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## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Cardno was commissioned by the Shire of Serpentine to prepare a Transport Impact Assessment for the proposed Byford District Structure Plan (BDSP) ('the Site' or 'the Structure Plan').
This report has been prepared in accordance with the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines Volume 2 - Planning Schemes, Structure Plans \& Activity Centre Plans (2016). This report will support the detailed structure planning for the locality by evaluating the sufficiency of existing and proposed intersection treatments across the Structure Plan Area.

### 1.2 Site Location and Description

The suburbs in the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale include Byford, Mundijong, Serpentine, Jarrahdale and Keysbrook. The Site covers in Byford, in the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale on the south-eastern edge of Perth with a population of 16,871 as of 2017 and with a density of 9.44 persons per hectare. The land area of Byford is 1,787 hectares, most of which is recent and developing with an industrial area and some commercial use of land.

Figure 1-1 depicts the location of the site and the study area within the structure plan.
Figure 1-1
Study Area


Source: Nearmap

Figure 1-2 shows the Byford structure plan area with the different types of developments including residential, commercial and urban areas.

The structure plan covers an area of 5,530 hectares of which predominant areas are urban or remnant rural residential zoned for future development. The main features in the structure plan area comprise the Byford Town Centre Precinct, Byford Trotting Complex Precinct and Briggs Park Sport and Education Precinct.

Figure 1-2 Structure Plan Location


Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale

### 1.3 Land Use Proposal

The main areas within the structure plan area are retail and commercial, residential development and rural pursuits with a significant amount of changes proposed for the future. The proposed structure plan comprises mostly of rural and urban areas and some industrial. The Cardup Business Park to the south of the District structure plan area is recognised as a future industrial area in the South Metropolitan Peel Framework. The rural land will be maintained and preserved as existing for various rural industries and food production activities.

Figure 1-3 Existing Situation


## Legend
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### 1.3.2 Key Issues Identified

Some of the main issues and constraints identified are as follows:
> Lack of facilities and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists.
> Lack of public transport between activity centres and regional destinations.
> Traffic issues that do not assist active transport modes.
> Limited connectivity through rail line

## 2 Existing Situation

### 2.1 Existing Land Uses

Current land use consists of medium residential densities R30-R60 within the immediate vicinity of the town centre and local centres.

As evident from Figure 2-1 and Figure 2-2, the land within the structure plan is predominantly zoned as urban development, rural living and rural under the local scheme zone as a significant portion of the Shire consists of rural areas.

Retail and commercial activity has been concentrated within the 'old' Byford town centre between Larsen Road and Abernethy Road.

Also existing is an industrial area at the intersection of South Western Highway and Nettleton Road and some commercial land use.

The BDSP covers 5,530 hectares of area of which the land is predominantly urban or remnant rural residential zoned for future urban development.

Figure 2-1 Existing Zoning


Figure 2-2 Existing Zoning


Source: Local Planning Scheme

### 2.2 Existing Road Network

The existing road network surrounding and within the LSP is shown in Figure 2-3. Road classifications are defined in the Main Roads Functional Hierarchy as follows:
> Primary Distributors (light blue): Form the regional and inter-regional grid of MRWA traffic routes and carry large volumes of fast-moving traffic. Some are strategic freight routes, and all are National or State roads. They are managed by Main Roads.
$>$ Regional Distributors (red): Roads that are not Primary Distributors, but which link significant destinations and are designed for efficient movement of people and goods within and beyond regional areas. They are managed by Local Government.
$>$ District Distributor A (green): These carry traffic between industrial, commercial, and residential areas and connect to Primary Distributors. These are likely to be truck routes and provide only limited access to adjoining property. They are managed by Local Government.
$>$ District Distributor B (dark blue): Perform a similar function to "District Distributor A" but with reduced capacity due to flow restrictions from access to and roadside parking alongside adjoining property. These are often older roads with traffic demand in excess of that originally intended. District Distributor A and B roads run between land-use cells and not through them, forming a grid that would ideally be around 1.5 kilometres apart. They are managed by Local Government.
> Local Distributors (orange): Carry traffic within a cell and link District Distributors at the boundary to access roads. The route of the Local Distributor discourages through traffic so that the cell formed by the grid of District Distributors only carries traffic belonging to or serving the area. These roads should accommodate buses but discourage trucks. They are managed by Local government.
$>$ Access Roads (grey): Provide access to abutting properties with amenity, safety and aesthetic aspects having priority over the vehicle movement function. These roads are bicycle and pedestrian friendly. They are managed by Local government.

Figure 2-3 Existing Road Network


Source: Main Roads WA

The following discusses the characteristics of the road network surrounding the Structure Plan:
$>$ Tonkin Highway is classified as Primary Distributor with a posted speed of $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. It forms a part of RAV 7 network (north of Welshpool Road East).
$>$ South Western Highway lies to the east of the structure plan area and is classified as Primary Distributor with a posted speed limit that varies from $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from Hobbs Dr to Rails Crescent, to $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from Mitchell Street to Thomas Rd then to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from Thomas Road to Abernethy Road.
$>$ Thomas Road is an undivided two lane road classified as Distributor A, with a posted speed limit of 70 km/h.
> Hopkinson Road is classified as Regional Distributor with a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ from Gloaming way which is a built up area, the speed then increases to
$>$ Orton Road is classified as a Local Distributor with a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

### 2.3 Existing Traffic Volumes

Traffic surveys were conducted on numerous locations within the Byford area. The results of these traffic counts are provided in Appendix B.

### 2.4 Existing Pedestrian/ Cycle Network

Existing pedestrian and cycle network is very limited due to the rural nature of the area. Active modes of transport such as walking and cycling are currently available for short distance journeys within the urban areas. There are several opportunities for network improvements to address existing issues of disconnected streets, lack of footpaths, unsafe routes and long distances.

Figure 2-4 shows the existing pedestrian and cycle facilities within the Study Area.
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### 2.5 Existing Public Transport Services

The existing public transport services are shown below in Figure 2-5. A railway line runs alongside the South Western Highway; however, standard commuter rail services currently terminate at Armadale.

The rail line south of Armadale is used primarily for freight, with a regional rail service provided by the Australind to Perth and Bunbury twice daily.

Figure 2-5 Existing Public Transport Routes


## Source: Transperth

Transperth bus Routes 251,252 and 253 connect Kingsbury Drive/Jacaranda Avenue to Armadale Station, while Route 254 connects Clifton Street/South Western Highway to Armadale Station.

## 3 Proposed Changes to Transport Networks

### 3.1 Road Network Changes

The current structure plan provides a list of changes that are proposed for the existing roads. These upgrades have been evaluated through Aimsun mesoscopic modelling and SIDRA analysis and, modifications applied to reflect recommended amendments to the network, as shown in Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2.

It is understood that intersection controls will continue to be interrogated and modified to suit the changing needs of the network.

Figure 3-1


[^2]Figure 3-2
Existing and Proposed Roads


Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale
The following changes are proposed to the existing road network along with the proposed new roads:
$>$ Extension of Tonkin Highway southward to connect through to Mundijong Road.
> Intersection connection treatments onto Tonkin Highway at Thomas Road and Orton Road.
> Abernethy Road continuation under Tonkin Highway.
$>$ New and upgraded primary distributors and integrator arterial roads.
> Upgrade of Thomas Road and Orton Road.
> Orton Road extension to link South Western Highway
> Additional north to south distributor roads included in extension/upgrade of Wungong South Road to Wungong Road.

### 3.2 Pedestrian and Cycle Network Changes

The strategies and opportunities to improve the pedestrian and cycle network include:
> Provision of pedestrian, bridle trail, cycling linkages internally and to the scarp.
$>$ Complete various trails that have not been ceded yet.
> Improved connectivity and greenways for cycling and walking.
> Walking and cycling catchments to the Byford Town Centre Railway Station and neighbourhood centres present opportunities to link to a wider cycle and pedestrian network.

As such, the opportunities and constraints map is explained on Figure 3-3.
Figure 3-3 Opportunities and Constraints Map


Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale

### 3.3 Public Transport Network Changes

Within the Sub-regional Planning Framework, the proposed public transport includes a network of passenger rail lines and transit corridors. A proposal for the extension of the Armadale line to Byford exists within the BDSP area. This railway facility is also proposed to have a High Frequency Transit Corridors (HFTC) providing public transport connections between activity centres, population catchments, train stations and local bus services.

### 3.4 Projected Daily Traffic Volumes

Assessment of the impacts of development growth both within and beyond the Byford Structure Plan area has been facilitated through Main Roads' ROM24 strategic model. This model relies on land use projections provided by Local and State Government agencies to generate vehicle trips across the network. Cardno has endeavoured to ensure that the land uses defined in ROM24 within the Study Area are consistent with the Shire's anticipated development horizon.
It is acknowledged that full build-out of this land area may not be achieved within the 2031 horizon, which is the only ROM24 time scale currently supplied by Main Roads WA. As such, the ROM24 outputs used as the basis of this TIA have been used to establish an anticipated development and traffic scenario at the point when build-out of the Shire's development planning has been achieved.
Figure 3-4 shows the 2031 daily vehicle volume output from ROM24 model as provided by Main Roads WA.
Table 3-1 shows a summary of 2031 daily vehicle volumes from the AIMSUN model.
Table 3-1 Forecast Traffic Volumes from AIMSUN Model (2031 horizon)

| Road | Forecast Traffic Volume 2031 (vpd) | Recommended Road Hierarchy | Recommended Road Reserve (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abernethy Road | 16,629 | Integrator A (<=60 kph) | 30 |
| Kardan Blvd | 15,683 | Neighbourhood Connector $A$ | 25-30 |
| Soldiers Road | 8,921 | Neighbourhood Connector A | 20 |
| Orton Road | 12,919 | Integrator B | 30 |
| Doley Road | 2,935 | Neighbourhood Connector A | 30/27.6 |
| Warrington Road | 7,238 | Neighbourhood Connector B | 20 |
| Turner Road | 5,272 | Access Road | 20 |
| Gordin way | 4,653 | Neighbourhood Connector B | 20 |
| Sansimeon Blvd | 5,269 | Integrator B | 30 |
| Indico Parkway | 11,668 | Integrator B | 27.5 |
| Malarkey Road | 4,430 | Integrator B | 30 |
| Caraway Ave | 10,638 | Access Road | 20 |
| Masters Road | 7,160 | Rural Road | 30 |
| Wungong South Road | 5,043 | Rural Road | 25 |
| Thomas Road | 31,277 | Primary Regional Road | 50 |
| George St | 9,917 | Town Centre Road | 20 |
| Clara Street | 526 | Integrator B Town Centre Road | 25 |
| Industrial North-South Road | N/A | Industrial Road | 27 |
| Cardup Siding Road | 5,449 | Access Road | 20 |

[^3]Figure 3-4 ROM24 Daily Traffic Volumes (2031 horizon)


Source: Main Roads WA

## 4 Integration with Surrounding Area

### 4.1 Surrounding Attractors/Generators

The major attractors for people from within the structure plan area include the Darling Downs Equestrian Facility, Byford and Districts Country Club, Serpentine Jarrahdale Community Recreation Centre and other surrounding areas as per Figure 4-1.

