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## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

GHD Pty Ltd (GHD) was engaged by the Department of Regional NSW (DRNSW) to prepare a Traffic Assessment (TA) for the three proposed development areas that form the Richmond Valley Regional Job Precinct (RJP's) located in Casino, NSW, as shown in Figure 1.1, namely:

- Area 1 - Nammoona Industrial precinct
- Area 2 - Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct
- Area 3 - Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct


Figure 1.1 Richmond Valley Regional Job Precincts

[^0]
### 1.2 Purpose of this report

This TA has been undertaken with the following key objectives to support the proposed development of the RJP:

- Inform future planning controls to ensure a coordinated and efficient approach to land use planning, environmental management and transport infrastructure.
- Provide an integrated approach to determining the optimal mix of land uses and density concentrations as a means of minimising (where possible) trip generation and transport-related demand.
- Ascertain the cumulative and regional traffic and transport impacts associated with future land-based demands associated with the RJP.
- Maximise efficiency and safety of the existing/proposed transport systems in proximity to the subject site.


### 1.3 Scope and limitations

The study has been limited by the following:

- The following traffic count surveys were undertaken to support the analysis included in this TA:
- Peak hour traffic survey counts (6:00 am - 9:00 am and 4:00 pm - 7:00 pm) at the following locations:
- Reynolds Road/Summerland Way
- Bruxner Highway/East Street
- Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive
- Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane
- Summerland Way/private Co-op access road
- Seven-day classified "tube" traffic counts at the following locations:
- Bruxner Highway east of Cassino Drive
- Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road
- Information on the RJP development land use and staging, provided by DRNSW.
- SIDRA intersection modelling has been undertaken for the 2031 and 2041 horizon years in accordance with the RJP land use data provided by the DRNSW.
- No strategic or micro-simulation traffic modelling has been undertaken for this study.
- Cost estimates for the proposed infrastructure are strategic only and have been developed based on benchmarking against similar projects.
- Analysis has accounted for the 1,700 dwellings associated with the Urban Growth Investigation Areas.

The following assumptions were made as part of this study:

- Trip generation for the proposed industrial land uses was undertaken on a first principles basis in accordance with the proposed land uses and traffic survey outputs.
- The trip generation for the residential dwellings associated with the Urban Growth Investigation Areas was determined in accordance with the Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) Technical Direction (2013).
- It has been assumed that a priority controlled T-junction will be constructed at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street by 2031.
- It has been assumed that a roundabout will be constructed at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street by 2041.
- It has been assumed that a roundabout will be constructed at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and East Street by 2041.


### 1.4 Data review

### 1.4.1 Local Strategic Planning Statement Beyond: 20-20 Vision (2020)

The Planning Statement was prepared by Richmond Valley Council to address planning and development issues and support a sustainable future for the region. Planning priorities identified in the statement include:

- Provide a safe integrated traffic, cycle and pedestrian network.
- Partner with the State government to grow agricultural and freight links along the Pacific Highway, Summerland Way, Bruxner Highway, and North Coast Railway, including an intermodal freight facility at Casino.


### 1.4.2 North Coast Regional Plan 2036

The North Coast Regional Plan 2036 (NCRP 2036) details the NSW Government Strategy to guide land use planning in the North Coast of NSW, including Casino. Key land use priorities for Richmond Valley include:

- Grow agricultural and freight links along Summerland Way
- Foster stronger transport connections with Kyogle, Lismore and South-east Queensland
- Support the development of an intermodal freight facility in Casino
- Deliver new employment opportunities at Casino

With respect to traffic and transport, some of the key directions and actions in the NCRP include:

- Facilitate more recreational walking and cycling paths and expand inter-regional walking and cycling links
- Strengthen regionally significant transport corridors


### 1.4.3 Draft North Coast Regional Plan 2041

The Draft North Coast Regional Plan 2041 (NCRP 2041) sets a 20 year strategic land use planning framework for the region. A key activity identified in the NCRP 2041, is:

Support the development of the Richmond Valley Regional Jobs Precinct to create a hub focused on high-value agriculture, food processing, manufacturing, distribution and renewable energy.

### 1.4.4 Summerland Way Draft Corridor Strategy (2016)

The Summerland Way Draft Corridor Strategy was prepared by the NSW Government to set out management strategies for Summerland Way for a 20-year period. The vision for Summerland Way includes:

- Become a safer route for all road users
- Cater for the travel needs of all road users between Grafton and the Queensland border as well as within Casino
- Support the active transport need of cyclists, pedestrians and public transport users

The following planning priorities were identified:

- Short term:
- Maintain and improve travel efficiency for local and regional road users, by catering for a mix of heavy vehicles, light vehicles, tourist traffic and vulnerable road users.
- Progressively improve formation widths to provide 3.5 m lanes, sealed shoulders and edge lines.
- Improve safety to high-risk areas with high crash rates, particularly at intersections in Grafton, Casino and Kyogle.
- Medium term:
- Continue to provide safety improvements
- Continue to improve formation widths
- Continue to maintain travel efficiency
- Long term:
- Continue to provide safety improvements
- Continue to maintain travel efficiency

The Corridor Strategy indicates that in 2035, Summerland Way is expected to operate with a good level of service and minimal delays accounting for the projected traffic volumes.

### 1.4.5 2740 Bruxner Highway, Casino Traffic Impact Assessment (2018)

In 2018, Bitzios Consulting prepared a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) to support the proposed industrial and residential rezoning for land located at 2740 Bruxner Highway, as displayed in Figure 1.2.


Figure 1.2 2740 Bruxner Highway subject site

Source: 2740 Bruxner Highway Traffic Impact Assessment.
The 2740 Bruxner Highway subject site is located within (and forms a significant proportion) the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct subject site, as detailed in Section 3.3.

The proposed development consists of 217 residential lots and $57,600 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of industrial land use. These land uses are expected to generate 338 trips in the AM peak hour and 394 trips in the PM peak hour.
Two proposed priority T-intersections on Bruxner Highway are proposed to provide access to the development, as displayed in Figure 1.3.


Figure 1.3
Proposed access intersection locations
Source: 2740 Bruxner Highway Traffic Impact Assessment
The analysis in the report indicated that, in accordance with Austroads, the proposed intersections require channelised and auxiliary turning lanes on the Bruxner Highway (refer to Figure 1.4).


Figure 1.4
Proposed access intersection configurations
Source: 2740 Bruxner Highway Traffic Impact Assessment
It was recommended that the 50 kilometre (km) per hour (h) posted speed limit be extended past the development on the Bruxner Highway.
SIDRA intersection modelling was undertaken for the two proposed access intersections and the existing intersection of Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive for the current year (2019) and a ten-year horizon (2029).
The SIDRA intersection analysis indicated that the intersections of interest are expected to operate with a good level of service and minimal delays in the 2029 horizon year of analysis.
It is noted that the rezoning proposed in the Bitzios report has not been implemented at the time of writing this report.

### 1.4.6 Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan (2020)

The Richmond Valley Council (RVC) Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan (PAMP) has been prepared to create a schedule for future active transport infrastructure in Richmond Valley.

The key issues identified for Casino include:

- Pedestrian crossings within the central shopping area are dominated by vehicle movement.
- Limited pedestrian and shared connections to locations outside of the town centre.
- A large proportion of the residential streets lack footpaths, resulting in pedestrian movement along roads.
- Residential streets close to the town centre have a higher volume of vehicles due to key attractors.
- Large rural residential lots reduce walkability and create longer distances to locations such as bus stops.
- Gaps in the existing network reduce the safety of users.

The PAMP categorises proposed upgrades as:

- Priority A - to be implemented as urgent projects
- Priority B - to be implemented when funding is available
- Priority C - to be implemented when funding is available

The existing and suggested active transport network is displayed in Figure 1.5.


Figure 1.5 Casino active transport network
Source: Richmond Valley Council - Pedestrian Access Mobility Plan
With respect to the three sites the PAMP proposes:

- A shared path on Summerland Way between Hotham Street and Reynolds Road (Geo Code C36, Priority C).
- A shared path on Spring Grove Road between Johnston Street and Naughtons Gap Road (Geo Code C28, Priority A).


### 1.4.7 Northern Rivers Rail Trail - Casino to Bentley Masterplan

RVC is in the preliminary planning stages for the provision of a recreational active transport path along a disused rail corridor between Casino and the town of Bentley (which is located in the City of Lismore LGA). The total length of this corridor is approximately 13.5 kilometres.

The Australian Government has committed $\$ 7.5$ million towards the planning and construction of the Casino to Bentley Rail Trail Corridor under the National Tourism Icons Program.

The proposed route of the rail trail between Casino and Bentley is displayed in Figure 1.6.


Figure 1.6
Northern Rivers Rail Trail
Source: Casino to Bentley Masterplan
A proposed "stop" on the rail trail is located at the Development Area 3a (Primex site), located within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (refer to Section 3.3).

It is proposed to provide an at grade car park and picnic facilities north west of the Development Area 3a (Primex) site adjacent to Spring Grove Road for persons using the rail trail for recreational purposes.

## 2. Existing situation

### 2.1 Roads

### 2.1.1 Road hierarchy

Functional road classification involves the relative balance of mobility and access functions. TfNSW has four levels in a typical functional road hierarchy, ranking from high mobility and low accessibility to high accessibility and low mobility. These road classes are:

- Arterial Roads - generally controlled by TfNSW, typically no limit in flow and designed to carry vehicles long distances between regional centres.
- Sub-Arterial Roads - can be managed by either TfNSW or local council. Typically, their operating capacity ranges between 10,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day, and their aim is to carry through traffic between specific areas in a sub-region or provide connectivity from arterial road routes (regional links).
- Collector Roads - provide connectivity between local roads and the-arterial road network and typically carry between 2,000 and 10,000 vehicles per day.
- Local Roads - provide direct access to properties and the collector road system and typically carry between 500 and 4,000 vehicles per day.

The key roads that will support access/egress to and from the RJP sites are displayed in Figure 2.1.


Figure $2.1 \quad$ Key road network
Source: Google Maps modified by GHD

### 2.1.2 Summerland Way

Summerland Way is a state road (refer to Figure 2.2) that runs north from Grafton, passing through Casino and terminating at the border of NSW and Queensland. It is a north-south inland route that runs approximately parallel to the Pacific Highway. Summerland Way is an important route for the agricultural and industrial industries in regional NSW.
A railway level crossing (refer to Figure 2.3) with supporting signage and boom gates is located at Summerland Way south of the Nammoona Industrial Precinct. The speed limit on Summerland Way is typically $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ but reduces to $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ within the Casino Township.

In proximity to the RJP, Summerland Way provides double lane markings and a single travel lane in either direction. The travel lanes provide widths of 3.5 m . While Summerland Way provides sealed shoulders, these are fairly narrow, in the order of one metre.

On-street parking and active transport infrastructure are not provided on Summerland Way.
A desktop review indicates that Summerland Way north of Casino has been designed and constructed in accordance with Austroads specifications, with 3.5 metre wide travel lanes and an overall road reserve of around eight metres.


Figure 2.2 Summerland Way at the frontage to the Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct

[^1]

Figure 2.3
Rail level crossing at Summerland Way
Source: Google Maps

### 2.1.3 Bruxner Highway

Bruxner Highway (named Johnston Street within Casino, refer to Figure 2.4) is a 420-kilometre east-west state road, which traverses Northern Tablelands. The Bruxner Highway connects Casino to Lismore and Ballina, linking into the Pacific Highway. Bruxner Highway is also an important route for the agricultural and industrial industries in regional NSW.

