			
9	R2	26	0.0	0.047	8.9	LOS A	0.1	1.0	0.58	0.79	43.7			
Appro	ach	34	0.0	0.047	8.0	LOS A	0.1	1.0	0.51	0.73	44.3			
West:	Blenheim F	Rd W												
10	L2	13	0.0	0.110	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.3			
11	T1	200	0.0	0.110	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.8			
Approach		213	0.0	0.110	0.3	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.8			
All Vel	hicles	832	0.0	0.302	0.5	NA	0.1	1.0	0.03	0.04	49.6			

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).



ANNEXURE B: SIDRA ANALYSIS (Sheet 3 of 4)

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

V Site: FUTURE AM - Blenheim Rd / Pittwater Rd

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles														
Mov ID	ODMo	Demand	Flows	Deg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back	of Queue	Prop.	Effective	Average			
		Total	ΗV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed			
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh			per veh	km/h			
South: I	Pittwater	r Rd S												
2	T1	1280	0.0	0.219	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	60.0			
Approach 1280		1280	0.0	0.219	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	60.0			
North: F	Pittwater	Rd N												
8	T1	287	0.0	0.233	3.3	LOS A	1.7	12.2	0.51	0.00	56.9			
9	R2	227	0.0	1.000	79.8	LOS F	11.6	81.0	1.00	2.09	24.9			
Approa	ch	514	0.0	1.000	37.1	NA	11.6	81.0	0.72	0.92	36.2			
West: B	llenheim	Rd												
10	L2	350	0.0	0.359	11.8	LOS A	1.8	12.4	0.63	0.87	45.3			
Approa	ch	350	0.0	0.359	11.8	LOS A	1.8	12.4	0.63	0.87	45.3			
All Vehi	cles	2144	0.0	1.000	10.8	NA	11.6	81.0	0.28	0.36	49.6			

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

✓ Site: FUTURE AM - Blenheim Rd / Cul-de-sac

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Moven	Movement Performance - Vehicles													
Mov ID	ODMo	Demand	Flows	Deg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back of Queue		Prop.	Effective	Average			
		Total	HV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed			
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh			per veh	km/h			
East: Bl	enheim F	Rd E												
5	T1	200	0.0	0.124	0.2	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.13	0.07	49.3			
6	R2	27	0.0	0.124	5.9	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.13	0.07	48.6			
Approach 227 0.0		0.124	0.9	NA	0.2	1.6	0.13	0.07	49.2					
North: C	Cul-de-sa	с												
7	L2	36	0.0	0.029	5.6	LOS A	0.1	0.8	0.36	0.56	45.8			
9	R2	14	0.0	0.018	6.9	LOS A	0.1	0.4	0.45	0.65	44.9			
Approa	ch	50	0.0	0.029	5.9	LOS A	0.1	0.8	0.39	0.58	45.5			
West: B	lenheim	Rd W												
10	L2	24	0.0	0.174	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.3			
11	T1	314	0.0	0.174	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.8			
Approa	ch	338	0.0	0.174	0.3	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.04	49.7			
All Vehi	cles	615	0.0	0.174	1.0	NA	0.2	1.6	0.08	0.09	49.2			

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).



ANNEXURE B: SIDRA ANALYSIS (Sheet 4 of 4)

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

V Site: FUTURE PM - Blenheim Rd / Pittwater Rd

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Moven	Movement Performance - Vehicles													
Mov ID	ODMo v	Demano Total	l Flows HV	Deg. Satn	Average Delay	Level of Service	95% Back Vehicles	of Queue	Prop. Queued	Effective Stop Rate	Average Speed			
		veh/h		v/c	sec		veh	m		per veh	km/h			
South: I	Pittwater	Rd S												
1	L2	8	0.0	0.080	5.5	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	58.1			
2	T1	458	0.0	0.080	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	59.9			
Approach 466		0.0	0.080	0.1	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.01	59.9				
North: F	Pittwater	Rd N												
8	T1	902	0.0	0.471	3.1	LOS A	7.0	49.3	0.68	0.00	57.0			
9	R2	584	0.0	1.157	306.0	LOS F	112.1	785.0	1.00	6.31	9.8			
Approa	ch	1486	0.0	1.157	122.1	NA	112.1	785.0	0.81	2.48	19.7			
West: E	Blenheim	Rd												
10	L2	212	0.0	0.199	5.5	LOS A	0.8	5.7	0.31	0.56	47.8			
12	R2	6	0.0	0.199	131.4	LOS F	0.6	4.3	0.91	0.92	27.2			
Approa	ch	218	0.0	0.199	9.0	LOS A	0.8	5.7	0.33	0.57	46.8			
All Vehi	cles	2170	0.0	1.157	84.5	NA	112.1	785.0	0.59	1.76	24.7			

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

MOVEMENT SUMMARY

✓ Site: FUTURE PM - Blenheim Rd / Cul-de-sac

Giveway / Yield (Two-Way)

Movement Performance - Vehicles

		101 man 00		100							
Mov IE	ODMo	Demand	Flows D	eg. Satn	Average	Level of	95% Back	of Queue	Prop.	Effective	Average
		Total	ΗV		Delay	Service	Vehicles	Distance	Queued	Stop Rate	Speed
		veh/h	%	v/c	sec		veh	m		per veh	km/h
East: I	Blenheim R	ld E									
5	T1	575	0.0	0.312	0.1	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.04	0.02	49.7
6	R2	25	0.0	0.312	5.5	LOS A	0.2	1.6	0.04	0.02	49.0
Appro	ach	600	0.0	0.312	0.3	NA	0.2	1.6	0.04	0.02	49.7
North:	Cul-de-sad	>									
7	L2	13	0.0	0.009	5.1	LOS A	0.0	0.3	0.28	0.51	46.0
9	R2	26	0.0	0.048	9.1	LOS A	0.1	1.0	0.59	0.80	43.7
Appro	ach	39	0.0	0.048	7.8	LOS A	0.1	1.0	0.49	0.70	44.4
West:	Blenheim F	Rd W									
10	L2	13	0.0	0.110	4.6	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.3
11	T1	200	0.0	0.110	0.0	LOS A	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.8
Appro	ach	213	0.0	0.110	0.3	NA	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.03	49.8
All Vel	nicles	852	0.0	0.312	0.6	NA	0.2	1.6	0.05	0.06	49.5

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay (RTA NSW).

Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay per movement

Minor Road Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all vehicle movements.

NA: Intersection LOS and Major Road Approach LOS values are Not Applicable for two-way sign control since the average delay is not a good LOS measure due to zero delays associated with major road movements.

SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.

Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).