Major generators within the structure plan include the Mary Grove Primary School, West Byford Primary School, Byford Trotting Complex and other existing infrastructure as per Figure 4-1. The Shire also has a wellestablished focus on equestrian activities, these areas along with the trails act as a major generator.

Figure 4-1 Generators and Attractors


| 1 | Darsuy Downs Equentrian Facley | \% | Eyforti Hall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Byfont and Districts Country Clutr | 5 | Byord jutn Civen Scteod |
| 3 | Epfurd Scout Hall/ Oid Relie Range | 16 | B,ford Oucket Nets and Change Rours |
| 4 | Blllicks Faolty | 17. | Brags Pak Piavión |
| 5 | Mry Greme Prmay Schoed | 31 | BMOXTran |
| \% | West Eytand Pownary School | 7 | Canteen and Starsge Faciltes |
| $p$ | Byfori Commmenty Konderpardern and Child Heath Cinac | 20 | Hegn Schnolowil |
| 1 | Matmma Resarve | 21 | Serpertine Jarrahaie Cormunily fecreston Certre |
| 9 | Kotmna Storage Facity | R2 | B, funstommumby Garden |
| 30 | Byfont Fere Station | $\underline{2}$ | Woodiand Gorde Prmary Sctiool |
| 41 | E,ford Teriss Courts | 24 | Woodiand Growe |
| 12 | Byford Primary School | E | Ayford Trating Compler |
| 13 | B,ford Secondary College | 26 | Enckwond Reserve Faclity |
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### 4.2 Proposed Changes to Surrounding Land uses

The structure plan identifies the requirement for development of areas in close proximity of key public transport networks and new nodes of activities. The surrounding area is to remain as rural and urban development whilst increasing the density codes around the town centre.

### 4.3 Level of Accessibility

The main access to the structure plan area from external attractors is through the connectivity of internal road networks to South Western Highway and Thomas Road, which are classified as Primary Distributor and Distributor A. Access through internal road intersections include:
> Thomas Road and Hopkinson Road
> Orton Road and Hopkinson Road
> Abernethy Road and South Western Highway
> South Western Highway and Cardup Siding Road
> Hopkinson Road and Abernethy Road
> Larsen Road and South Western Highway
For access by public transport, there are bus Routes 251, 252 and 253 run along South Western Highway and through the internal road network to Armadale Station.
Current provision of alternative transport modes such as cycling and walking include a good riding environment and a shared path along South Western Highway.

The proposed Train Station in Byford Town Centre and the associated walking and cycling catchment will further improve accessibility and match the desire lines.
It is expected that the existing road network will be able to cater for the travel desire lines between the structure plan area and the surrounding land uses.

## 5 Analysis of Transport Network

### 5.1 Assessment Years and Time Periods

The assessment period is based on the future mesoscopic modelling results which was conducted for 2031.

### 5.2 Background and Future Traffic Generation Estimation

A mesoscopic traffic model was developed to model the current traffic situation and provide a base to determine the likely future traffic impacts.

A number of data sources were used in the formulation of the mesoscopic model which included traffic, surveys, census data and information provided by local authorities.
The future-year models are based on the traffic growth scenario derived from information provided by the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale and Main Roads (ROM24 outputs) for the 2031 scenario years.

### 5.3 Intersection Assessment

Based on the results provided by the mesoscopic model, the network in the area of Byford is operating at an acceptable level of service with sufficient capacity to accommodate traffic for the 2018 scenario.

With respect to the 2031 scenario, the mesoscopic model identified a number of intersections which exhibited capacity or delay issues. These intersections have been assessed in SIDRA to determine the minimum extent of upgrades required to ensure that they are operating at an acceptable level of service in 2031.

Table 5-1 provides a summary of the intersections which experienced excessive delays or overcapacity issues as identified by the mesoscopic model in the 2031 scenario.

Table 5-1 Intersections to be Assessed

| Number | Intersections | Time Period |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Tonkin Hwy \& Thomas Rd | 2031 AM \& PM |
| 2 | Abernethy Rd \& S Western Hwy | 2031 PM |
| 3 | Abernethy Rd \& New Road 4 \& Gordin Way | 2031 PM |
| 4 | Soldiers Rd \& New Road 6 | 2031 AM \& PM |
| 5 | New Road 5 \& Tonkin Hwy | 2031 AM \& PM |

All other intersections assessed through the mesoscopic model were considered to operate at an acceptable level of service for the 2031 scenario.

The following density maps identify locations where peak period demand may create localised capacity constraints, and where upgrades to the network may be required. These locations have been assessed further through SIDRA assessment to ascertain whether further upgrades are required.

Figure 5-1 Simulated 2031 Density Map (AM Peak)


Figure 5-2 Simulated 2031 Density Map (PM Peak)


Figure 5-3 indicates the new road locations and the locations of the assessed intersections within the Byford Area.

Figure 5-3 Location of New Links


### 5.4 Summary of Results

The following map identifies the results of intersection evaluation across the Byford area. Intersections have been classified into 3 groups and shown in Figure 5-4 and Figure 5-5 below:

1. Existing Intersection Sufficient: the existing (2018) geometry has been evaluated through the Aimsun mesoscopic model and shown to be sufficient to accommodate future traffic growth.
2. Modified Intersection Sufficient: the Shire's proposed modifications have been evaluated through the Aimsun mesoscopic model and shown to be sufficient to accommodate future traffic growth.
3. Additional Reconfiguration Required: The existing and/or proposed intersection form has been evaluated through the Aimsun mesoscopic model and found to experience excessive congestion or delay. These intersections have been re-evaluated in SIDRA and changes identified to improve operation.

Figure 5-4 Intersection Sufficiency Map


Figure 5-5 Intersection Sufficiency Map


### 5.5 Intersection Performance

SIDRA results for each approach are presented below in the form of Degree of Saturation (DOS), Average Delay, Level of Service (LOS) and 95th Percentile Queue. These characteristics are defined as follows:
> Degree of Saturation (DOS): is the ratio of the arrival traffic flow to the capacity of the approach during the same period. The theoretical intersection capacity is exceeded for an un-signalized intersection where DOS > 0.80;
> $95 \%$ Queue: is the statistical estimate of the queue length up to or below which $95 \%$ of all observed queues would be expected;
> Average Delay: is the average of all travel time delays for vehicles through the intersection. An unsignalised intersection can be considered to be operated at capacity where the average delay exceeds 40 seconds for any movement; and
> Level of Service (LOS): is the qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream and the perception by motorists and/or passengers. The different levels of service can generally be described as shown in Table 5-2.

Table 5-2 Level of Service (LOS) Performance Criteria

| LOS | Description | Signalised <br> Intersection | Unsignalised <br> Intersection |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| A | Free-flow operations (best condition) | $\leq 10 \mathrm{sec}$ | $\leq 10 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| B | Reasonable free-flow operations | $10-20 \mathrm{sec}$ | $10-15 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| C | At or near free-flow operations | $20-35 \mathrm{sec}$ | $15-25 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| D | Decreasing free-flow levels | $35-55 \mathrm{sec}$ | $5-35 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| E | Operations at capacity | $55-80 \mathrm{sec}$ | $35-50 \mathrm{sec}$ |
| F | A breakdown in vehicular flow (worst condition) | $\geq 80 \mathrm{sec}$ | $\geq 50 \mathrm{sec}$ |

### 5.5.2 Evaluation Process

The following process has been used to inform the SIDRA assessment:
> Intersections have been modelled as per their proposed configuration, or where no changes have previously been identified, the existing road form.
> Intersections where Aimsun modelling shows simulated traffic density or approach projected delays are high are considered to be 'at risk', and have been reviewed using SIDRA analysis.
> For the purposed of the SIDRA assessment, turning movements with extremely low turning volumes (<5 vph) have been tripled to provide a robust assessment. It is acknowledged that these low volumes are likely an artefact of the coarse road network and zoning structure. However, it can be expected that these turning movement values will not dominate the intersection function.
> SIDRA intersection modelling has been used only to identify the minimum necessary intervention required from an operational standpoint. Additional measures may be required to ensure intersection geometry meets Austroads guidelines for safety and function.

### 5.5.3 No. 1 - Tonkin Highway and Thomas Road

The following presents the results of the analysis of the Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road intersection. Figure 5-6 is a SIDRA layout representation of the intersection which is based on the indicative layouts used in the mesoscopic model.

Figure 5-6 SIDRA Layout for Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection


The results from the SIDRA analysis are summarised in Table 5-3 and Table 5-4.