Within Casino, Bruxner Highway has a speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. To the east of Cassino Drive, the speed limit increases to 100 km/h outside the Casino Township.


Figure 2.4

[^2]Typically, the Bruxner Highway provides lane markings and a single travel lane in either direction. The travel lanes on Bruxner Highway provide widths of 3.5 m .

Within the Casino Town Centre, on-street parking is available on Bruxner Highway. However, to the east of Clark Street, the road reserve narrows and on-street parking is not available.

A desktop review indicates that the Bruxner Highway west of Casino has been designed and constructed in accordance with Austroads specifications, with travel lanes of 3.5 metres and an overall road reserve of approximately eight metres.

### 2.1.4 Spring Grove Road

Access to North Casino is provided via Spring Grove Road and Naughtons Gap Road. Spring Grove Road (refer to Figure 2.5) is a local road with a $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit.

Spring Grove Road is a sealed road with a width of approximately six to seven metres. No lane markings or sealed shoulders are provided.


Figure $2.5 \quad$ Spring Grove Road looking to the north-east

## Source: Google Maps

To the south of Dryaaba Street, Spring Grove Road's name changes to East Street. East Street intersects Bruxner Highway at a four-way priority controlled intersection (refer to Figure 2.6).


Figure 2.6 East Street looking south to Bruxner Highway

Source: Google Maps

### 2.1.5 Cassino Drive

Cassino Drive is a local road that provides access to a number of commercial/industrial land uses. It typically provides a single travel and parking lane in either direction. Cassino Drive has a posted $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit.


Figure 2.7 Cassino Drive looking south to the Bruxner Highway

Source: Google Maps
The intersection of the Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive is displayed in Figure 2.8.


Figure 2.8
Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive intersection
Source: Google Maps modified by GHD
At its intersection with Cassino Drive, the Bruxner Highway provides an (approximate) 80 m left turn deceleration lane and a 90 m acceleration lane for left turning vehicles from Cassino Drive. Additionally, an auxiliary right turn is provided to enable westbound vehicles to manoeuvre around vehicles seeking to turn right into Cassino Drive.

### 2.1.6 Reynolds Road

Reynolds Road is a local road that provides existing industrial land uses within the Nammoona Industrial precinct subject site, which provides a single travel lane in either direction.

Between Summerland Way and Dargaville Drive, Reynolds Road provides a carriageway width of approximately seven metres with marked centre lines (refer to Figure 2.9).

North of Dargaville Drive, the road reserve narrows to approximately six metres, without centre lines (refer to Figure 2.10).


Figure 2.9
Reynolds Road looking north from Summerland Way
Source: Google Maps


Figure 2.10 Reynolds Road looking north from Dargaville Road
Source: Google Maps

### 2.2 Public transport

Casino is served by a rail service operating between Central Station in Sydney and Roma Street Station in Brisbane (refer to Figure 2.11). The morning rail service travels between Sydney and Brisbane, and the evening service travels between Casino and Sydney.

Additionally, there are daily regional coach services that connect Casino to areas such as Brunswick Heads, Lismore, Byron Bay and Ballina.


Figure 2.11 Public transport - Casino
Source: TfNSW
The location of Casino Station in the context of the RJP sites is displayed in Figure 2.12. The station is located approximately two - three kilometres from the RJP sites, and it is unlikely future workers will utilise the train to access their places of employment.


Figure 2.12 Casino Station
The following local bus services operate within Casino:

- 671 Casino to Gays Hill loop service (refer to Figure 2.13) - two morning and two afternoon services.
- 672 Casino to Northwest Casino via Hospital loop service (refer to Figure 2.14) - three morning and two afternoon services.

The bus services do not currently provide access to the Richmond Valley RJP subject sites.


Figure 2.13
671 bus service
Source: TfNSW


Figure $2.14 \quad 672$ bus service
Source: TfNSW

### 2.3 Active transport

A desktop review of the active transport facilities in Casino indicates the following:

- There are no bicycle facilities provided on Summerland Way. The road provides sealed shoulder with widths of approximately one metre.
- An east/west concrete footpath is provided on the southern side of Summerland Way (referred to as Queensland Road within Casino) between Colches Street and West Street. The concrete footpath also aligned in a north/south direction on the western side of West Street.
- A pedestrian crossing is provided on Summerland Way at the frontage to Casino High School.
- A concrete footpath is provided on the Bruxner Highway between West Street and Cassino Drive. Within Casino, the Bruxner Highway provides sealed shoulders of up to seven metres. However, in proximity to Cassino Drive, the shoulder widths narrow to the order of one metre or less.

Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A Paths for Walking and Cycling indicates the desirable minimum width for a regional two-way bicycle path should be three metres. Accordingly, the shoulders on Summerland Way and Bruxner Highway (east of Clark Street) of approximately one metre are not wide enough to accommodate cyclists safely.

In accordance with their relatively remote locations, the active transport infrastructure in proximity to the Nammoona Industrial precinct and Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct is poor.

The active transport facilities in proximity to the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct are better, with the provision of footpaths and wide shoulders on the Bruxner Highway.

### 2.4 Freight access

The TfNSW Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) map identifies Summerland Way, Bruxner Highway, Reynolds Road and Cassino Drive as being part of the $19 / 23 / 25 \mathrm{~m} \mathrm{~B}$ - double routes (refer to Figure 2.15).


Figure 2.15
TfNSW Freight Routes
Source: TfNSW

### 2.5 Current traffic volumes

This section outlines the traffic count surveys undertaken for the purposes of this assessment. The timing and locations of the traffic surveys were discussed and agreed upon with RVC.

### 2.5.1 Intersection counts

GHD engaged Trans Traffic Survey to undertake traffic turning counts on Tuesday 25 October 2022, at the following intersections:

- Reynolds Road/Summerland Way
- Bruxner Highway/East Street
- Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive
- Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane
- Summerland Way/private Co-op access road

The surveys were undertaken during the following time periods:

- Weekday AM peak (three hours): 6:00 am to 9:00 am
- Weekday PM peak (three hours): 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm

Analysis of the survey data identified the following peak hour periods:

- Weekday AM peak hour: 8:00 am to 9:00 am
- Weekday PM peak hour: 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm

The outputs of the traffic survey volumes for Summerland Way are displayed in Figure 2.16 (AM peak hour) and Figure 2.17 (PM peak hour).


Figure 2.16 Summerland Way intersections - AM peak hour


Figure $2.17 \quad$ Summerland Way intersections - PM peak hour
The data in Figure 2.16 and Figure 2.17 indicates that:

- The volumes of vehicles using Hillcrest Lane are minor, and the private access is the primary entry/exit point to the industrial land uses within the Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct.
- The majority of vehicles access/egress Reynolds Road and the private access road to/from the east (in the direction of Casino).
The outputs of the traffic survey volumes for the Bruxner Highway are displayed in Figure 2.18 (AM peak hour) and Figure 2.19 (PM peak hour).


Figure 2.18 Bruxner Highway intersections - AM peak hour


Figure 2.19 Bruxner Highway intersections - PM peak hour

### 2.5.2 Mid-block traffic counts

Seven day classified "tube" traffic counts at the following locations between Saturday 22 October 2022 and
Saturday 29 October 2022, at the following locations:

- Bruxner Highway east of Cassino Drive
- Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road

The outputs of the tube counts for Summerland Way are displayed in Figure 2.20.


Figure 2.20 Average weekday traffic volumes on Summerland Way (2022)
The traffic survey data displayed in Figure 2.20 indicates that:

- Peak hour activity occurs between 8:00 am-9:00 am (373 vehicles) and 4:00 pm-5:00 pm (366 vehicles).
- In the morning peak hour, approximately 60 percent of vehicles travel eastbound toward Casino and 40 percent travel westbound away from Casino.
- In the afternoon peak hour approximately 50 percent of vehicles travel eastbound toward Casino and 50 percent travel westbound away from Casino.
The data indicates that approximately 13 percent of vehicles on Summerland Way are trucks.
The outputs of the tube counts for Bruxner Highway are displayed in Figure 2.21.


Figure 2.21
Average weekday traffic volumes on Bruxner Highway (2022)
The traffic survey data displayed in Figure 2.21 indicates that:

- Peak hour activity occurs between 8:00 am - 9:00 am (599 vehicles) and 4:00 pm - 5:00 pm (704 vehicles).
- In the morning peak hour, approximately 55 percent of vehicles travel eastbound away from Casino and 45 percent travel westbound towards Casino.
- In the morning peak hour, approximately 45 percent of vehicles travel eastbound away from Casino and 55 percent travel westbound towards Casino.
- The data indicates that approximately 12 percent of vehicles on Bruxner Highway are heavy vehicles.

It is noted that the timing and locations of the traffic surveys detailed above were discussed and agreed upon with RVC.

The traffic survey data is displayed in Appendix A.

### 2.6 Intersection operation

### 2.6.1 Current intersection performance

The performance of an existing road network is largely dependent on the operating performance of key intersections, which are critical capacity control points on the road network. SIDRA 9.0 intersection modelling software was used to assess the proposed peak-hour operating performance of intersections on the surrounding road network.

The criteria for evaluating the operational performance of intersections are provided by the Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (TfNSW, 2002) and reproduced in Table 2.1. The criteria for evaluating the operational performance of intersections are based on a qualitative measure (i.e., Level of Service - LoS A), which is applied to each band of average vehicle delay.

Table 2.1 Level of Service Criteria for Intersections

| Level of <br> Service | Average Delay per <br> Vehicle (seconds/veh) | Traffic Signals, Roundabouts | Give Way \& Stop Signs |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | $<14$ | Good operation | Good operation |
| B | 15 to 28 | Good with acceptable delays \& spare <br> capacity | Acceptable delays \& spare capacity |
| C | 29 to 42 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory, but accident study <br> required |
| D | 43 to 56 | Operating near capacity | Near capacity \& accident study <br> required |
| E | 57 to 70 | At capacity; at signals, incidents will <br> cause excessive delays <br> Roundabouts require other control <br> modes | At capacity, requires other control <br> mode |
| F | $>70$ | Over Capacity <br> Unstable operation | Over Capacity <br> Unstable operation |

Source: Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (TfNSW 2002)
The existing intersection layouts, which have been modelled using SIDRA 9 as part of this assessment, include:

- Summerland Way/Reynolds Road and Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane (modelled as a network - refer to Figure 2.22)
- Summerland Way and Co-op access road (refer to Figure 2.23)
- Bruxner Highway and East Street (refer to Figure 2.24)
- Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive (refer to Figure 2.25)


Figure 2.22 Summerland Way intersection with Reynolds Road and Hillcrest Lane (SIDRA)


Figure 2.23
Summerland Way and Co-op access road (SIDRA)


Figure 2.24
Bruxner Highway and East Street (SIDRA)


Figure 2.25
Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive (SIDRA)
The results of the SIDRA intersection modelling analysis, based on the existing traffic volumes and road geometry, are summarised in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Current intersection performance - SIDRA results