Table 5-3 Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 394 | 7.4 | 0.918 | 57.6 | LOS E | 37.2 | 276.6 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 1.33 | 30.8 |
| 2 T1 | 670 | 7.2 | 0.918 | 55.2 | LOS E | 37.2 | 276.6 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.38 | 31.1 |
| 3 R2 | 17 | 0.0 | 0.918 | 62.2 | LOS E | 28.7 | 213.0 | 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.40 | 30.4 |
| Approach | 1081 | 7.1 | 0.918 | 56.1 | LOS E | 37.2 | 276.6 | 1.00 | 1.11 | 1.36 | 31.0 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 16 | 0.0 | 1.116 | 279.6 | LOS F | 93.7 | 698.9 | 1.00 | 1.97 | 3.31 | 10.6 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 109 | 5.5 | 1.116 | 274.0 | LOS F | 93.7 | 698.9 | 1.00 | 1.97 | 3.31 | 10.6 |
| 6 R2 | 490 | 8.4 | 1.116 | 279.6 | LOS F | 93.7 | 698.9 | 1.00 | 1.97 | 3.31 | 10.6 |
| Approach | 615 | 7.6 | 1.116 | 278.6 | LOS F | 93.7 | 698.9 | 1.00 | 1.97 | 3.31 | 10.6 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 299 | 6.0 | 1.025 | 139.2 | LOS F | 70.2 | 519.2 | 1.00 | 1.63 | 2.14 | 18.3 |
| 8 T1 | 394 | 7.1 | 1.025 | 133.6 | LOS F | 70.2 | 519.2 | 1.00 | 1.63 | 2.14 | 18.5 |
| 9 R2 | 107 | 7.5 | 1.297 | 592.3 | LOS F | 26.1 | 194.7 | 1.00 | 2.32 | 5.60 | 5.5 |
| Approach | 800 | 6.8 | 1.297 | 197.0 | LOS F | 70.2 | 519.2 | 1.00 | 1.72 | 2.61 | 14.0 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 58 | 19.0 | 1.093 | 241.3 | LOS F | 36.0 | 270.4 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 3.19 | 11.9 |
| 11 T1 | 43 | 7.0 | 1.093 | 235.6 | LOS F | 36.0 | 270.4 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 3.19 | 12.0 |
| 12 R2 | 169 | 5.3 | 1.093 | 241.2 | LOS F | 36.0 | 270.4 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 3.19 | 11.9 |
| Approach | 270 | 8.5 | 1.093 | 240.3 | LOS F | 36.0 | 270.4 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 3.19 | 11.9 |
| All Vehicles | 2766 | 7.3 | 1.297 | 164.3 | LOS F | 93.7 | 698.9 | 1.00 | 1.55 | 2.33 | 16.0 |

Table 5-4 Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn | Demand Total veh/h | Flows HV \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 50 | 4.0 | 0.858 | 70.4 | LOS E | 8.7 | 63.5 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.40 | 32.4 |
| 2 T 1 | 243 | 4.5 | 0.858 | 62.4 | LOS E | 8.9 | 64.6 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.40 | 36.7 |
| $3 \quad \mathrm{R} 2$ | 11 | 0.0 | 0.072 | 60.0 | LOS E | 0.6 | 3.9 | 0.95 | 0.68 | 0.95 | 34.5 |
| Approach | 304 | 4.3 | 0.858 | 63.7 | LOS E | 8.9 | 64.6 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 1.38 | 35.8 |
| East: Thomas Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 10 | 10.0 | 0.777 | 57.4 | LOS E | 13.9 | 101.6 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.13 | 35.7 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 496 | 5.0 | 0.777 | 50.9 | LOS D | 13.9 | 101.8 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.13 | 35.6 |
| 6 R2 | 863 | 0.6 | 0.855 | 55.7 | LOS E | 24.9 | 175.0 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 35.1 |
| Approach | 1369 | 2.3 | 0.855 | 54.0 | LOS D | 24.9 | 175.0 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 1.17 | 35.3 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 541 | 11.8 | 0.463 | 12.3 | LOS B | 8.8 | 67.7 | 0.41 | 0.75 | 0.41 | 59.4 |
| 8 T1 | 798 | 10.0 | 0.856 | 50.7 | LOS D | 23.2 | 176.3 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 42.1 |
| 9 R2 | 571 | 6.5 | 0.842 | 40.0 | LOS D | 9.9 | 73.0 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 1.23 | 41.7 |
| Approach | 1910 | 9.5 | 0.856 | 36.6 | LOS D | 23.2 | 176.3 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 0.99 | 45.7 |
| West: Thomas Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 380 | 4.5 | 0.369 | 16.2 | LOS B | 9.3 | 67.8 | 0.56 | 0.74 | 0.56 | 55.3 |
| 11 T1 | 542 | 6.1 | 0.836 | 54.6 | LOS D | 15.7 | 115.4 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.23 | 34.4 |
| 12 R2 | 57 | 1.8 | 0.114 | 38.7 | LOS D | 2.3 | 16.3 | 0.79 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 41.5 |
| Approach | 979 | 5.2 | 0.836 | 38.8 | LOS D | 15.7 | 115.4 | 0.82 | 0.86 | 0.94 | 40.8 |
| All Vehicles | 4562 | 6.0 | 0.858 | 44.1 | LOS D | 24.9 | 176.3 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 1.06 | 40.3 |

The SIDRA results show that the intersection will operate at an unacceptable level of service with long delays and queues. Significant modifications to the geometry and the signal timing are required to ensure that the intersection operates within an acceptable level of service. Figure 5-7 shows the reconfigured dominimum intersection layout.

Figure 5-7 Reconfigured SIDRA Layout for Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection


The SIDRA results based on this reconfigured intersection layout and signal phasing analysis are summarised in Table 5-5 and Table 5-6. The results show that there will be some slight delays for right turning movements, particularly on the western and northern legs of the intersection. However, these delays are considered to be acceptable as they do not considerably exceed the LOS threshold for unacceptable delays.

For the PM peak period, the intersection is approaching capacity and grade separation could be considered to improve capacity.

Table 5-5 Reconfigured Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID <br> Turn | Demand Total veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 103 | 6.8 | 0.892 | 61.6 | LOS E | 21.5 | 160.3 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.35 | 35.1 |
| 2 T1 | 1021 | 7.8 | 0.892 | 53.4 | LOS D | 21.8 | 162.5 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.35 | 40.6 |
| 3 R 2 | 45 | 24.4 | 0.158 | 47.0 | LOS D | 1.9 | 16.0 | 0.88 | 0.74 | 0.88 | 36.9 |
| Approach | 1169 | 8.4 | 0.892 | 53.9 | LOS D | 21.8 | 162.5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.33 | 39.9 |
| East: Thomas Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.600 | 31.3 | LOS C | 9.0 | 66.9 | 0.94 | 0.78 | 0.94 | 49.3 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 506 | 6.9 | 0.600 | 25.0 | LOS C | 9.0 | 67.0 | 0.94 | 0.78 | 0.94 | 47.5 |
| 6 R2 | 888 | 3.4 | 0.680 | 44.8 | LOS D | 13.4 | 96.9 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.98 | 38.9 |
| Approach | 1403 | 4.6 | 0.680 | 37.6 | LOS D | 13.4 | 96.9 | 0.96 | 0.82 | 0.97 | 41.7 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 520 | 8.3 | 0.397 | 11.2 | LOS B | 6.6 | 49.6 | 0.36 | 0.73 | 0.36 | 61.4 |
| 8 T1 | 769 | 6.6 | 0.894 | 53.8 | LOS D | 22.1 | 163.4 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.35 | 40.7 |
| 9 R2 | 578 | 7.6 | 0.911 | 69.0 | LOS E | 17.3 | 129.4 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 31.4 |
| Approach | 1867 | 7.4 | 0.911 | 46.7 | LOS D | 22.1 | 163.4 | 0.82 | 0.93 | 1.12 | 40.8 |
| West: Thomas Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 653 | 8.4 | 0.747 | 25.6 | LOS C | 19.9 | 149.2 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 1.05 | 48.0 |
| 11 T1 | 359 | 7.2 | 0.876 | 57.9 | LOS E | 10.1 | 74.8 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.45 | 33.4 |
| 12 R2 | 36 | 5.6 | 0.336 | 58.8 | LOS E | 1.8 | 13.3 | 0.99 | 0.73 | 0.99 | 33.6 |
| Approach | 1048 | 7.9 | 0.876 | 37.8 | LOS D | 19.9 | 149.2 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 1.19 | 41.2 |
| All Vehicles | 5487 | 7.0 | 0.911 | 44.2 | LOS D | 22.1 | 163.4 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 1.14 | 40.9 |



Table 5-6 Reconfigured Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID Turn | Demand Total veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 50 | 4.0 | 0.208 | 40.1 | LOS D | 3.7 | 27.1 | 0.83 | 0.72 | 0.83 | 43.5 |
| 2 T1 | 243 | 4.5 | 0.208 | 32.1 | LOS C | 3.8 | 27.8 | 0.83 | 0.67 | 0.83 | 52.9 |
| 3 R 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.035 | 45.8 | LOS D | 0.5 | 3.2 | 0.86 | 0.68 | 0.86 | 40.0 |
| Approach | 304 | 4.3 | 0.208 | 33.9 | LOS C | 3.8 | 27.8 | 0.83 | 0.68 | 0.83 | 50.5 |
| East: Thomas Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 10 | 10.0 | 0.610 | 36.4 | LOS D | 9.0 | 65.7 | 0.95 | 0.84 | 1.10 | 44.9 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 496 | 5.0 | 0.610 | 29.9 | LOS C | 9.0 | 65.8 | 0.95 | 0.84 | 1.10 | 44.7 |
| 6 R2 | 863 | 0.6 | 0.819 | 54.5 | LOS D | 14.9 | 105.1 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 1.20 | 35.5 |
| Approach | 1369 | 2.3 | 0.819 | 45.4 | LOS D | 14.9 | 105.1 | 0.98 | 0.89 | 1.16 | 38.4 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 541 | 11.8 | 0.436 | 12.3 | LOS B | 8.2 | 63.4 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 0.42 | 59.4 |
| 8 T1 | 798 | 10.0 | 0.872 | 49.2 | LOS D | 21.9 | 166.8 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.27 | 42.9 |
| 9 R 2 | 571 | 6.5 | 0.946 | 79.8 | LOS E | 18.8 | 138.9 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.69 | 28.8 |
| Approach | 1910 | 9.5 | 0.946 | 47.9 | LOS D | 21.9 | 166.8 | 0.84 | 0.94 | 1.16 | 40.2 |
| West: Thomas Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 380 | 4.5 | 0.324 | 11.4 | LOS B | 6.2 | 45.2 | 0.43 | 0.71 | 0.43 | 59.6 |
| 11 T1 | 542 | 6.1 | 0.963 | 78.7 | LOS E | 18.7 | 137.7 | 1.00 | 1.24 | 1.83 | 28.2 |
| 12 R2 | 57 | 1.8 | 0.518 | 59.6 | LOS E | 2.9 | 20.7 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 1.01 | 33.7 |
| Approach | 979 | 5.2 | 0.963 | 51.4 | LOS D | 18.7 | 137.7 | 0.78 | 1.01 | 1.24 | 35.8 |
| All Vehicles | 4562 | 6.0 | 0.963 | 47.0 | LOS D | 21.9 | 166.8 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 1.15 | 39.1 |



### 5.5.4 No. 2 - Abernethy Road and South Western Highway

The following presents the results of the analysis of the Abernethy Road/South Western Highway intersection. Figure 5-8 is a SIDRA layout representation of the intersection which is based on the indicative layouts used in the mesoscopic model.

Figure 5-8 SIDRA Layout for Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection


The SIDRA results based on this intersection layout and signal phasing analysis are summarised in Table 57 and Table 5-8.

Table 5-7 Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov Turn ID | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Flows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| South: S Western Hwy (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 129 | 10.1 | 0.803 | 56.7 | LOS E | 30.8 | 228.6 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 0.96 | 31.6 |
| 2 T1 | 784 | 6.1 | 0.803 | 50.2 | LOS D | 30.8 | 228.6 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 0.94 | 32.7 |
| 3 R2 | 65 | 4.6 | 0.266 | 69.8 | LOS E | 4.2 | 30.8 | 0.91 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 27.6 |
| Approach | 978 | 6.5 | 0.803 | 52.3 | LOS D | 30.8 | 228.6 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 0.94 | 32.2 |
| East: Abernethy Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 74 | 5.4 | 0.298 | 55.9 | LOS E | 7.7 | 57.0 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 31.5 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 59 | 6.8 | 0.298 | 50.2 | LOS D | 7.7 | 57.0 | 0.84 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 32.0 |
| 6 R2 | 137 | 10.2 | 0.362 | 54.4 | LOS D | 8.2 | 62.7 | 0.86 | 0.78 | 0.86 | 31.2 |
| Approach | 270 | 8.1 | 0.362 | 53.9 | LOS D | 8.2 | 62.7 | 0.85 | 0.76 | 0.85 | 31.5 |
| North: S Western Hwy (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 35 | 14.3 | 0.627 | 53.0 | LOS D | 22.5 | 167.4 | 0.89 | 0.78 | 0.89 | 32.9 |
| 8 T1 | 665 | 6.8 | 0.627 | 46.6 | LOS D | 22.5 | 167.4 | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 33.9 |
| 9 R2 | 123 | 3.3 | 0.498 | 72.5 | LOS E | 8.3 | 59.9 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 27.1 |
| Approach | 823 | 6.6 | 0.627 | 50.7 | LOS D | 22.5 | 167.4 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 0.89 | 32.7 |
| West: Abernethy Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 209 | 9.1 | 0.625 | 60.9 | LOS E | 16.9 | 126.8 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 29.8 |
| 11 T1 | 56 | 5.4 | 0.625 | 55.2 | LOS E | 16.9 | 126.8 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 30.4 |
| 12 R2 | 116 | 7.8 | 0.484 | 72.5 | LOS E | 7.8 | 58.6 | 0.95 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 27.1 |
| Approach | 381 | 8.1 | 0.625 | 63.6 | LOS E | 16.9 | 126.8 | 0.93 | 0.81 | 0.93 | 29.0 |
| All Vehicles | 2452 | 7.0 | 0.803 | 53.7 | LOS D | 30.8 | 228.6 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 31.7 |

Table 5-8 Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: S Western Hwy (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 134 | 6.0 | 0.578 | 47.4 | LOS D | 18.5 | 136.1 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.87 | 34.2 |
| 2 T1 | 546 | 6.2 | 0.578 | 41.5 | LOS D | 18.5 | 136.1 | 0.86 | 0.76 | 0.86 | 35.4 |
| 3 R 2 | 71 | 4.2 | 0.262 | 62.0 | LOS E | 4.1 | 30.0 | 0.90 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 29.3 |
| Approach | 751 | 6.0 | 0.578 | 44.5 | LOS D | 18.5 | 136.1 | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 34.5 |
| East: Abernethy Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 94 | 6.4 | 0.459 | 58.9 | LOS E | 9.4 | 69.5 | 0.91 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 30.6 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 69 | 5.8 | 0.459 | 53.3 | LOS D | 9.4 | 69.5 | 0.91 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 31.2 |
| 6 R2 | 96 | 6.3 | 0.228 | 36.6 | LOS D | 4.1 | 30.1 | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 36.9 |
| Approach | 259 | 6.2 | 0.459 | 49.1 | LOS D | 9.4 | 69.5 | 0.87 | 0.76 | 0.87 | 32.8 |
| North: S Western Hwy (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 68 | 5.9 | 0.773 | 51.0 | LOS D | 27.1 | 200.6 | 0.95 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 33.5 |
| 8 T1 | 765 | 7.1 | 0.773 | 43.9 | LOS D | 27.1 | 200.6 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 34.7 |
| 9 R2 | 236 | 2.5 | 0.860 | 69.2 | LOS E | 15.4 | 110.3 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 1.02 | 27.8 |
| Approach | 1069 | 6.0 | 0.860 | 50.0 | LOS D | 27.1 | 200.6 | 0.93 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 32.8 |
| West: Abernethy Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 116 | 10.3 | 0.503 | 59.6 | LOS E | 10.2 | 77.0 | 0.92 | 0.79 | 0.92 | 30.3 |
| 11 T1 | 59 | 5.1 | 0.503 | 53.9 | LOS D | 10.2 | 77.0 | 0.92 | 0.79 | 0.92 | 30.9 |
| 12 R2 | 312 | 2.9 | 1.155 | 349.0 | LOS F | 56.7 | 406.9 | 1.00 | 1.71 | 2.97 | 8.7 |
| Approach | 487 | 4.9 | 1.155 | 244.3 | LOS F | 56.7 | 406.9 | 0.97 | 1.38 | 2.24 | 11.7 |
| All Vehicles | 2566 | 5.8 | 1.155 | 85.2 | LOS F | 56.7 | 406.9 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 1.16 | 24.7 |

The SIDRA results show that the western leg of the intersection will experience delays in the PM peak. However, reconfiguring the turning movement arrangement and intersection layout would likely improve the operation of the intersection. Figure 5-9 shows the updated layout and Table 5-10 and Table 5-10 show the results with the modified signal phasing for the PM peak.

Figure 5-9 Reconfigured SIDRA Layout for Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection


Table 5-9 Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection AM Results 2031


Table 5-10 Abernethy Road/South Western Highway Intersection PM Results 2031



### 5.5.5 No. 3 - Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way

The following presents the results of the analysis of the Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way intersection.
Figure $\mathbf{5 - 1 0}$ is a SIDRA layout representation of the intersection which is based on the indicative layouts used in the mesoscopic model.

Figure 5-10 SIDRA Layout for Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection


The SIDRA results based on this intersection layout and signal phasing are summarised in Table 5-11 and Table 5-12.

Table 5-11 Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection AM Results 2031


Table 5-12 Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection PM Results 2031


The SIDRA results shows that the intersection will operate at an unacceptable level of service with long delays and queues in the PM peak.

However, this intersection has been proposed to be reconstructed as a roundabout, providing additional capacity for peak period movements. Figure 5-11 shows a SIDRA depiction of the updated layout. Table 513 and Table $5-14$ show the results of assessment. The results indicate that the reconfigured intersection would function at a high LOS through to the development horizon.

Figure 5-11 Reconfigured SIDRA Layout for Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection


Table 5-13 Reconfigured Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Gordin Way (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 29 | 6.9 | 0.200 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.1 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 53.9 |
| 2 T1 | 168 | 3.0 | 0.200 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.1 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 55.5 |
| 3 R 2 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.200 | 10.4 | LOS B | 1.0 | 7.1 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 55.8 |
| Approach | 208 | 3.4 | 0.200 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.1 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 55.3 |
| East: Abernethy Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 7 | 14.3 | 0.083 | 4.5 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.6 | 0.27 | 0.39 | 0.27 | 54.2 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 156 | 7.1 | 0.088 | 4.3 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.0 | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0.26 | 55.5 |
| 6 R2 | 80 | 16.3 | 0.088 | 9.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.0 | 0.25 | 0.53 | 0.25 | 53.9 |
| Approach | 243 | 10.3 | 0.088 | 6.0 | LOS A | 0.5 | 4.0 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 54.9 |
| North: New Rd 4 (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 13 | 0.0 | 0.065 | 4.5 | LOS A | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 53.4 |
| 8 T1 | 32 | 0.0 | 0.065 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 54.7 |
| 9 R2 | 26 | 0.0 | 0.065 | 9.9 | LOS A | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 54.9 |
| Approach | 71 | 0.0 | 0.065 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 54.6 |
| West: Abernethy Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 54 | 7.4 | 0.100 | 4.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.5 | 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.45 | 53.9 |
| 11 T1 | 166 | 4.2 | 0.100 | 4.9 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.5 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 55.1 |
| 12 R2 | 32 | 3.1 | 0.100 | 10.5 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.3 | 0.47 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 54.6 |
| Approach | 252 | 4.8 | 0.100 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.5 | 0.46 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 54.8 |
| All Vehicles | 774 | 5.7 | 0.200 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.1 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 54.9 |

Table 5-14 Reconfigured Abernethy Rd/New Road 4/Gordin Way Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Gordin Way (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 54 | 1.9 | 0.209 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.1 | 7.7 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 53.9 |
| 2 T1 | 139 | 1.4 | 0.209 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.1 | 7.7 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 55.3 |
| 3 R2 | 25 | 4.0 | 0.209 | 10.5 | LOS B | 1.1 | 7.7 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 55.5 |
| Approach | 218 | 1.8 | 0.209 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.1 | 7.7 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 55.0 |
| East: Abernethy Rd (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 36 | 0.0 | 0.092 | 4.8 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.0 | 0.40 | 0.46 | 0.40 | 54.1 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 159 | 5.0 | 0.097 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.6 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 55.0 |
| 6 R2 | 53 | 18.9 | 0.097 | 10.1 | LOS B | 0.6 | 4.6 | 0.39 | 0.52 | 0.39 | 54.0 |
| Approach | 248 | 7.3 | 0.097 | 5.9 | LOS A | 0.6 | 4.6 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 54.7 |
| North: New Rd 4 (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 40 | 0.0 | 0.194 | 4.8 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 53.5 |
| 8 T1 | 114 | 1.8 | 0.194 | 5.1 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 54.8 |
| 9 R2 | 53 | 3.8 | 0.194 | 10.3 | LOS B | 1.0 | 7.3 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 54.9 |
| Approach | 207 | 1.9 | 0.194 | 6.4 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.3 | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 54.6 |
| West: Abernethy Rd (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 118 | 11.0 | 0.129 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.1 | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 54.1 |
| 11 T1 | 194 | 2.6 | 0.129 | 4.8 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.1 | 0.44 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 55.4 |
| 12 R2 | 21 | 0.0 | 0.129 | 10.2 | LOS B | 0.8 | 5.6 | 0.44 | 0.50 | 0.44 | 55.3 |
| Approach | 333 | 5.4 | 0.129 | 5.1 | LOS A | 0.8 | 6.1 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.43 | 54.9 |
| All Vehicles | 1006 | 4.4 | 0.209 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.1 | 7.7 | 0.43 | 0.52 | 0.43 | 54.8 |

### 5.5.6 No. 4 - Soldiers Road and New Road 6 (Orton Road)

The following presents the results of the analysis of the Soldiers Road/New Road 6 intersection. Figure 5-12 is a SIDRA layout representation of the intersection which is based on the indicative layouts used in the mesoscopic model.

Figure 5-12 SIDRA Layout for Soldiers Road/New Road 6 Intersection


The SIDRA results based on this reconfigured intersection layout and signal phasing analysis are summarised in Table 5-15 and Table 5-16.

Table 5-15 Soldiers Road/New Road 6 Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Turn | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Soldiers Rd (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 171 | 4.1 | 1.063 | 221.9 | LOS F | 43.2 | 309.1 | 1.00 | 1.42 | 2.25 | 13.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 81 | 1.2 | 1.063 | 214.9 | LOS F | 43.2 | 309.1 | 1.00 | 1.42 | 2.25 | 13.5 |
| 3 | R2 | 49 | 0.0 | 1.063 | 221.5 | LOS F | 43.2 | 309.1 | 1.00 | 1.42 | 2.25 | 13.1 |
| Appro |  | 301 | 2.7 | 1.063 | 219.9 | LOS F | 43.2 | 309.1 | 1.00 | 1.42 | 2.25 | 13.2 |
| East: New Road 6 (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 80 | 1.3 | 1.089 | 254.1 | LOS F | 108.3 | 793.5 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 2.32 | 11.7 |
| 5 | T1 | 520 | 6.5 | 1.089 | 248.5 | LOS F | 108.3 | 793.5 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 2.32 | 11.6 |
| 6 | R2 | 63 | 1.6 | 1.089 | 254.0 | LOS F | 108.3 | 793.5 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 2.32 | 11.7 |
| Appro |  | 663 | 5.4 | 1.089 | 249.7 | LOS F | 108.3 | 793.5 | 1.00 | 1.84 | 2.32 | 11.6 |
| North: Soldiers Rd (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 166 | 4.8 | 1.090 | 262.6 | LOS F | 58.4 | 421.5 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 2.43 | 11.4 |
| 8 | T1 | 198 | 2.5 | 1.090 | 255.5 | LOS F | 58.4 | 421.5 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 2.43 | 11.8 |
| 9 | R2 | 1 | 0.0 | 1.090 | 262.2 | LOS F | 58.4 | 421.5 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 2.43 | 11.4 |
| Appro |  | 365 | 3.6 | 1.090 | 258.8 | LOS F | 58.4 | 421.5 | 1.00 | 1.67 | 2.43 | 11.6 |
| West: New Road 6 (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 1 | 0.0 | 1.069 | 227.8 | LOS F | 52.8 | 385.5 | 1.00 | 1.71 | 2.26 | 12.8 |
| 11 | T1 | 255 | 6.3 | 1.069 | 222.3 | LOS F | 52.8 | 385.5 | 1.00 | 1.71 | 2.26 | 12.6 |
| 12 | R2 | 102 | 2.0 | 1.069 | 227.7 | LOS F | 52.8 | 385.5 | 1.00 | 1.71 | 2.26 | 12.7 |
| Approach |  | 358 | 5.0 | 1.069 | 223.8 | LOS F | 52.8 | 385.5 | 1.00 | 1.71 | 2.26 | 12.6 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1687 | 4.4 | 1.090 | 240.9 | LOS F | 108.3 | 793.5 | 1.00 | 1.70 | 2.32 | 12.1 |

Table 5-16 Soldiers Road/New Road 6 Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. <br> Satn <br> v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| South: Soldiers Rd (S) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 160 | 1.3 | 1.010 | 151.0 | LOS F | 42.3 | 298.3 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.81 | 17.8 |
| 2 T1 | 71 | 0.0 | 1.010 | 144.0 | LOS F | 42.3 | 298.3 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.81 | 18.6 |
| 3 R 2 | 133 | 0.8 | 1.010 | 150.6 | LOS F | 42.3 | 298.3 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.81 | 17.7 |
| Approach | 364 | 0.8 | 1.010 | 149.5 | LOS F | 42.3 | 298.3 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 1.81 | 17.9 |
| East: New Road 6 (E) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 109 | 0.0 | 0.998 | 133.7 | LOS F | 53.5 | 381.4 | 1.00 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 19.5 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 307 | 2.9 | 0.998 | 128.1 | LOS F | 53.5 | 381.4 | 1.00 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 19.1 |
| 6 R2 | 62 | 1.6 | 0.998 | 133.6 | LOS F | 53.5 | 381.4 | 1.00 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 19.4 |
| Approach | 478 | 2.1 | 0.998 | 130.1 | LOS F | 53.5 | 381.4 | 1.00 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 19.2 |
| North: Soldiers Rd (N) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 125 | 4.8 | 1.020 | 163.2 | LOS F | 33.3 | 239.3 | 1.00 | 1.33 | 1.94 | 16.9 |
| 8 T1 | 153 | 2.0 | 1.020 | 156.2 | LOS F | 33.3 | 239.3 | 1.00 | 1.33 | 1.94 | 17.7 |
| 9 R2 | 1 | 0.0 | 1.020 | 162.8 | LOS F | 33.3 | 239.3 | 1.00 | 1.33 | 1.94 | 16.9 |
| Approach | 279 | 3.2 | 1.020 | 159.3 | LOS F | 33.3 | 239.3 | 1.00 | 1.33 | 1.94 | 17.3 |
| West: New Road 6 (W) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 132 | 0.0 | 0.995 | 131.2 | LOS F | 51.0 | 363.3 | 1.00 | 1.27 | 1.65 | 19.7 |
| 11 T1 | 238 | 3.8 | 0.995 | 125.6 | LOS F | 51.0 | 363.3 | 1.00 | 1.27 | 1.65 | 19.3 |
| 12 R2 | 91 | 1.1 | 0.995 | 131.1 | LOS F | 51.0 | 363.3 | 1.00 | 1.27 | 1.65 | 19.6 |
| Approach | 461 | 2.2 | 0.995 | 128.3 | LOS F | 51.0 | 363.3 | 1.00 | 1.27 | 1.65 | 19.5 |
| All Vehicles | 1582 | 2.0 | 1.020 | 139.2 | LOS F | 53.5 | 381.4 | 1.00 | 1.28 | 1.74 | 18.6 |

The SIDRA results shows that the intersection will operate at an unacceptable level of service with long delays and queues. Modifications to the geometry and the signal timing are required to ensure that the intersection operates within an acceptable level of service. Figure $\mathbf{5 - 1 3}$ shows the reconfigured intersection layout and Table 5-17 and Table 5-18 shows the results for the modified signal phasing.

Figure 5-13 Reconfigured SIDRA Layout for Soldiers Road/New Road 6 Intersection


Table 5-17 Reconfigured Soldiers Road/New Road 6 Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID <br> Turn | Demand Total veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue <br> Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Soldiers Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 171 | 4.1 | 0.574 | 44.1 | LOS D | 11.6 | 83.1 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 34.8 |
| 2 T1 | 81 | 1.2 | 0.574 | 38.5 | LOS D | 11.6 | 83.1 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 35.4 |
| 3 R 2 | 49 | 0.0 | 0.462 | 61.0 | LOS E | 2.6 | 18.3 | 1.00 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 29.5 |
| Approach | 301 | 2.7 | 0.574 | 45.4 | LOS D | 11.6 | 83.1 | 0.95 | 0.80 | 0.95 | 33.9 |
| East: New Road 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 80 | 1.3 | 0.836 | 40.2 | LOS D | 29.6 | 217.4 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 1.04 | 37.2 |
| 5 T1 | 520 | 6.5 | 0.836 | 34.6 | LOS C | 29.6 | 217.4 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 1.04 | 37.9 |
| 6 R2 | 63 | 1.6 | 0.515 | 60.0 | LOS E | 3.3 | 23.7 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 1.00 | 29.7 |
| Approach | 663 | 5.4 | 0.836 | 37.7 | LOS D | 29.6 | 217.4 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 1.04 | 36.9 |
| North: Soldiers Rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 166 | 4.8 | 0.823 | 52.2 | LOS D | 19.5 | 140.4 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.16 | 32.6 |
| 8 T1 | 198 | 2.5 | 0.823 | 46.6 | LOS D | 19.5 | 140.4 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.16 | 33.2 |
| 9 R2 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.009 | 57.2 | LOS E | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.96 | 0.59 | 0.96 | 30.4 |
| Approach | 365 | 3.6 | 0.823 | 49.2 | LOS D | 19.5 | 140.4 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.16 | 32.9 |
| West: New Road 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 49 | 0.0 | 0.397 | 28.9 | LOS C | 10.9 | 79.9 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.75 | 42.0 |
| 11 T1 | 255 | 6.3 | 0.397 | 23.4 | LOS C | 10.9 | 79.9 | 0.75 | 0.67 | 0.75 | 42.9 |
| 12 R2 | 102 | 2.0 | 0.835 | 66.1 | LOS E | 5.9 | 41.7 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.42 | 28.3 |
| Approach | 406 | 4.4 | 0.835 | 34.8 | LOS C | 10.9 | 79.9 | 0.81 | 0.74 | 0.92 | 37.9 |
| All Vehicles | 1735 | 4.3 | 0.836 | 40.8 | LOS D | 29.6 | 217.4 | 0.93 | 0.86 | 1.02 | 35.7 |



| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID | Turn | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \end{aligned}$ $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| South: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 160 | 1.3 | 0.664 | 36.0 | LOS D | 7.8 | 55.0 | 0.98 | 0.85 | 1.04 | 37.7 |
| 2 | T1 | 71 | 0.0 | 0.664 | 30.5 | LOS C | 7.8 | 55.0 | 0.98 | 0.85 | 1.04 | 38.4 |
| 3 | R2 | 133 | 0.8 | 0.720 | 42.5 | LOS D | 4.9 | 34.6 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.21 | 34.6 |
| Appro |  | 364 | 0.8 | 0.720 | 37.3 | LOS D | 7.8 | 55.0 | 0.99 | 0.86 | 1.10 | 36.6 |
| East: New Road 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L2 | 110 | 0.9 | 0.785 | 34.2 | LOS C | 14.8 | 106.4 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 1.13 | 39.3 |
| 5 | T1 | 312 | 4.5 | 0.785 | 28.7 | LOS C | 14.8 | 106.4 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 1.13 | 40.1 |
| 6 | R2 | 62 | 1.6 | 0.394 | 40.7 | LOS D | 2.2 | 15.4 | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.98 | 35.2 |
| Appro |  | 484 | 3.3 | 0.785 | 31.5 | LOS C | 14.8 | 106.4 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 1.11 | 39.2 |
| North: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 125 | 4.8 | 0.803 | 40.2 | LOS D | 10.3 | 74.3 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.25 | 36.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 153 | 2.0 | 0.803 | 34.6 | LOS C | 10.3 | 74.3 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.25 | 37.3 |
| 9 | R2 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.005 | 36.7 | LOS D | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.92 | 0.59 | 0.92 | 36.7 |
| Appro |  | 279 | 3.2 | 0.803 | 37.1 | LOS D | 10.3 | 74.3 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.25 | 37.0 |
| West: New Road 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 133 | 0.8 | 0.690 | 30.8 | LOS C | 11.8 | 84.6 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.99 | 40.6 |
| 11 | T1 | 238 | 3.8 | 0.690 | 25.3 | LOS C | 11.8 | 84.6 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.99 | 41.4 |
| 12 | R2 | 91 | 1.1 | 0.576 | 41.7 | LOS D | 3.3 | 23.1 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 1.06 | 34.9 |
| Appro |  | 462 | 2.4 | 0.690 | 30.1 | LOS C | 11.8 | 84.6 | 0.96 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 39.7 |
| All Ve | icles | 1589 | 2.5 | 0.803 | 33.4 | LOS C | 14.8 | 106.4 | 0.98 | 0.89 | 1.10 | 38.3 |



### 5.5.7 No. 5 - New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway

The following presents the results of the analysis of the New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway intersection.
Figure 5-14 is a SIDRA layout representation of the intersection which is based on the indicative layouts used in the mesoscopic model.

Figure 5-14 SIDRA Layout for New Road 6/South Western Highway Intersection


The SIDRA results based on this intersection layout and signal phasing analysis are summarised in Table 519 and Table 5-20.

Table 5-19 New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection AM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 394 | 7.4 | 0.305 | 6.6 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 59.9 |
| 2 T1 | 670 | 7.2 | 0.305 | 0.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 3.4 | 0.06 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 90.2 |
| 3 R2 | 17 | 0.0 | 0.305 | 14.0 | LOS B | 0.5 | 3.4 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 70.1 |
| Approach | 1081 | 7.1 | 0.305 | 3.1 | NA | 0.5 | 3.4 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 75.8 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 16 | 0.0 | 16.529 | 27975.3 | LOS F | 765.4 | 5708.7 | 1.00 | 5.29 | 19.46 | 0.1 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 109 | 5.5 | 16.529 | 27983.0 | LOS F | 765.4 | 5708.7 | 1.00 | 5.29 | 19.46 | 0.1 |
| 6 R2 | 490 | 8.4 | 16.529 | 27981.3 | LOS F | 765.4 | 5708.7 | 1.00 | 5.29 | 19.46 | 0.1 |
| Approach | 615 | 7.6 | 16.529 | 27981.4 | LOS F | 765.4 | 5708.7 | 1.00 | 5.29 | 19.46 | 0.1 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 299 | 6.0 | 0.337 | 7.1 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 67.7 |
| 8 T1 | 394 | 7.1 | 0.337 | 4.6 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.17 | 0.40 | 0.21 | 77.1 |
| 9 R2 | 107 | 7.5 | 0.337 | 19.5 | LOS C | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.84 | 0.72 | 1.06 | 49.7 |
| Approach | 800 | 6.8 | 0.337 | 7.6 | NA | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.20 | 0.41 | 0.25 | 68.5 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 58 | 19.0 | 6.380 | 9719.6 | LOS F | 302.6 | 2272.5 | 1.00 | 5.67 | 19.09 | 0.4 |
| 11 T1 | 43 | 7.0 | 6.380 | 9739.6 | LOS F | 302.6 | 2272.5 | 1.00 | 5.67 | 19.09 | 0.4 |
| 12 R2 | 169 | 5.3 | 6.380 | 9736.3 | LOS F | 302.6 | 2272.5 | 1.00 | 5.67 | 19.09 | 0.4 |
| Approach | 270 | 8.5 | 6.380 | 9733.2 | LOS F | 302.6 | 2272.5 | 1.00 | 5.67 | 19.09 | 0.4 |
| All Vehicles | 2766 | 7.3 | 16.529 | 7175.0 | NA | 765.4 | 5708.7 | 0.39 | 1.95 | 6.28 | 0.5 |

Table 5-20 New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection PM Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | Flows HV \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 131 | 5.3 | 0.124 | 6.9 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 65.0 |
| 2 T1 | 95 | 5.3 | 0.124 | 0.0 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 70.9 |
| 3 R2 | 37 | 0.0 | 0.143 | 19.5 | LOS C | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.85 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 44.3 |
| Approach | 263 | 4.6 | 0.143 | 6.2 | NA | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.12 | 0.45 | 0.12 | 62.8 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 36 | 0.0 | 6.501 | 9929.8 | LOS F | 346.7 | 2533.9 | 1.00 | 6.11 | 21.75 | 0.4 |
| 5 T1 | 64 | 14.1 | 6.501 | 9944.4 | LOS F | 346.7 | 2533.9 | 1.00 | 6.11 | 21.75 | 0.4 |
| 6 R2 | 211 | 3.3 | 6.501 | 9943.1 | LOS F | 346.7 | 2533.9 | 1.00 | 6.11 | 21.75 | 0.4 |
| Approach | 311 | 5.1 | 6.501 | 9941.8 | LOS F | 346.7 | 2533.9 | 1.00 | 6.11 | 21.75 | 0.4 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 361 | 6.4 | 0.410 | 7.2 | LOS A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 67.8 |
| 8 T1 | 893 | 6.2 | 0.410 | 3.1 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.2 | 0.14 | 0.51 | 0.15 | 83.0 |
| 9 R2 | 153 | 5.2 | 0.410 | 9.1 | LOS A | 1.9 | 14.2 | 0.25 | 0.67 | 0.26 | 62.9 |
| Approach | 1407 | 6.1 | 0.410 | 4.8 | NA | 1.9 | 14.2 | 0.12 | 0.48 | 0.12 | 76.0 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 5 | 20.0 | 8.568 | 13647.0 | LOS F | 481.3 | 3480.6 | 1.00 | 6.01 | 22.80 | 0.3 |
| 11 T1 | 50 | 0.0 | 8.568 | 13658.0 | LOS F | 481.3 | 3480.6 | 1.00 | 6.01 | 22.80 | 0.3 |
| 12 R2 | 360 | 4.2 | 8.568 | 13655.1 | LOS F | 481.3 | 3480.6 | 1.00 | 6.01 | 22.80 | 0.3 |
| Approach | 415 | 3.9 | 8.568 | 13655.3 | LOS F | 481.3 | 3480.6 | 1.00 | 6.01 | 22.80 | 0.3 |
| All Vehicles | 2396 | 5.4 | 8.568 | 3659.1 | NA | 481.3 | 3480.6 | 0.38 | 2.16 | 6.86 | 1.0 |

The SIDRA results shows that the intersection will operate at an unacceptable level of service with long queues and delays on the eastern and western leg of the intersection. Modifications to the geometry are required to ensure that the intersection operates within an acceptable level of service. Figure 5-15 shows the reconfigured intersection layout Option 1.

Figure 5-15 Reconfigured SIDRA Layout for New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection Option 1


The SIDRA results based on this reconfigured intersection layout Option 1 - Roundabout are summarised in Table 5-21 and Table 5-22. The results show that the intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service with these upgrade.

Table 5-21 Reconfigured New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection AM Option 1 Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 394 | 7.4 | 0.662 | 11.8 | LOS B | 8.6 | 63.6 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.29 | 50.2 |
| 2 T1 | 670 | 7.2 | 0.662 | 13.3 | LOS B | 8.6 | 63.6 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.33 | 50.7 |
| 3 R2 | 17 | 0.0 | 0.662 | 19.4 | LOS B | 7.5 | 55.8 | 1.00 | 1.12 | 1.35 | 50.5 |
| Approach | 1081 | 7.1 | 0.662 | 12.8 | LOS B | 8.6 | 63.6 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 1.32 | 50.5 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 16 | 0.0 | 0.767 | 11.6 | LOS B | 7.8 | 57.8 | 0.87 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 47.7 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 109 | 5.5 | 0.767 | 12.0 | LOS B | 7.8 | 57.8 | 0.87 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 48.9 |
| 6 R2 | 490 | 8.4 | 0.767 | 17.8 | LOS B | 7.8 | 57.8 | 0.87 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 49.0 |
| Approach | 615 | 7.6 | 0.767 | 16.6 | LOS B | 7.8 | 57.8 | 0.87 | 1.12 | 1.31 | 48.9 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 299 | 6.0 | 0.307 | 4.6 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 54.2 |
| 8 T1 | 394 | 7.1 | 0.307 | 4.7 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.51 | 55.1 |
| 9 R2 | 107 | 7.5 | 0.307 | 10.5 | LOS B | 2.1 | 15.9 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.52 | 54.8 |
| Approach | 800 | 6.8 | 0.307 | 5.5 | LOS A | 2.3 | 16.8 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.51 | 54.7 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 58 | 19.0 | 0.524 | 12.8 | LOS B | 3.5 | 26.5 | 0.87 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 47.6 |
| 11 T1 | 43 | 7.0 | 0.524 | 12.3 | LOS B | 3.5 | 26.5 | 0.87 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 49.1 |
| 12 R2 | 169 | 5.3 | 0.524 | 17.9 | LOS B | 3.5 | 26.5 | 0.87 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 49.3 |
| Approach | 270 | 8.5 | 0.524 | 15.9 | LOS B | 3.5 | 26.5 | 0.87 | 1.03 | 1.11 | 48.9 |
| All Vehicles | 2766 | 7.3 | 0.767 | 11.8 | LOS B | 8.6 | 63.6 | 0.82 | 0.92 | 1.06 | 51.1 |

Table 5-22 Reconfigured New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection PM Option 1 Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demano <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 131 | 5.3 | 0.116 | 5.2 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.57 | 0.56 | 0.57 | 54.0 |
| 2 T1 | 95 | 5.3 | 0.116 | 5.5 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 54.5 |
| 3 R 2 | 37 | 0.0 | 0.116 | 11.2 | LOS B | 0.7 | 5.0 | 0.58 | 0.61 | 0.58 | 54.7 |
| Approach | 263 | 4.6 | 0.116 | 6.2 | LOS A | 0.7 | 5.4 | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.57 | 54.3 |
| East: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 36 | 0.0 | 0.652 | 15.2 | LOS B | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.33 | 45.9 |
| $5 \quad \mathrm{~T} 1$ | 64 | 14.1 | 0.652 | 16.1 | LOS B | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.33 | 46.9 |
| 6 R2 | 211 | 3.3 | 0.652 | 21.2 | LOS C | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.33 | 47.3 |
| Approach | 311 | 5.1 | 0.652 | 19.4 | LOS B | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.91 | 1.10 | 1.33 | 47.0 |
| North: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 361 | 6.4 | 0.628 | 7.3 | LOS A | 6.7 | 49.6 | 0.81 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 52.7 |
| 8 T1 | 893 | 6.2 | 0.628 | 7.9 | LOS A | 6.7 | 49.6 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.94 | 53.6 |
| 9 R2 | 153 | 5.2 | 0.628 | 14.3 | LOS B | 6.5 | 47.7 | 0.83 | 0.86 | 0.98 | 53.2 |
| Approach | 1407 | 6.1 | 0.628 | 8.5 | LOS A | 6.7 | 49.6 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.93 | 53.3 |
| West: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 5 | 20.0 | 0.423 | 5.7 | LOS A | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 50.7 |
| 11 T1 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.423 | 5.3 | LOS A | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 52.6 |
| 12 R2 | 360 | 4.2 | 0.423 | 11.1 | LOS B | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 52.7 |
| Approach | 415 | 3.9 | 0.423 | 10.4 | LOS B | 2.5 | 18.0 | 0.57 | 0.73 | 0.57 | 52.7 |
| All Vehicles | 2396 | 5.4 | 0.652 | 10.0 | LOS A | 6.7 | 49.6 | 0.76 | 0.81 | 0.88 | 52.4 |

The SIDRA results based on this reconfigured intersection layout Option 2 - Signal Intersection are summarised in Table 5-23 and Table 5-24. The results show that the intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service with these upgrades. Figure 5-16 shows the reconfigured intersection layout Option 2.

Figure 5-16 Reconfigured Intersection layout Option 2


Table 5-23 Reconfigured New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection PM Option 2 Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID Turn | Demand Total veh/h | Flows <br> HV <br> \% | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 394 | 7.4 | 0.297 | 7.9 | LOS A | 3.7 | 27.3 | 0.36 | 0.66 | 0.36 | 52.2 |
| 2 T1 | 670 | 7.2 | 0.899 | 47.3 | LOS D | 16.1 | 119.4 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.49 | 33.7 |
| 3 R 2 | 17 | 0.0 | 0.122 | 45.0 | LOS D | 0.7 | 4.6 | 0.96 | 0.69 | 0.96 | 34.0 |
| Approach | 1081 | 7.1 | 0.899 | 32.9 | LOS C | 16.1 | 119.4 | 0.77 | 0.95 | 1.07 | 38.8 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 16 | 0.0 | 0.887 | 55.7 | LOS E | 5.8 | 42.3 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.68 | 32.3 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 109 | 5.5 | 0.887 | 50.2 | LOS D | 5.8 | 42.3 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.68 | 32.8 |
| 6 R2 | 490 | 8.4 | 0.868 | 41.9 | LOS D | 21.4 | 160.7 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 1.25 | 35.1 |
| Approach | 615 | 7.6 | 0.887 | 43.7 | LOS D | 21.4 | 160.7 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.34 | 34.6 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 299 | 6.0 | 0.204 | 6.5 | LOS A | 1.4 | 10.2 | 0.22 | 0.62 | 0.22 | 53.3 |
| 8 T1 | 394 | 7.1 | 0.528 | 31.8 | LOS C | 7.1 | 52.7 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.94 | 39.4 |
| 9 R2 | 107 | 7.5 | 0.809 | 51.8 | LOS D | 4.7 | 35.2 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 1.42 | 31.9 |
| Approach | 800 | 6.8 | 0.809 | 25.0 | LOS C | 7.1 | 52.7 | 0.68 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 42.2 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 58 | 19.0 | 0.780 | 51.1 | LOS D | 4.4 | 34.6 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.35 | 32.7 |
| 11 T1 | 43 | 7.0 | 0.780 | 45.4 | LOS D | 4.4 | 34.6 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 1.35 | 33.5 |
| 12 R2 | 169 | 5.3 | 0.270 | 25.9 | LOS C | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 41.5 |
| Approach | 270 | 8.5 | 0.780 | 34.4 | LOS C | 4.8 | 34.9 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.98 | 37.9 |
| All Vehicles | 2766 | 7.3 | 0.899 | 33.2 | LOS C | 21.4 | 160.7 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 1.02 | 38.5 |



Table 5-24 Reconfigured New Road 5 and Tonkin Highway Intersection PM Option 2 Results 2031

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov Turn } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Flows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance m | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed km/h |
| South: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 L2 | 131 | 5.3 | 0.098 | 7.6 | LOS A | 1.0 | 7.5 | 0.30 | 0.63 | 0.30 | 52.5 |
| 2 T1 | 95 | 5.3 | 0.088 | 22.5 | LOS C | 1.4 | 9.9 | 0.76 | 0.58 | 0.76 | 43.8 |
| 3 R2 | 37 | 0.0 | 0.199 | 43.0 | LOS D | 1.4 | 9.8 | 0.95 | 0.72 | 0.95 | 34.6 |
| Approach | 263 | 4.6 | 0.199 | 17.9 | LOS B | 1.4 | 9.9 | 0.56 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 45.9 |
| East: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 L2 | 36 | 0.0 | 0.736 | 49.7 | LOS D | 4.3 | 32.3 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.26 | 33.6 |
| $5 \quad$ T1 | 64 | 14.1 | 0.736 | 44.1 | LOS D | 4.3 | 32.3 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 1.26 | 34.2 |
| 6 R2 | 211 | 3.3 | 0.490 | 34.7 | LOS C | 7.3 | 52.5 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 0.91 | 37.8 |
| Approach | 311 | 5.1 | 0.736 | 38.4 | LOS D | 7.3 | 52.5 | 0.94 | 0.83 | 1.02 | 36.4 |
| North: Tonkin Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 L2 | 361 | 6.4 | 0.252 | 6.7 | LOS A | 2.0 | 14.7 | 0.25 | 0.63 | 0.25 | 53.1 |
| 8 T1 | 893 | 6.2 | 0.862 | 38.0 | LOS D | 20.5 | 151.0 | 0.99 | 1.04 | 1.27 | 36.9 |
| 9 R2 | 153 | 5.2 | 0.855 | 52.4 | LOS D | 6.9 | 50.5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.49 | 31.7 |
| Approach | 1407 | 6.1 | 0.862 | 31.5 | LOS C | 20.5 | 151.0 | 0.80 | 0.93 | 1.03 | 39.3 |
| West: New Road 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 L2 | 5 | 20.0 | 0.383 | 46.5 | LOS D | 2.2 | 15.6 | 0.99 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 34.9 |
| 11 T1 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.383 | 40.8 | LOS D | 2.2 | 15.6 | 0.99 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 35.9 |
| 12 R2 | 360 | 4.2 | 0.840 | 44.4 | LOS D | 15.6 | 112.9 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.26 | 34.3 |
| Approach | 415 | 3.9 | 0.840 | 44.0 | LOS D | 15.6 | 112.9 | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.23 | 34.5 |
| All Vehicles | 2396 | 5.4 | 0.862 | 33.1 | LOS C | 20.5 | 151.0 | 0.83 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 38.6 |



### 5.5.8 Soldiers Road / Gordin Way / Turner Road

Cardno understands that there is a strong desireline for trips between Mundijong residential cells and the Byford Town Centre. This trip is currently supported by Soldiers Road and Abernethy Road.

However, the close spacing of South Western Highway, George Street, the rail line, Soldiers Road and the Byford Village access road means that this heavy traffic demand puts significant stress on the local road infrastructure.

The following modification to the road network has been considered in this context, and is intended to support a preferred route between the Byford Town Centre and Mundijong along the Gordin Way alignment. In addition, regional traffic would be partially redirected onto South Western Highway through to Abernethy Road.


It is noted that the location of Turner Way imposes a geometric impediment on the types of intersection treatment that may be considered. In this instance, a 'peanut' roundabout provides full turning movement capability and a reasonably high capacity intersection.

Traffic from Soldiers Road south is incentivised to undertake the new 'through' movement to Gordin Way, rather than the wide deviation to stay on Soldiers Road. Traffic from Soldiers Road north is only slightly inconvenienced by the roundabout. This intersection geometry could be designed to support some small truck movements, but any larger vehicles should use South Western Highway.

This geometry can be expected to result the following changes to traffic flow:
> Diversion to Gordin Way
$>$ the majority of traffic headed to the Byford Town Centre,
$>$ the majority of traffic travelling to and from Soldiers Road (south) to Abernethy Road (west).
> Diversion to South Western Highway
$>$ A small proportion of traffic heading from Soldiers Road (south) to Abernethy Road (east)
$>$ A minor component of traffic heading from Abernethy Road (east) to Soldiers Road (south)
The extent of this impact is determined by the origin-destination profile of traffic using Soldiers Road across the day. OD modelling and turn count data has been used to provide an indication of the existing directional splits (Table 5-25) for traffic:

Table 5-1 Existing Local Traffic Distribution - Soldiers Road

| Direction (from/to) | Soldiers Road Northbound |  | Soldiers Road Southbound |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| Gordin Way | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Soldiers Road | $95 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| to/from Byford Town Centre | $35 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| to/from Abernethy Road East | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| to/from Abernethy Road West | $21 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $28 \%$ |

With the potential for the above modifications to redirect traffic, a possible future distribution is described below (Table 5-26). These results are largely consistent with the modelled network scenario, with some minor amendments to reflect the additional turn penalties imposed by the modified intersection form.

Table 5-2 Potential Modified Local Traffic Distribution (Future Network) - Soldiers Road

| Direction (from/to) | Soldiers Road Northbound |  | Soldiers Road Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| Gordin Way | 47\% | 59\% | 73\% | 74\% |
| to/from Byford Town Centre | 22\% | 10\% | 4\% | 8\% |
| to/from Abernethy Road/Mead Street West | 21\% | 31\% | 63\% | 31\% |
| to/from San Simeon Boulevard | 4\% | 18\% | 6\% | 35\% |
| Soldiers Road | 23\% | 21\% | 23\% | 23\% |
| to/from Byford Town Centre | 12\% | 8\% | 4\% | 12\% |
| to/from Abernethy Road East | 10\% | 12\% | 16\% | 10\% |
| to/from Abernethy Road West | 1\% | 1\% | 3\% | 1\% |
| South Western Highway | 30\% | 10\% | 4\% | 3\% |

This distribution would result in a significant decrease in traffic on Soldiers Road north of Turner Road, from a projected $5,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ (ROM24 for 2031), to less than $2,000 \mathrm{vpd}$. Of this traffic a sizeable portion would be relocated to Gordin Way. However, this would primarily be local traffic accessing the Byford Town Centre.

### 5.5.9 Byford Town Centre Signalisation

The Byford Structure Plan shows a series of new signal-controlled intersections around the Byford District Centre. These intersections have been evaluated as part of this TIA and are shown to be effective at
controlling traffic movements. More importantly, the signalised intersections support pedestrian and cycling movements in this key activated area, creating a safer and more attractive environment for visitors to the Centre.

An alternative arrangement consisting of roundabout intersections would perform a similar function with respect to allowing vehicle turning movements, but without the intrinsic benefits for active transport modes.
As such, the traffic controls identified in the Byford Structure Plan are recommended to be retained as part of future development works.

## 6 Conclusions

Cardno was commissioned by the Shire of Serpentine to prepare a Transport Impact Assessment for the proposed Byford Town Centre Structure Plan ('the Site' or 'the Structure Plan').

The traffic impacts from this Structure Plan have been evaluated in a mesoscopic modelling framework, which classified the network into three categories based on operational performance:

1. The existing intersection forms are considered sufficient to accommodate future growth. These include:

- Kardan Boulevard/Ballawarra Avenue
- South West Highway/Thomas Road
- Abernethy Road/Briggs Road
- Warrington Road/Turner Road
- Doley Road/Shepparton Boulevard

2. The proposed intersection forms are considered sufficient to accommodate future growth. These include:

- Thomas Road/Kardan Boulevard
- Thomas Road/Masters Road
- Thomas Road/Plaistowe Boulevard
- Thomas Road/Alexander Road
- Thomas Road/George Street
- Ballawarra Avenue/Malarkey Street
- Ballawarra Avenue/Briggs Road
- Ballawarra Avenue/Plaistowe Boulevard
- Ballawarra Avenue/Larsen Road/Sansimeon Boulevard
- Abernethy Road/Tonkin Highway
- Abernethy Road/Kardan Boulevard/Tourmaline Boulevard
- Abernethy Road/Doley Road
- Abernethy Road/Warrington Road
- Turner Road/Warrington Road
- Orton Road/Warrington Road
- Orton Road/Doley Road
- Doley Road/Cardup Siding Road
- Orton Road/Tourmaline Boulevard
- South Western Highway/Sansimeon Boulevard
- Sansimeon Boulevard Intersection

3. For a number of key intersections, alternative intersection forms were considered necessary to accommodate future growth. These include:

- Tonkin Highway/Thomas Road
- Abernethy Road/Sansimeon Boulevard/Gordin Way
- Soldiers Road/Orton Road
- Tonkin Highway/Orton Road
- South Western Highway/Abernethy Rd

The minimum intersection form required to accommodate future traffic growth is shown in Section 5.5. It is anticipated that additional works will be required to ensure intersection geometry meets Austroads and Main Roads WA guidelines.

Overall, with the reconfigured intersection forms, the SP network is considered to operate satisfactorily in the 2031 future scenario.

Byford Structure Plan

## APPENDIX



WAPC CHECKLIST

| Item | Provided | Comments/Proposals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary |  |  |
| Introduction/Background | Included in Section 1 |  |
| Structure plan proposal | Included in Section 1 |  |
| - regional context | Included in Section 1 |  |
| - proposed land uses | Included in Section 1 |  |
| - table of land uses and quantities | Included in Section 1 |  |
| - major attractors/generators | Included in Section 4 |  |
| - specific issues | N/A |  |
| Existing situation |  |  |
| - existing land uses within structure plan | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing land uses within 800 metres of structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing road network within structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing pedestrian/cycle networks within structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing public transport services within structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing road network within 2 (or 5 ) km of structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - traffic flows on roads within structure plan area (PM and/or AM peak hours) | N/A |  |
| - traffic flows on roads within 2 (or 5) km of structure plan area (AM and/or PM peak hours) | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing pedestrian/cycle networks within 800 m of structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| - existing public transport services within 800 m of structure plan area | Included in Section 2 |  |
| Proposed internal transport networks |  |  |
| - changes/additions to existing road network or proposed new road network | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - road reservation widths | N/A |  |
| - road cross-sections \& speed limits | N/A |  |
| - intersection controls | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - pedestrian/cycle networks and crossing facilities | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - public transport routes | Included in Section 3 |  |
| Changes to external transport networks |  |  |
| - road network | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - intersection controls | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - pedestrian/cycle networks and crossing facilities | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - public transport services | Included in Section 3 |  |
| Integration with surrounding area |  |  |
| - trip attractors/generators within 800 metres | Included in Section 4 |  |
| - proposed changes to land uses within 800 metres | Included in Section 4 |  |
| - travel desire lines from structure plan to these attractors/generators | N/A |  |
| - adequacy of external transport networks | N/A |  |
| - deficiencies in external transport networks | N/A |  |


| - remedial measures to address deficiencies | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analysis of internal transport networks |  |  |
| - assessment year(s) and time period(s) | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - structure plan generated traffic | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - extraneous (through) traffic | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - design traffic flows (ie. total traffic) | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - road cross-sections | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| - intersection controls | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - access strategy | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| - pedestrian / cycle networks | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - safe routes to schools | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| - pedestrian permeability \& efficiency | Included in Section 3 |  |
| - access to public transport | Included in Section 3 |  |
| Analysis of external transport networks |  |  |
| - extent of analysis | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - base flows for assessment year(s) | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - total traffic flows | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - road cross-sections | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |
| - intersection layouts \& controls | Included in Section 5 |  |
| - pedestrian/cycle networks | Included in Section 3 |  |
| Conclusions | Included in Section 6 |  |

Byford Structure Plan

## APPENDIX



EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Observed Traffic Volumes - 2018 AM Peak


Observed Traffic Volumes - 2018 PM Peak


## APPENDIX

FUTURE MODELLED TRAFFIC

2031 AM Peak - Byford Area (North)

 $\rightarrow-\frac{787}{187}-{ }^{796}-$ Thomas Rd

2031 AM Peak - Byford Area (South)


2031 PM Peak - Byford Area (North)




[^0]:    Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale

[^1]:    Source: Department of Transport (2016)

[^2]:    Original Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale

[^3]:    * Reduced verge width shall be considered adjacent to public park land

[^4]:    Source: Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale