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {h }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ & \text { Queue (m) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Summerland Way and Reynolds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 1.5 | A | 0.9 | 1.0 | A | 0.6 |
| Reynolds Road | 5.3 | A | 1.1 | 5.0 | A | 0.8 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.1 | A | 0 | 0.2 | A | 0 |
| Total | 1.2 | A | 1.1 | 1.1 | A | 0.8 |
| Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.3 | A | 0 | 0 | A | 0 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.1 | A | 0.1 | 0.1 | A | 0 |
| Hillcrest Lane | 14.6 | B | 0.4 | 9.1 | A | 0.1 |
| Total | 0.4 | A | 0.4 | 0.1 | A | 0.1 |
| Summerland Way and Co-op access road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.9 | A | 0 | 0.4 | A | 0 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.2 | A | 0.5 | 0 | A | 0.1 |
| Co-op access road | 6.2 | A | 0.8 | 8.4 | A | 1.0 |
| Total | 0.8 | A | 0.8 | 0.9 | A | 1.0 |
| Bruxner Highway and East Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Street - south | 15.6 | B | 0.6 | 14.2 | A | 0.8 |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 0.8 | A | 2.8 | 0.8 | A | 3.3 |
| East Street - north | 19.6 | B | 8.2 | 18.5 | B | 5.2 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 0.5 | A | 0.3 | 0.6 | A | 0.2 |
| Total | 2.3 | A | 8.2 | 1.8 | A | 5.2 |
| Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 0.6 | A | 1.0 | 0.6 | A | 1.2 |
| Cassino Drive | 22.1 | B | 9.2 | 18.7 | B | 7.6 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.1 | A | 0 | 0.6 | A | 0 |
| Total | 3 | A | 9.2 | 2.6 | A | 7.6 |

The data in Table 2.2 indicates that the intersections of interest on Summerland Way and the Bruxner Highway currently operate with minor delays and a good LoS.

The SIDRA outputs for the existing situation are included in Appendix B.

### 2.6.2 Mid-block analysis

The TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments indicates that urban roads (consistent with roads within a town), have midblock capacities of 900 vehicles/hour/lane (corresponding to a Level of Service D).

The traffic volume data detailed in Section 2.5 indicates that Summerland Way, Reynolds Road, Cassino Drive and East Street/Spring Grove Road are all operating well within their mid-block capacities.

### 2.7 Crash data

Crash data for Summerland Way and Bruxner Highway has been sourced for a five-year period (2016-2020) from the TfNSW Centre for Road Safety.

Crash data for Summerland Way between Hotham Street and the railway crossing is displayed in Figure 2.26.


Figure 2.26 Crash Data - Summerland Way
Source: TfNSW
In summary:

- A total of eight crashes were recorded.
- One crash at the intersection with Hotham Street resulted in a minor injury.
- Two crashes were recorded at the intersection with Rosewood Avenue, one of which resulted in a serious injury and one of which was a non-casualty crash.
- Two crashes were recorded in proximity to Hillcrest Lane, one of which resulted in a serious injury and one of which was a non-casualty crash.
- Two crashes occurred between Hotham Street and Rosewood Avenue, one of which resulted in a serious injury and one of which was a non-casualty crash.
- One crash occurred south of the rail crossing and resulted in a moderate injury.

Crash data for Bruxner Highway between East Street and Richmond Road is displayed in Figure 2.27.
In summary, six crashes were recorded as follows:

- Four crashes resulted in moderate injuries
- Two crashes resulted in serious injuries


Figure 2.27
Crash Data - Bruxner Highway
Source: TfNSW

## 3. Proposed developments

A summary of each of the RJP sites is provided below. The preliminary analysis of proposed land use data for each of the sites has been provided by the DRNSW. Detailed land uses will be identified subject to specific development applications subsequent to the approval of the RJP.

### 3.1 Area 1 - Nammoona Industrial precinct

### 3.1.1 Site summary

The Nammoona Industrial precinct currently contains the following land uses:

- Northern Rivers Livestock Exchange
- A council landfill facility
- Riverina stockfeed
- A Boral timber facility

Information provided by the DRNSW indicates that these land uses have a combined Gross Floor Area (GFA) of $47,550 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

This area also has direct heavy rail frontage to the North Coast Railway Line but only provides limited access to this infrastructure (e.g. loading/unloading rail ballast). Within the southern portion, 13 hectares of land is already under construction to provide nine industrial lots.

Nammoona Industrial precinct is zoned IN1, RU1 Primary Production with additional use of a rail freight transport facility is permitted under Schedule 1 of the Richmond Valley Local Environmental Plan (RVLEP) for land at Reynolds Road, Casino, being Lot 2, DP 547143. Surrounding land includes zoning E2 Environmental Conservation.

The Draft Richmond Valley RJP Structure Plan recommendations for the Nammoona Industrial precinct are shown in Figure 3.1. The primary access to the site will be provided via the intersection of Summerland Way and Reynolds Road. A small section of the Nammoona Industrial precinct is located to the southwest of Summerland Way.


Figure 3.1
Regional Jobs Precinct 1 - Nammoona Industrial precinct
Source: Richmond Valley Regional Jobs Precinct Draft Structure Plan

### 3.1.2 Proposed land use

The proposed land uses for the Nammoona Industrial precinct include:

- An intermodal rail facility with supporting warehousing facilities
- Heavy industry food processing facilities
- A renewable circular energy provider, i.e. energy from waste
- General industrial, potentially including:
- Bio-degradable and/or compostable packaging manufacturers
- Technical/engineering service providers support to the regional food processing industry
- Logistics suppliers who provide intermodal/cold chain solutions
- Medical grade processors


### 3.1.3 Intermodal facility

The Nammoona Industrial precinct proposes an intermodal facility to the north of the subject site utilising access from the Australian Rail Track Corporation (ARTC) mainline via a passing loop at Nammoona Industrial precinct to minimise cost and additional signalling arrangements. At this stage, planning for multiple uses for bulk and intermodal products also adds flexibility of operation in the terminal layout.

The Northern Terminal has development approval as the Casino Rail Freight Terminal for rural related produce and is progressing through further planning and funding for construction, with plans that include both container traffic from the site and a grain facility which is focused toward stockfeed for domestic and export markets.
Potential for woodchips, logs, grains and meat /hides are also considered in the business plan with potential volumes of 300,000 tonnes to 500,000 tonnes from year one to year three growing beyond that time to one million tonnes per annum (research dated 2011). An assessment of the terminal operations by the proponent as part of planning approval applications for the terminal operations has indicated annual truck movements growing from 22,000 to 60,000 over the first five years of operation. However, this will be dependent on actual demand outcomes.

The intermodal facility has the potential to generate significant heavy vehicle traffic on Reynolds Road and at the intersection with Summerland Way.

### 3.2 Area 2 - Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct

### 3.2.1 Site summary

The Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct is currently a single-user area but does support a variety of activities. Several different activities are undertaken within the complex, with cattle yards supporting an abattoir and tannery. The Draft Richmond Valley RJP Structure Plan recommendations for the Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct are shown in Figure 3.2. It is noted that:

- Several different activities are undertaken within the complex, with cattle yards supporting an abattoir and tannery.
- The three properties adjoining the complex are all owned by infrastructure providers, including Essential Energy, Richmond Valley Council, and NSW Education.
- Information provided by the DRNSW indicates that these land uses have a combined Gross Floor Area (GFA) of $66,680 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
- The land acquired by Essential Energy was previously intended to accommodate a substation. This is currently zoned IN1 Light Industry, so it would be immediately capable of supporting a variety of uses, with the appropriate consent.
- RVC-owned land is part of the town's water supply network. This land is zoned RU1 Primary Production, so it may rely on rezoning to facilitate further development (depending on the use).
- Land owned by the Minister for Education is currently zoned R1 General Residential and hosts a variety of activities connected to the High School as well as other community uses.
- The primary access is proposed via the intersections of Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane and Summerland Way/Co-op access road.


Figure 3.2
Regional Job Precinct 2 - Casino Food Co-op Area

Source: Richmond Valley Regional Jobs Precinct Draft Structure Plan

### 3.2.2 Proposed land use

Information provided by the DRNSW indicates that while additional light/general industrial uses may be provided at the Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct, no land uses are currently put forth as part of the RJP. This is due to the Nammoona, Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct being identified as being sufficient to accommodate the required commercial/industrial land uses in Casino.

### 3.3 Area 3 - Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct

### 3.3.1 Site summary

The Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct currently contain a mix of industrial, and agribusiness uses as well as the Casino STP. The Draft Richmond Valley RJP Master Plan recommendations for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct are shown in Figure 3.3.

Area 3 - Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct consists of the following areas:

- Development Area 3a (Primex)
- Development Area 3b (Arthur Street)
- Development Area 3c (STP residue)

The existing zoning for Area 3 consists of:

- IN1 General Industrial
- RU1 Primary Production
- E2 Environmental Conservation

A number of industrial land uses are currently located within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct that are accessed/egressed to and from Cassino Drive, including a council works depot, manufacturing facilities, a smash repair facility and warehousing/storage facilities.
It is proposed to relocate Council's current STP from the north east corner of the site (highlighted in yellow hatching below), to an adjacent site to the east (highlighted as item 1 below).


Figure 3.3 Regional Job Precinct 3 -Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct
Source: Richmond Valley Regional Jobs Precinct Draft Structure Plan
The primary access to the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct is proposed via:

- The existing intersection of Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive
- A potential new roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street

A secondary access is proposed on Spring Grove Road, as displayed in Figure 3.3.

- The preferred access/egress point is located approximately 600 metres (travel distance) north of Bruxner Highway (between Dryaaba Street and Naughtons Gap Road).
- An alternate access/egress point is located approximately two kilometres (travel distance) north of the Bruxner Highway.

Key benefits of the preferred access point on Spring Grove Road include:

- It is closer to Bruxner Highway and provides better integration with the Casino township.
- It provides a more direct route to the Bruxner Highway for emergency evacuations.

For the purposes of the assessment, it is assumed that the intersections would consist of T-junctions, with a single travel lane in either direction on all legs and short left turn and right turn lanes provided on Spring Grove Road.

The proposed structure plan displayed in Figure 3.3 provides:

- A series of new local roads including:
- Arthur Street, which is proposed to run in a north/south direction and intersect Bruxner Highway
- Rous Drive, which is proposed to run in an east west direction and intersect Spring Grove Drive
- The extension of Irving Drive to support connectivity between Cassino Drive and Arthur Street
- Multiple access/egress points provide flexibility for emergency vehicles to enter and exit the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (as required).
- A potential new travel route between Bruxner Highway and Spring Grove Road via Arthur Street.

In summary, the existing/proposed road network will provide multiple external access points and will support internal connectivity to the existing/proposed industrial land uses.

A concept level drawing of the preferred access intersection on Spring Grove Road is displayed in Figure 3.4. Key features of the potential Spring Grove Road access intersection include a channelised right lane (CHR) and auxiliary left lane (AUL) suitable for accommodating 19 metre semi-trailers. The preferred access intersection is approximately 170 m south west of the proposed central entry to the Primex site and approximately 150 m south west of the proposed southern Rail Trail car park off Spring Grove Road. Property impacts and potential infrastructure conflicts to be considered during the detailed design of the intersection include:

- Property boundary (northern side of Spring Grove Road)
- Property access (southern side of Spring Grove Road)
- Overhead powerlines (northern side of Spring Grove Road)
- DN 600mm sewer rising main (northern side road reserve of Spring Grove Road)
- DN 100mm water main (southern side road reserve of Spring Grove Road)


Figure 3.4 Proposed preferred access intersection on Spring Grove Road
Information provided by RVC indicates that the outputs of flood models show that an easement approximately 50 metres wide is required on the southeastern side of Spring Grove Road, to retain capacity for drainage flows. Accordingly for the preferred access point, a concrete bridge structure would be required to cross the drainage easement and link into Spring Grove Road.

Information provided by RVC indicates that the bridge structure would consist of a Reinforced Concrete Box Culvert with link slabs ( 12 metre by 14 metre) and guard rails.

The Regional Jobs Precinct Flood Impact Assessment (2023) under flood conditions with limited warning time, the evacuation of the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct would need to occur via Bruxner Highway and Spring Grove Road. The provision of the bridge structure would be required to support evacuation activity via Spring Grove Road.

### 3.3.2 Proposed land use

The proposed land uses for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct include:

- An intensive agriculture facility
- General industrial, potentially including:
- Bio-degradable and/or compostable packaging manufacturers
- Technical/engineering service providers support to the regional food processing industry
- Logistics suppliers who provide intermodal/cold chain solutions
- Medical grade processors.


### 3.4 RJP land use summary

A summary of the land uses for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct and Nammoona Industrial area precinct are provided in Table 3.1.


### 3.5 Residential development

RVC has identified the need for additional housing in Casino to support the potential growth in population and businesses. It is estimated that between 700 to 1,700 additional houses will be required in the next 20 years to support the additional influx of people and families.

RVC has identified, through the Urban Land Release Strategy 2005, several future growth areas for Casino. The key Casino Urban Growth Investigation Areas (UGIA) identified to support the residential growth in Casino are displayed in Figure 3.5 and include:

- South Fairy Hill Residential Investigation Area
- North Casino Residential Investigation Area
- Barlings Lane Residential Investigation Area
- West Casino Residential Investigation Area
- Urban infill sites (within the Casino Township)


Figure 3.5
Proposed residential development areas
Source: DRNSW

The projected timing of the development of the residential dwellings in Casino is summarised in Table 3.2. It is noted that there is no residential development proposed for the West Casino site.

Table 3.2 Residential development projections - 2026 to 2041

| Area | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 1}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barlings Lane | 64 | 64 | - | - | 128 |
| Urban infill | 30 | 53 | 51 | 36 | 170 |
| South Fairy Hill | 237 | 425 | 408 | 290 | 1,360 |
| North Casino | 7 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 42 |
| Total | 338 | 555 | 472 | 335 | 1,700 |

The majority of the dwellings associated with the UGIA are proposed to be constructed within the South Fairy Hill subdivision.

The preliminary Fairy Hill Master Plan is displayed in Figure 3.6. It currently proposes a single access/egress point (via a large roundabout) on Summerland Way.


Figure 3.6 Fairy Hill Master Plan
Source: DRNSW
The majority of vehicles associated with the Fairy Hill UGIA would be expected to utilise Summerland Way to access and egress the Casino Township.

## 4. Traffic impact assessment

### 4.1 Trip generation rates

### 4.1.1 TfNSW data

The TfNSW (2013) technical direction trip generation rates for industrial parks and business estates in regional areas are summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 TfNSW (2013) average trip rates for business parks and industrial estates

| Weekday Rates | Regional Average | Regional Range |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AM peak (one hour) vehicle trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of GFA. | 0.70 | $0.32-1.20$ |
| PM peak (one hour) vehicle trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of GFA. | 0.78 | $0.39-1.30$ |

The technical direction specifies the following regional average trip rates for industrial development in regional areas:

- AM peak hour 0.70 trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA
- PM peak hour 0.78 trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA.


### 4.1.2 Case Study

In January 2022, GHD undertook a traffic study to support the application of a mixed-use commercial / industrial development in Mount Penang on the Central Coast. As part of this study, GHD prepared the working paper Mount Penang Parklands - Trip Generation Review. The purpose of the technical document was to detail the trip generation rate review for the industrial / business park land uses planned for the proposed development within the Mount Penang Parklands.

The key outputs of the study are as follows:

- To support the analysis, traffic surveys were undertaken at the existing Manns Road Industrial Area in the Central Coast, NSW.
- The analysis was based on three days of traffic survey data to support a robust analysis.
- The analysis identified the following peak hour trip generation rates:
- AM site peak hour (one hour between 7:00 am - 9:00 am) - 0.48 trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA.
- PM site peak hour (one hour between 4:00 pm - 6:00 pm) - 0.40 trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA.
- The identified rates fall within the "regional range" provided by TfNSW.
- TfNSW reviewed and approved the road network peak hour trip rates.


### 4.1.3 Traffic count data

A first principles trip generation analysis has been undertaken for the proposed development based on the outputs of the traffic surveys detailed in Section 2.5. This analysis is outlined in the following sub-sections.

### 4.1.3.1 Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct

Cassino Drive is the only access/egress point for the majority of the existing industrial land uses currently located within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct. Information provided by the DRNSW indicates that these existing industrial land uses have a combined Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 36,750 m².

Based on the traffic surveys data (detailed in Section 2.5) during peak periods of road network activity, the following vehicle activity was recorded at Cassino Drive:

- 182 vehicle movements (105 inbound and 77 outbound).
- 143 vehicle movements (54 inbound and 89 outbound).

Based on the observed traffic data for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, the trip rates (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA) for the existing land uses are summarised in Table 4.2.

Table $4.2 \quad$ Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct trip rates

| GFA $\left(\mathbf{m}^{2}\right)$ | Per $\mathbf{1 0 0} \mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of trips | Trip rate | Number of trips | Trip rate |
| 36,750 | 367.5 | 182 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | 143 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9}$ |

The data in Table 4.2 indicates that the existing industrial land uses within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct:

- $\quad 0.50$ trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA in the AM peak hour
- 0.39 trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA in the PM peak hour


### 4.1.3.2 Nammoona Industrial precinct

Reynolds Road is the only access/egress point for the existing industrial land uses currently located within the Nammoona Industrial precinct. Information provided by the DRNSW indicates that these land uses have a combined Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 47,550 m².

Based on the traffic survey data (detailed in Section 2.5) during peak periods of road network activity, the following vehicle activity was recorded at Reynolds Road:

- 65 vehicle movements ( 26 inbound and 39 outbound)
- 62 vehicle movements ( 25 inbound and 37 outbound)

Based on the observed traffic counts, the resulting trip generation rates (per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2} \mathrm{GFA}$ ) for the Nammoona Industrial precinct are summarised in Table 4.3.

Table $4.3 \quad$ Nammoona Industrial precinct trip rates

| GFA | Per $\mathbf{1 0 0} \mathbf{~ m}^{2}$ | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of trips | Trip rate | Number of trips | Trip rate |
| 47,550 | 475.5 | 65 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 4}$ | 62 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 3}$ |

The data in Table 4.3 indicates that the industrial land uses within the Nammoona Industrial precinct generate:

- $\quad 0.14$ trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA in the AM peak hour
- $\quad 0.13$ trips per $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ GFA in the PM peak hour

The existing land uses accessed from Cassino Drive include commercial developments such as a car wash and a vehicle smash repair, which are expected to generate more traffic than the land uses accessed via Reynolds Road, which contributes to the difference in the trip generation outputs.

### 4.1.4 Summary

The trip generation rates associated with the existing industrial and uses accessed from Cassino Drive have been used in order to determine the trip traffic generation for the RJP land uses for the following reasons:

- They are specific to Casino Township and, therefore provide a robust approach for deriving the traffic generation of similar industrial development for this area.
- They are consistent with the range of trip rates for industrial uses identified by TfNSW in their technical direction (2013).
- They are consistent with the trip generation values determined by a GHD case study for an existing industrial area.
- They are higher than the rates associated with the current land uses within the Nammoona Industrial precinct and will, therefore provide a robust approach to the traffic and transport assessment for the RJP sites.

For the purposes of this traffic generation, the following arrival and departure split has been adopted for the analysis, as this is consistent with the current vehicle activity at Cassino Drive:

- 60 percent inbound and 40 percent outbound in the AM peak hour
- 40 percent inbound and 60 percent outbound in the PM peak hour

Additionally, in accordance with the traffic survey data from the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive, it has been assumed that 25 percent of overall vehicles will consist of heavy vehicles.

### 4.1.5 Intermodal facility

As detailed in Table 3.1, the Nammoona Industrial precinct includes the following intermodal facilities:

- Intermodal facilities operation
- Warehousing
- General industrial land uses, including intermodal/cold chain solutions

In 2010, a Traffic Impact Assessment ${ }^{1}$ was prepared for an intermodal rail terminal within the Nammoona Industrial precinct. The assessment identified that:

- The intermodal facility would have up to 20 employees.
- With respect to heavy vehicles, the maximum movements are expected to be 344 heavy vehicles per day, (172 inbound and 172 outbound).

GHD has reviewed the intermodal facility assessment and noted the following:

- The growth perspective of the terminal operations to enable triple the number of truck trips in the first five years appears very high, and assumptions in 2010 are not necessarily applicable today (new woodchips and log processing facilities). At this stage, without a further updated assessment, the tempering or staging of this volume uptake needs to be considered with likely lower overall number of trips if not all opportunities are realised.
- In addition, the increase in the use of road train configurations which can carry up to four standard containers (TEU) or additional bulk loadings, would likely reduce the overall number of trips accessing the terminal.
- The impact will be greater for bulk materials, including aggregate, grain and woodchips, where the impact Is likely to be a reduction of trips by up to $20-25$ percent. However, there is also a potential for a reduction of trips for logs and container traffic in the region of 15 percent of total trips.
- Considering that bulk materials represent 55 percent of trips and logs and containers represent 45 percent of trips this indicates an overall impact of reducing the number of trips by approximately 25 percent.
- Accordingly, compared to the data in the 2010 assessment, a reduction in heavy vehicles of 25 percent is appropriate. Therefore, it has been assumed that the intermodal facility will generate up to 260 heavy vehicle movements per day ( 130 inbound and 130 outbound).
Additionally, for the purposes of analysis, it has been assumed that:
- The trip data identified above apply to the facilities operation and warehousing. For the general industrial land uses associated with the intermodal facility, the trip rates identified in Section 4.1.4 are appropriate.
- 20 percent of the overall daily heavy vehicle activity will occur in each of the morning and afternoon peak hours.
- In accordance with the data in Table 3.1, it is assumed that the intermodal facility will be 50 percent operational in 2031 and fully operational in 2041.


### 4.1.6 Residential development

The TfNSW (2013) technical direction identifies the following trip rates for low-density rural residential dwellings:

- $\quad 0.71$ trips per dwelling in the AM peak hour
- $\quad 0.78$ trips per dwelling in the PM peak hour

[^3]It is noted that these rates do not include trips made internal to a subdivision, which may constitute 25 percent of the overall trips.

For the purposes of analysis, the following arrival and departure split has been assumed for the proposed residential development:

- 20 percent inbound and 80 percent outbound in the AM peak hour
- 80 percent inbound and 20 percent outbound in the PM peak hour


### 4.2 Trip generation (number of vehicles)

The following sections summarise the expected traffic generation for each of the proposed future land uses for the future horizons years of 2031 and 2041. This traffic generation analysis has been undertaken to inform the SIDRA intersection modelling analysis, detailed in Section 4.4.

### 4.2.1 Industrial development

The expected trips associated with the Nammoona Industrial precinct, in accordance with the land use data detailed in Table 3.1, are detailed in Table 4.4.

Table $4.4 \quad$ Nammoona Industrial precinct trip generation

| Year | GFA | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Intermodal facility (including warehouses) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2031 | 16,222 | 22 | 14 | 14 | 22 |
|  | Light vehicle | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 16 | 10 | 10 | 16 |
| 2041 | 33,295 | 43 | 29 | 29 | 43 |
|  | Light vehicle | 12 | 8 | 8 | 12 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 31 | 21 | 21 | 31 |
| Other industrial land uses |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2031 | 72,942 | 219 | 146 | 128 | 192 |
|  | Light vehicle | 164 | 109 | 96 | 144 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 55 | 36 | 32 | 48 |
| 2041 | 149,715 | 449 | 299 | 234 | 350 |
|  | Light vehicle | 337 | 225 | 175 | 363 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 112 | 75 | 58 | 88 |
| Total Nammoona Industrial precinct |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2031 | 89,164 | 241 | 160 | 142 | 214 |
|  | Light vehicle | 170 | 114 | 100 | 150 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 71 | 46 | 42 | 64 |
| 2041 | 183,010 | 492 | 328 | 263 | 393 |
|  | Light vehicle | 349 | 233 | 183 | 375 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 143 | 96 | 79 | 119 |

The data in Table 4.4 indicates that the Nammoona Industrial precinct is expected to result in the following trip generation:

- In 2031: 401 trips in the AM peak hour, with 356 trips in the PM peak hour
- In 2041: 820 trips in the AM peak hour and 656 trips in the PM peak hour

The expected trips associated with the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, in accordance with the land use data detailed in Table 3.1, are detailed in Table 4.5.

Table $4.5 \quad$ Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct trip generation

| Year | GFA | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Inbound |  | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| Total Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 , 3 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ |
|  | Light vehicle | 154 | 103 | 81 | 119 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 52 | 35 | 26 | 40 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 2 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 0}$ |
|  | Light vehicle | 316 | 210 | 164 | 247 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 106 | 71 | 55 | 83 |

The data in Table 4.5 indicates that the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct will generate:

- In 2031: 343 trips in the AM peak hour and 267 trips in the PM peak hour
- In 2041: 702 trips in the AM peak hour and 549 trips in the PM peak hour


### 4.2.2 Residential development

The trips associated with the proposed residential developments detailed in Section 3.5 and the trip rates detailed in Section 4.1.6 are summarised in Table 4.6. A 25 percent reduction has been applied to account for internal trips within the South Fairy Hill Subdivision.
Additionally, it is expected that there will be a nexus between the commercial/industrial trips detailed in Table 4.4 and Table 4.5 and the residential trips. Namely, some residents from the UGIAs will work at the RJP. To account for this expected interaction, the residential trips have been reduced by 10 percent, i.e. 10 percent of the residential trips are associated with individuals accessing/egressing their place of employment within the Nammoona, Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct. As the RJP is intended to support the colocation of jobs within regional communities, a ten percent reduction supports a conservative assessment.

Table $4.6 \quad$ Residential trip volumes (UGIAs)

| Year | Site | No Dwellings | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | Barlings Lane | 128 | 16 | 65 | 72 | 18 |
|  | Infill | 83 | 11 | 42 | 47 | 12 |
|  | South Fairy Hill | 662 | 63 | 254 | 279 | 70 |
|  | North Casino | 20 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 3 |
|  | Total | 893 | 93 | $\mathbf{3 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 4 1}$ | Barlings Lane | 128 | 16 | 65 | 72 | 18 |
|  | Infill | 170 | 22 | 87 | 95 | 24 |
|  | South Fairy Hill | 1,360 | 130 | 521 | 573 | 143 |
|  | North Casino | 42 | 5 | 21 | 24 | 6 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 , 7 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 1}$ |

The data in Table 4.6 indicates that the proposed residential developments are expected to generate:

- In 2031: 465 trips in the AM peak hour and 511 trips in the PM peak hour
- In 2041: 869 trips in the AM peak hour and 955 trips in the PM peak hour.


### 4.3 Trip distribution

The expected trips generated by the RJP and residential developments have been distributed onto the road network based on observed traffic patterns identified in the traffic surveys detailed in Section 2.5.

The following sections outline the assumed trip distribution for the other proposed land uses.

### 4.3.1 Nammoona Industrial precinct

The outputs from the traffic surveys at Reynolds Road indicate that in AM and PM peak periods, approximately 95 percent of vehicles access and egress the existing industrial land uses to and from the south. This pattern is consistent with residents of Casino using Summerland Way to access/egress their place of employment.

As the RJP sites are developed, it is expected that there will be an increase in vehicles accessing/egressing the Nammoona Industrial precinct to and from the north, i.e., the South Fairy Hill subdivision. For the purposes of analysis, it has been assumed that in the 2031 and 2041 horizon years (refer to Figure 4.1):

- 25 percent of trips will access/egress the Nammoona Industrial precinct to and from the north
- 75 percent of trips will access/egress the Nammoona Industrial precinct to and from the south.


Figure $4.1 \quad$ Nammoona Industrial precinct - estimated trip distribution

### 4.3.2 Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct

As detailed in Section 3.3, the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct master plan propose an upgrade of the Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street. Preliminary analysis has been based on assuming a T-junction at the Arthur Street intersection. A concept level drawing of the proposed intersection upgrade is displayed in Figure 4.2.


Figure 4.2
Potential Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street upgrade
Key features of the potential Arthur Street intersection upgrade include a channelised right lane (CHR) and auxiliary left lane (AUL) suitable for accommodating 19 metre semi-trailer.
With respect to the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, the following has been assumed:

- A minor/secondary access will be provided on Spring Grove Road. For the purposes of analysis, it has been assumed that 20 percent of vehicles will access/egress the RJP via the intersection of East Street/ Spring Grove Road. In accordance with the current patterns of vehicle activity at the intersection of East Street/Bruxner Highway:
- For vehicles egressing the RJP from Spring Grove Road/East Street, 55 percent will turn right onto Bruxner Highway and (towards Casino) 45 percent will turn left onto the Bruxner Highway.
- For vehicles entering the RJP from Spring Grove Road/East Street, 70 percent will turn left from the Bruxner Highway (from Casino) 30 percent will turn right from the Bruxner Highway.
- The main access point to the industrial areas will be provided on the Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive and Arthur Street. For the purposes of analysis it has been assumed that:
- 55 percent of trips will access/egress the RJP site to and from the west (from the direction of Casino).
- 25 percent will access and egress the RJP site to and from the east.

As displayed in Figure 3.3, internal roads will connect Cassino Drive with Arthur Street and the wider RJP subject site.

The trip distribution assumptions that have been applied to the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct are displayed in Figure 4.3.


Figure 4.3
Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct Johnston Streettrip distribution

### 4.3.3 Residential areas

A description of the trip distribution assumptions that have been applied to the residential areas detailed in Section 3.5 is as follows:

- For North Casino, it is assumed that all vehicles will access/egress the site via Naughtons Gap Road, Spring Grove Road and East Street.
- For Barlings Lane and the infill sites it is assumed that:
- 20 percent of inbound and outbound trips will traverse Bruxner Highway
- 20 percent of inbound and outbound trips will traverse Summerland Way
- For South Fairy Hill it has been assumed that:
- 25 percent of trips will access/egress the site to/from the north, and 75 percent of trips will access/egress the site to/from the south
- 20 percent of the trips to and from the south will traverse the Bruxner Highway

The trip distribution assumptions that have been applied to the residential UGIAs are displayed in Figure 4.4.


Figure 4.4 UGIA trip distribution

### 4.4 Impact assessment

### 4.4.1 2031 horizon year

Based on the key assumptions identified in Section 4.1- Section 4.3:

- The 2031 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for Summerland Way are displayed in Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6, respectively.
- The 2031 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for Bruxner Highway are displayed in Figure 4.7 and Figure 4.8, respectively.

To account for wider regional growth, an additional five percent growth rate has been applied to the through traffic on Summerland Way and Bruxner Highway.


Figure 4.5 Summerland Way AM peak hour traffic volumes - 2031


Figure 4.6
Summerland Way PM peak hour traffic volumes - 2031


Figure 4.7
Bruxner Highway AM peak hour traffic volumes - 2031


Figure 4.8
Bruxner Highway PM peak hour traffic volumes - 2031
The layout of the Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street intersection, as modelled in SIDRA is displayed in Figure 4.9.
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Figure $4.9 \quad$ Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street intersection layout (SIDRA)
The outputs of the 2031 horizon year SIDRA analysis are displayed in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 2031 SIDRA analysis

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Summerland Way and Reynolds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 6.2 | A | 14 | 2.3 | A | 5 |
| Reynolds Road | 7.3 | A | 5 | 6.8 | A | 6 |
| Summerland Way - west | 1.1 | A | 0 | 1.2 | A | 0 |
| Total | 4.2 | A | - | 3.1 | A | - |
| Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.1 | A | 0 | 0.1 | A | 0 |


| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.1 | A | 0 | 0.1 | A | 0 |
| Hillcrest Lane | 32.7 | C | 2 | 14.8 | B | 0 |
| Total | 0.4 | A | - | 0.1 | A | - |
| Summerland Way and Co-op access road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.5 | A | 0 | 0.2 | A | 0 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.3 | A | 1 | 11.6 | A | 0 |
| Co-op access road | 10.6 | A | 2 | 12.3 | A | 2 |
| Total | 0.6 | A | - | 0.6 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and East Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Street - south | 29.0 | C | 1 | 22.4 | B | 2 |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 2.3 | A | 9 | 1.3 | A | 8 |
| East Street - north | 121.7 | F | 57 | 61.9 | E | 20 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 0.5 | A | 1 | 0.5 | A | 0 |
| Total | 11.6 | A | - | 5.1 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 2.7 | A | 7 | 1.1 | A | 3 |
| Cassino Drive | 53.9 | D | 20 | 48.5 | D | 26 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.2 | A | 0 | 0.8 | A | 0 |
| Total | 5.9 | A | - | 6.3 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 0.8 | A | 1 | 0.3 | A | 1 |
| Cassino Drive | 34.8 | C | 18 | 30.7 | C | 14 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 0.8 | A | 0 | 0.5 | A | 0 |
| Total | 4.4 | A | - | 3.1 | A | - |

The data in Table 4.7 indicates that in the 2031 horizon year, the intersections of interest typically operate with an acceptable LoS. The exception is the intersection of Bruxner Highway and East Street. Due to the heavy east/west traffic volumes on Bruxner Highway, the vehicles on East Street (north) are expected to experience long delays.

To mitigate against this, the intersection of Bruxner Highway and East Street was remodelled as a single lane roundabout, as displayed in Figure 4.10.


Figure 4.10 Proposed roundabout at Bruxner Highway and East Street
Key aspects of the proposed roundabout include:

- A single approach, departure and circulation lane
- An 8.5 m wide circulation lane to support the movement of large trucks

The layout of the proposed roundabout, as modelled in SIDRA, is displayed in Figure 4.11.


Figure 4.11
Bruxner Highway/East Street mitigated layout (SIDRA)

The 2031 SIDRA outputs for the intersection of Bruxner Highway and East Street accounting for the proposed mitigated layout are displayed in Table 4.8.

Table $4.8 \quad$ Bruxner Highway and East Street 2031 SIDRA outputs - roundabout

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Bruxner Highway and East Street (roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Street - south | 9.4 | A | 1 | 10.6 | A | 1 |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 3.8 | A | 34 | 3.6 | A | 44 |
| East Street - north | 11.7 | A | 11 | 9.6 | A | 6 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 3.3 | A | 49 | 3.2 | A | 30 |
| Total | 4.2 | A | - | 3.9 | A | - |

The data in Table 4.8 indicates that in the 2031 horizon year, the intersection of Bruxner and East Street operates with an acceptable Level of Service as a single lane roundabout.

The SIDRA outputs for the 2031 horizon year are displayed in Appendix C.

### 4.4.2 2041 horizon year

For the purposes of analysis, it has been assumed that the roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and East Street (refer to Figure 4.10) will be constructed prior to 2041.

Additionally, on 27July 2022, GHD met with TfNSW and RVC to discuss access options for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct. During the meeting, TfNSW indicated that they would, in principle, support a roundabout on Bruxner Highway at Cassino Drive or Arthur Street. RVC have indicated a preference for the roundabout at Arthur Street as it would slow vehicles on Bruxner Street approaching the Casino Township from the east.

The concept layout drawing of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street is displayed in Figure 4.12.


Figure 4.12 Proposed roundabout at Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street
Key aspects of the proposed roundabout include:

- A single approach and departure with additional short acceleration and deceleration lanes on Bruxner Highway.
- Two circulation lanes.
- A circulation carriageway width of 10 metres and a 24 metre diameter island to support the movement of large trucks.

The layout of the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street, as modelled in SIDRA, is displayed in Figure 4.13.


Figure $4.13 \quad$ Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street intersection mitigated layout (SIDRA)
Based on the key assumptions identified in Section 4.1-Section 4.3:

- The 2041 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for Summerland Way are displayed in Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.15, respectively.
- The 2041 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for Bruxner Highway are displayed in Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.17, respectively.

To account for wider regional growth, an additional ten percent growth rate has been applied to the through traffic on Summerland Way and Bruxner Highway.


Figure 4.14
Summerland Way AM peak hour traffic volumes - 2041


Figure 4.15 Summerland Way PM peak hour traffic volumes - 2041


Figure 4.16
Bruxner Highway AM peak hour traffic volumes - 2041


Figure 4.17 Bruxner Highway PM peak hour traffic volumes - 2041
The 2041 SIDRA outputs are displayed in Table 4.9.

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Summerland Way and Reynolds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 39.9 | C | 174 | 2.8 | A | 12 |
| Reynolds Road | 13.7 | A | 17 | 10.9 | A | 19 |
| Summerland Way - west | 1.4 | A | 0 | 1.5 | A | 0 |
| Total | 18.3 | B | - | 5.0 | A | - |
| Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.1 | A | 0 | 0.1 | A | 0 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.2 | A | 0 | 0.1 | A | 0 |
| Hillcrest Lane | 102.0 | F | 6 | 26.2 | B | 0 |
| Total | 0.6 | A | - | 0.2 | A | - |
| Summerland Way and Co-op access road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.4 | A | 0 | 0.3 | A | 0 |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.7 | A | 5 | 0.1 | A | 1 |
| Co-op access road | 26.8 | B | 4 | 25.5 | B | 5 |
| Total | 1.0 | A | - | 0.9 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and East Street (roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Street - south | 13.3 | A | 1 | 17.2 | B | 2 |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 5.3 | A | 64 | 5.3 | A | 99 |
| East Street - north | 28.2 | A | 68 | 10.0 | A | 1 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 4.9 | A | 130 | 4.4 | A | 7 |
| Total | 7.1 | A | - | 5.4 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 8.1 | A | 27 | 1.8 | A | 7 |
| Cassino Drive | >200 | F | 421 | >200 | F | 463 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.3 | A | 0 | 0.9 | A | 0 |
| Total | 163.0 | F | - | 152.7 | F | - |
| Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street (roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 7.0 | A | 10 | 6.7 | A | 13 |
| Cassino Drive | 13.5 | A | 9 | 12.3 | A | 9 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 5.8 | A | 12 | 5.6 | A | 8 |
| Total | 7.1 | A | - | 7.0 | A | - |

The data in Table 4.9 indicates that:

- In the 2041 horizon year the intersections of interest typically operate with an acceptable LoS.
- At the intersection with Reynolds Road, the queues on the eastern leg of Summerland Way associated with vehicles accessing the Nammoona RJP will be in the order of 175 metres. The current right-turning lane has a length of approximately 150 metres. Accordingly, it may need to be lengthened slightly so that right turning vehicles do not inhibit northbound vehicles on Summerland Way.
- Vehicles on Hillcrest Lane seeking to exit onto Summerland Way in the AM peak hour and vehicles on Cassino Drive seeking to exit onto Bruxner Highway are expected to experience significant delays.

A review of the SIDRA model for Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane indicates that the delays are associated with the right turning vehicles. Due to the chevron on Summerland Way (refer to Figure 4.18), right turning vehicles are required to traverse an additional three metres to head south. Accordingly, SIDRA allocates an increased gap acceptance parameter resulting in poor LoS.


Figure 4.18 Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane
The intersection of Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane was remodelled in SIDRA in the 2041 horizon years without the chevron, as displayed in Figure 4.19.


Figure $4.19 \quad$ Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane mitigated layout
The outputs of the 2041 SIDRA analysis for the intersection of Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane, in accordance with the geometry displayed in Figure 4.19, are detailed in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane - 2041 SIDRA outputs

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | 95 <br> Queue (m) | Av Delay <br> (sec) | LOS | 95 <br> Queue (m) |  |
| Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summerland Way - east | 0.1 | A | 0 | 0.1 | A | 0 |  |
| Summerland Way - west | 0.5 | A | 3 | 0.1 | A | 1 |  |
| Hillcrest Lane | 34.1 | C | 2 | 12.6 | A | 0 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | A | - | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ | A | - |  |

The data in Table 4.10 indicates that based on the geometry displayed in Figure 4.19, the intersection of Summerland Way and Hillcrest Lane will operate with an acceptable LoS in the 2041 horizon year.

Analysis indicates that due to the heavy vehicle activity on Bruxner Highway, in the 2041 horizon year, there are insufficient gaps for vehicles to turn from Cassino Drive, resulting in long delays for outbound vehicles.

A potential mitigation measure is to construct a "seagull" layout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive. A seagull intersection would enable right turning vehicles from Cassino Drive to merge into the westbound traffic lane on Bruxner Highway.

A concept drawing of a seagull intersection (in accordance with Austroads Guidelines) at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive is displayed in Figure 4.20.


Figure 4.20 Seagull configuration at the intersection of Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway

It is noted that under a seagull arrangement, right turning vehicles seeking to access/egress properties to the west of Cassino Drive, would be required to cross the merge lane and chevron lane, which has potential safety issues. Accordingly, a seagull layout is not considered feasible at the intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway.
An alternative mitigation measure is to ban right turn movements from Cassino Drive onto Bruxner Highway. Under this arrangement, vehicles could:

- Utilise the internal road network within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct to access Arthur Street and turn right onto Bruxner Highway.
- Turn left from Cassino Drive onto Bruxner Highway and undertake a U-turn at the Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street intersection.

For the purposes of analysis, it has been assumed that in the 2041 horizon year, 50 percent of the right turning vehicles will egress directly from Arthur Street, and 50 percent of vehicles will undertake a U-turn at the proposed roundabout.

The layout of the Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive (left out only) intersection, as modelled in SIDRA in the 2041 horizon year, is displayed in Figure 4.21.


Figure 4.21 Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive mitigated layout
The 2041 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the intersections of Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street, accounting for the removal of right turns from Cassino Drive, are displayed in Figure 4.22 and Figure 4.23, respectively.


Figure 4.22
Bruxner Highway AM peak hour traffic volumes (no right turns Cassino Drive) - 2041


Figure 4.23 Bruxner Highway PM peak hour traffic volumes (no right turns Cassino Drive) - 2041
The 2041 SIDRA outputs for the intersections of Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street, accounting for the removal of right turns from Cassino Drive, are displayed in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11 Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street - 2041 SIDRA outputs

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive (no right turn) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 8.3 | A | 36 | 1.9 | A | 10 |
| Cassino Drive | 19.2 | B | 4 | 13.6 | A | 3 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.4 | A | 0 | 1.0 | A | 0 |
| Total | 4.7 | A | - | 2.0 | A | - |
| Bruxner Highway and Arthur Street (roundabout) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 7.9 | A | 11 | 7.9 | A | 15 |
| Arthur Street | 14.2 | A | 13 | 13.2 | A | 13 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 6.2 | A | 15 | 6.3 | A | 10 |
| Total | 7.9 | A | - | 8.1 | A | - |

The results in Table 4.11 indicate that in the 2041 horizon year if the right turn from Cassino Drive is removed and the associated traffic is redistributed onto the proposed roundabout at Arthur Street, both intersections with the Bruxner are expected to operate with a good LoS.

If in the 2041 horizon year, right turns from Cassino Drive are removed, vehicles seeking to exit the Johnston Street Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (refer to Figure 3.3) could alternatively exit onto Spring Grove Road, travel southwards and turn right from East Street onto Bruxner Highway.

As detailed previously, Spring Grove Road is intended to support a secondary access to the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct. Analysis has been undertaken for the following scenarios:

- In the AM peak hour, 40 percent of the right turning vehicles from Cassino Drive were distributed on the right turn from East Street on Bruxner Highway.
- In the PM peak hour, 50 percent of the right turning vehicles from Cassino Drive were distributed on the right turn from East Street on Bruxner Highway.

The 2041 AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes for the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street accounting for the removal of right turns from Cassino Drive are displayed in Figure 4.24 and Figure 4.25, respectively.


Figure 4.24 Bruxner Highway/East Street AM peak hour traffic volumes (no right turns Cassino Drive) - 2041


Figure $4.25 \quad$ Bruxner Highway/East Street PM peak hour traffic volumes (no right turns Cassino Drive) - 2041
The 2041 SIDRA outputs, for the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street, accounting for the removal of right turns from Cassino Drive, are displayed in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12
Bruxner Highway/East Street - 2041 SIDRA outputs

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Bruxner Highway and East Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| East Street - south | 14.2 | A | 1 | 19.6 | B | 3 |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 6.2 | A | 70 | 12.2 | A | 173 |
| East Street - north | 41.2 | D | 60 | 10.8 | A | 15 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 5.0 | A | 135 | 4.4 | A | 58 |
| Total | 9.4 | A | - | 9.1 | A | - |

The data in Table 4.12 indicates that in the 2041 horizon year, if the right turns from Cassino Drive are removed and the associated traffic is partially redistributed onto East Street, the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street is expected to operate with a good LoS.

The 2041 SIDRA outputs are included in Appendix D.

### 4.4.3 Road upgrades

As detailed in Section 2.1.6, Reynolds Road:

- Between Summerland Way and Dargaville Drive has a road reserve width of approximately seven metres with marked centre lines.
- North of Dargaville Road, has a road reserve width of approximately six metres without centre lines.

As displayed in Figure 3.1, the Nammoona Industrial precinct proposes a vehicle access on Reynolds Roads, approximately 1.2 kilometres north of Dargaville Road.
It is recommended that the 1.2 kilometre section of Reynolds Road be widened prior to 2031 to support the vehicle activity associated the Nammoona Industrial precinct.

### 4.4.4 Summary

A summary of the impacts associated with the RJP and UGIAs and the recommended upgrades to the road network is provided below.
In 2031:

- Based on its current configuration, the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street is expected to operate with an unacceptable LoS in the AM peak hour.
- It is recommended that the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street be upgraded to a single lane roundabout (refer to Figure 4.10).
- It is recommended that the intersection of Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street be upgraded to a priority controlled T-junction to support access/egress to and from the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (refer to Figure 4.2).
In 2041:
- Based on their current configuration, the intersection of Summerland Way/Hillcrest Lane and Bruxner Highway/Cassino Drive are expected to operate with an unacceptable LoS in AM and PM peak hour periods. Due to the heavy volumes on Bruxner Highway, there are not sufficient gaps to support right turning vehicles from Cassino Drive.
- It is recommended that the chevrons on Summerland Way in proximity to Hillcrest Lane be removed to support an improved LoS.
- It is recommended that the intersection of Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street be upgraded to a roundabout to support access/egress to and from the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct Nammoona Industrial area and surrounds precinct (refer to Figure 4.12).
- It is recommended that right turn movements be removed from Cassino Drive onto Bruxner Highway (refer to Figure 4.21).
- The provision of a priority controlled seagull at the intersection of Bruxner Highway and Cassino Drive is not considered feasible (refer to Figure 4.20).
- SIDRA analysis indicates that the proposed roundabouts at East Street and Arthur Street could accommodate the redistributed right turn movements from Cassino Drive.


### 4.4.5 Costings

### 4.4.5.1 Introduction

The preliminary indicative cost estimates do not include specific allowances for factors such as the relocation of utilities, site materials and land acquisition. Actual costs will be dependent on market conditions at the time of tendering and construction. A $50 \%$ contingency has been applied for such factors, pending detailed design. The estimates have been prepared using rates from current and previous projects GHD has been involved with. The estimate for each site includes the following:

- Civil works for intersection construction.
- 50 percent contingency due to stage of design.

The estimates exclude the following:

- All excavation will be undertaken in materials other than rock.
- No allowance has been made for contaminated materials.
- No allowance for utilities relocations.
- No allowance for property acquisitions.
- No allowance for design.
- It is noted that actual costs will be dependent on market conditions at the time of tendering and construction and will depend on other factors including (but not limited to) weather, access and material availability.


### 4.4.5.2 Intersections

Preliminary indicative cost estimates have been prepared for the construction of the UGIA access intersections detailed in Section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 as follows:

- A priority controlled T-junction at the intersection of Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street (refer to Figure 4.2) \$2,119,238 (ex GST).
- A three legged roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street (refer to Figure 4.12) \$4,111,788 (ex GST).
- A four legged roundabout at the intersection of Bruxner Highway/East Street (refer to Figure 4.10) \$2,334,037 (ex GST).
It is noted that the cost of the roundabout at the Bruxner Highway/Arthur Street does not assume that a T -junction has already been constructed.

Additionally, costings have been prepared for the preferred and alternate access/egress intersection for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, on Spring Grove Road (refer to Section 3.3). A concept drawing has been prepared for the preferred intersection as shown in Figure 3.4). The indicative cost estimates for the Spring Grove Road are as follows:

- Preferred location - \$3,716,650 (ex GST)
- Alternate location - \$2,374,330 (ex GST)

The higher cost for the preferred location is associated with the bridge structure over the drainage easement, adjacent to Spring Grove Road.

Additionally, the cost associated with extending the turning lane on Summerland Way (at Reynolds Road) and removing the chevrons on Summerland Way (at Hillcrest Lane) will be in the order of $\$ 20,000$ (each for both items noted).

### 4.4.5.3 Roads

The indicative costs associated with the upgrade of Reynolds Road for a length of 1.2 kilometres north of Dargaville Drive with and additional width of one metre is $\$ 1,547,424$ (ex GST), this includes earthworks, asphalt and linemarking.
A breakdown of the costing calculations for roads and intersections is provided in Appendix F .

### 4.5 Staging analysis

A low growth and high growth staging analysis has been completed for Lot 320 within the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct. The analysis has been undertaken to determine the capacity of the existing intersection of Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway to accommodate additional traffic volumes associated with the industrial area and the wider growth within and in proximity to the Casino Township.
It is noted that this staging analysis excludes other land uses associated with the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, i.e. the Primex sites.
The location of Lot 320 in the context of the Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway intersection is displayed in Figure 4.26.


Figure 4.26 Lot 320 location

[^4]Outputs from the Draft Structure Plan identify a northern and southern area within the Johnston Street industrial area and surrounds precinct that based on an inundation assessment are most likely to be subject to initial development.


Figure 4.27 Stage 1 Key development areas
Source: Draft Structure Plan Richmond Valley Regional Job Precinct modified by GHD
The northern area is consistent with Lot 320 (refer to Figure 4.26), and as per the analysis below, it is assumed that access will initially be provided via Cassino Drive. Further, it is assumed that the southern areas will be accessed/egressed via an initial upgrade to Arthur Street, and then a further roundabout upgrade to accommodate the future requirements of the entirety of stage 1. These scenarios have also been considered in the infrastructure report staging. (ref; 12621341-REP_Utilities Infrastructure Analysis Report)

SIDRA analysis has been completed for the intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway, accounting for the Lot 320 low growth scenario trips in the 2031 and 2041 horizon years and a high growth scenario in the 2026 and 2031 horizon years. It is noted that the Lot 320 analysis:

- Is intended to determine the capacity of Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway and excludes the other Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct land uses.
- Assumes that the other proposed access/egress points at Arthur Street and Spring Grove Road have not been developed, i.e., all Lot 320 vehicle activity occurs via Cassino Highway/Bruxner Highway.
- Accounts for:
- The previously listed assumptions with respect to the proposed residential areas are detailed in Section 4.2.2.
- The trip distribution characteristics detailed in Section 4.3.2, i.e. 75 percent of trips will access/egress the site to and from the west (from the direction of Casino), and 25 percent of trips will access/egress the site to and from the east.
- The background growth rates on the Bruxner Highway are detailed in Section 4.4, i.e. a five percent increase in background traffic volumes in 2031 and a ten percent increase in traffic volumes by 2041.


### 4.5.1 Scenario 1 - low growth

Based on information provided by the Client, the expected yield for the Lot 320 low growth scenario is displayed in Table 4.13.

Table $4.13 \quad$ Lot 320 yield - low growth scenario

| Year | ${\text { Yield } \mathbf{m}^{2}}^{\|c\|}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2026 | 6,866 |
| 2031 | 12,302 |
| 2036 | 11,808 |
| 2041 | 8,366 |
| Total | 39,342 |

Utilising the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct trip rates detailed in Section 4.1.3.1, the accumulated vehicle trips associated with the Lot 320 low growth land uses are displayed in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14 Lot 320 trip generation characteristics - low growth scenario

| Year | GFA | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| 2026 | 6,866 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 16 |
|  | Light vehicle | 15 | 10 | 8 | 12 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 2031 | 19,168 | 58 | 38 | 30 | 45 |
|  | Light vehicle | 43 | 29 | 22 | 34 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 14 | 10 | 7 | 11 |
| 2036 | 30,976 | 93 | 62 | 48 | 72 |
|  | Light vehicle | 70 | 46 | 36 | 54 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 23 | 15 | 12 | 18 |
| 2041 | 39,342 | 118 | 79 | 61 | 92 |
|  | Light vehicle | 89 | 59 | 46 | 69 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 30 | 20 | 15 | 23 |

The data in Table 4.14 indicates that the industrial land uses associated with Lot 320 low growth scenario will generate:

- 2026 - 35 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 27 trips in the PM peak hour.
- 2031-96 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 75 trips in the PM peak hour.
- 2036-155 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 120 trips in the PM peak hour.
- 2041-197 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 153 trips in the PM peak hour.

The trips associated with Lot 320 low growth scenario in the 2031 horizon year are displayed in Figure 4.28, and the 2041 horizon year trips are displayed in Figure 4.29.

## AM Peak Hour



PM Peak Hour


Figure $4.28 \quad$ Lot 320 trips - 2031 -low growth scenario

## AM Peak Hour



PM Peak Hour


Figure 4.29 Lot 320 trips -2041- low growth scenario
The horizon year traffic volumes accounting for the Lot 320 low growth scenario trips, residential trips and background traffic growth are displayed in Figure 4.30 (2031 horizon year) and Figure 4.31 (2041 horizon year).

## AM Peak Hour
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Figure $4.30 \quad 2031$ traffic volumes (Lot 320) - low growth scenario

## AM Peak Hour
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Figure 4.312041 traffic volumes (Lot 320) - low growth scenario
The SIDRA outputs for the intersection of Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway accounting for the existing intersection configuration (as displayed in Figure 2.25) and the traffic volumes in Figure 4.30 (2031) and Figure 4.31 (2041), excluding the Primex site trips and potential additional access points on Arthur Street and Spring Grove Road are presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15
Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway analysis (Lot 320) - low growth scenario

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\mathrm{th}} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 1.7 | A | 4 | 0.9 | A | 2 |
| Cassino Drive | 53.6 | D | 30 | 37.9 | C | 23 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.2 | A | 0 | 0.8 | A | 0 |
| Total | 7.3 | A | - | 5.6 | A | - |
| 2041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 3.2 | A | 8 | 1.2 | A | 4 |
| Cassino Drive | > 150 | F | 288 | > 150 | F | 257 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.3 | A | 0 | 1.0 | A | 1.0 |
| Total | 62.2 | E | - | 53.7 | D | - |

The data in Table 4.15 indicates that for the low growth scenario:

- For both the 2031 and 2041 analysis, the main delays are associated with vehicles turning right from Cassino Drive onto Bruxner Highway.
- The 2031 horizon year analysis indicates that Cassino Drive is approaching capacity, but generally operates within acceptable parameters.
- The 2041 horizon year Cassino Drive is operating beyond capacity with significant delays.

In summary, the staging analysis indicates that based upon the expected yields and timing for Lot 320 low growth scenario detailed in Table 4.13, the intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway has the capacity to operate within generally actable parameters to 2031.
However:

- As per the analysis detailed in Section 4.4, subsequent to 2031, additional access points will be required, including via a new intersection on Spring Grove Road (refer to Figure 3.4) and/or via Arthur Street (refer to Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.12) in accordance with the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct structure plan (refer to Figure 3.3).
- The upgrade of Arthur Street will also support access/egress to and from southern areas, as displayed in Figure 4.27.


### 4.5.2 Scenario 2 - high growth

Additional analysis has been undertaken for a scenario for Lot 320 high growth scenario. Based on information provided by the Client, the expected yield for the Lot 320 high growth scenario is displayed in Table 4.13.

Table $4.16 \quad$ Lot 320 yield - high growth scenario

| Year | Yield $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2026 | 6,866 |
| 2031 | 24,604 |
| 2036 | 7,872 |
| Total | 39,342 |

Utilising the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct trip rates detailed in Section 4.1.3.1, the accumulated vehicle trips associated with the Lot 320 high growth land uses are displayed in Figure 4.17.

Table $4.17 \quad$ Lot 320 trip generation characteristics - high growth scenario

| Year | GFA | AM peak hour | PM peak hour |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 , 8 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |
|  | Light vehicle | 15 | 10 | 8 | 12 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 , 1 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | 49 | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
|  | Light vehicle | 71 | 47 | 37 | 55 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 24 | 16 | 12 | 18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 3 6}$ | 39,342 | $\mathbf{7 9}$ | 59 | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ |
|  | Light vehicle | 89 | 20 | 46 | 69 |
|  | Heavy vehicles | 30 | 15 | 23 |  |

The data in Table 4.17 indicates that the industrial land uses associated with Lot 320 high growth scenario will generate:

- 2026 - 35 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 27 trips in the PM peak hour.
- 2031-157 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 123 trips in the PM peak hour.
- 2036-197 vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 153 trips in the PM peak hour.

For the high growth scenario, analysis has been completed for the 2026 and 2031 horizon years. The trips associated with Lot 320 high growth scenario in the 2026 horizon year are displayed in Figure 4.32, and the 2031 horizon year trips are displayed in Figure 4.33.
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Figure 4.32 Lot 320 trips - 2026 -high growth scenario
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Figure $4.33 \quad$ Lot 320 trips -2031- high growth scenario
It is noted that for the 2026 horizon year to account for wider regional growth, an additional 2.5 percent growth rate has been applied to the through traffic on Bruxner Highway. Additionally, the following residential trips were applied to the analysis (refer to Table 4.18).

Table $4.18 \quad$ Residential trip volumes (2026)

| Year | Site | No Dwellings | AM peak hour |  | PM peak hour |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Inbound | Outbound | Inbound | Outbound |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ | Barlings Lane | 64 | 9 | 36 | 40 | 10 |
|  | Infill | 30 | 4 | 17 | 19 | 5 |
|  | South Fairy Hill | 237 | 25 | 101 | 111 | 28 |
|  | North Casino | 7 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |

The horizon year traffic volumes accounting for the Lot 320 high growth scenario trips, residential trips and background traffic growth are displayed in Figure 4.34 (2026 horizon year) and Figure 4.35 (2031 horizon year).
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Figure 4.34
2026 traffic volumes (Lot 320) - high growth scenario
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Figure 4.352031 traffic volumes (Lot 320) - high growth scenario
The SIDRA outputs for the intersection of Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway accounting for the existing intersection configuration (as displayed in Figure 2.25) and the traffic volumes in Figure 4.34 (2026) and Figure 4.35 (2031), excluding the Primex site trips and potential additional access points on Arthur Street and Spring Grove Road, are presented in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19 Cassino Drive/Bruxner Highway analysis (Lot 320) - Iow growth scenario

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Av Delay (sec) | LOS | $\begin{gathered} 95^{\text {th }} \% \\ \text { Queue (m) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 0.9 | A | 2 | 0.7 | A | 2 |
| Cassino Drive | 32.4 | C | 15 | 25.4 | B | 12 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.2 | A | 0 | 0.7 | A | 0 |
| Total | 4.2 | A | - | 3.5 | A | - |
| 2031 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bruxner Highway - east | 2.4 | A | 5 | 1.1 | A | 3 |
| Cassino Drive | 87.3 | F | 59 | 56.8 | E | 43 |
| Bruxner Highway - west | 1.4 | A | 0 | 0.9 | A | 0 |
| Total | 12.6 | A | - | 9.3 | A | - |

The data in Table 4.19 indicates that for the high growth scenario:

- For both the 2026 and 2031 analysis, the main delays are associated with vehicles turning right from Cassino Drive onto Bruxner Highway.
- The 2026 horizon year analysis indicates that the intersection of Cassino Drive is operating with an acceptable LoS.
- The 2031 horizon year Cassino Drive is operating beyond capacity with significant delays.

The staging analysis indicates that based upon the expected yields and timing for Lot 320 high growth scenario detailed in Table 4.16, the intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway has the capacity to operate within generally actable parameters to 2026, but will reach capacity prior to 2031. Accordingly, additional access will be required to be constructed prior to 2031.

In summary, the analysis indicates that based upon the expected yields:

- The intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway will operate with an acceptable LoS in the 2026 horizon year.
- In the 2031 horizon year the intersection of Cassino Drive and Bruxner Highway approaches capacity in the low growth scenario (based on a GFA 19,168 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) and is beyond capacity for the high growth scenario (based on a GFA.

Based upon the data and assumptions included in this report, the intersection of Arthur Street and Bruxner Highway should be upgraded to a roundabout (as displayed in Figure 4.12) by the time approximately 19,000 m² of the proposed industrial land uses within the Johnston Street industrial areas and surrounds precinct have been constructed.

If this High Growth scenario of lot 320 is realised, consideration should be given to the efficiencies of constructing the roundabout upgrade at Arthur Street/Bruxner Highway initially. This could avoid abortive or redundant pavement upgrades to the Arthur street intersection required for a low growth scenario.

All the Lot 320 SIDRA outputs are included in Appendix E.

## 5. Active and public transport

### 5.1 Active transport

As detailed in Section 2.3, the active transport facilities in proximity to the RJP subject sites is relatively poor. A summary of recommended upgrades to active transport for each of the RJP sites is provided below.

### 5.1.1 Nammoona Industrial precinct

As detailed in Section 1.4.4, some of the key visions for Summerland Way (as detailed in key planning documents) are to provide a safe, integrated traffic, cycle and pedestrian network and support the transport need of cyclists, pedestrians and public transport users.

The current layout/road reserve of Summerland Way does not provide any active transport infrastructure or support these visions.
Reynolds Road is about 3.2 km from the Casino Town Centre, which exceeds a comfortable walking distance. However, 3.2 km is a relatively comfortable cycling distance (less than 15 minutes). Additionally, reducing the speed limit on Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, would also provide a safer and more comfortable environment for cyclists.

It is recommended that Summerland Way between the Casino Township and Reynolds Road be widened to provide cycle paths, in accordance with the Austroads criteria displayed in Figure 5.1.

The data in Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6 indicates that by 2031 Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road will accommodate 930-960 vehicles per hour.

The data in Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.15 indicates that by 2041 Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road will accommodate $1,530-1,550$ vehicles per hour.


Figure 5.1
Bike path criteria
Source: Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides
Preliminary analysis suggests that based on the data in Figure 5.1:

- Based on a $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit on Summerland Way between Casino and Reynolds Road, the provision of physically separated bicycle lane would be appropriate.
- Based on a speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on Summerland Way, a physically separated bike lane with supporting verges would be required.
It is noted that TfNSW have indicated a preference for a separated shared path on the Summerland Way.
As described in Section 1.4.6, the PAMP proposes a shared path on Summerland Way between Hotham Street and Reynolds Road. This path would support active transport connectivity between the Nammoona RJP and the Casino Township.

The Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6A: Paths for walking and cycling indicates that bicycle paths have a desirable minimum width of between $2.5 \mathrm{~m}-3 \mathrm{~m}$.

Additional items to consider when reviewing the provision of active transport to the Nammoona Industrial precinct include:

- Providing an active transport path into the industrial areas from Summerland Way. It is not suggested that heavy vehicles and cyclists share Reynolds Road, unless a dedicated path is provided.
- Providing a bi-directional cycle path on the north-east side of Summerland Way, so northbound cyclists are not required to cross a busy road to access the Nammoona Industrial precinct (which is consistent with the PAMP).
A summary of the active transport recommendations for the Nammoona Industrial precinct, are as follows:
- Design the proposed upgrades for the active transport paths on Summerland Way and Reynolds Road.
- Reduce the speed limit on Summerland Way in proximity to Reynolds Road from $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Prepare an advocacy strategy ${ }^{2}$ to plan and construct cycling facilities on Summerland Way.
- $\quad$ Seek funding from State and Federal Governments to support regional and local active transport upgrades.
- Implement bike paths/shared paths on Summerland Way and Reynolds Road.

[^5]
### 5.1.2 Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct

As detailed in Section 3.2, no land uses are currently put forth in the Casino Food Co-op and surrounds precinct as part of the RJP. This is due to the Nammoona, Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct being identified as being sufficient to accommodate the required commercial/industrial land uses in Casino.
The proposed shared path on Summerland Way detailed in the PAMP would provide utility to the Casino Food Co-op site.

### 5.1.3 Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct

The proximity of the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct to the Casino township, highlights that walking and cycling should be encouraged as mode shares. The upgrades of the active transport infrastructure in proximity to the industrial areas would provide utility to future employees/residents of the industrial and the wider Casino community.
A significant majority of pedestrians and cyclists would be expected to access/egress the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct to/from the west, as there are limited residential developments to the east.

Within Casino, Bruxner Highway has a speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. To the east of Cassino Drive, the speed limit increases to $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ outside the Casino Township.

The Bruxner Highway currently provides a concrete footpath between West Street and Cassino Drive. It is recommended that the footpath be extended east on Bruxner Highway from Cassino Drive to additional access intersection constructed for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (as required).

The Bruxner Highway typically provides wide shoulders within Casino, however, in proximity to Cassino Drive the shoulder widths narrow to order of one metre or less. It is recommended that dedicated cycle paths be constructed along the Bruxner Highway between West Street, Cassino Drive and the additional access intersection(s) constructed for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct (as required).
The bike path should be constructed in accordance with the speed limit on the Bruxner Highway and the projected traffic volumes, in accordance with the criteria included in Figure 5.1.

The data in Figure 4.7 and Figure 4.8 indicates that by 2031 Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road will accommodate 930-960 vehicles per hour.

The data in Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.17 indicates that by 2041 Summerland Way south of Reynolds Road will accommodate 1,250-1,550 vehicles per hour.
Preliminary analysis suggests that based on the data in Figure 5.1:

- Based on a $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit on Bruxner Highway between Casino and Arthur Street, the provision of physically separated bicycle lane would be appropriate.
- Based on a speed limit of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or more on Bruxner Highway, a physically separated bike lane with supporting verges would be required.
A summary of the active recommendations for the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct, are as follows:
- Update the PAMP to include the upgrade of the active transport infrastructure on the Bruxner Highway.
- Design the proposed active transport upgrades on the Bruxner Highway.
- Reduce the speed limit on the Bruxner Highway in proximity to Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct to the west of Arthur Street from $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Seek funding from State and Federal Governments to support regional and local active transport upgrades on the Bruxner Highway.
- Implement bike paths/shared paths on Bruxner Highway.

As detailed in Section 1.4.7, it is proposed to construct a 13.5 kilometre active transport rail trail along a disused rail corridor between Casino and the town of Bentley. This trail will primarily support a recreational function, however it will also provide an opportunity for residents of North Casino to cycle to and from key employment areas, particularly the Johnston Street Industrial area and surrounds precinct.

### 5.1.4 Costings

The following active transport items have been costed:

- The provision of a bi-directional bike path on Reynolds Road with a length of two kilometres.
- The provision of a bi-directional bike path on Bruxner Highway between West Street and Cassino Drive, with a length of 2.4 kilometres.

As the PAMP proposes an active transport path on Summerland Way and Hotham Street it has been excluded from the costing assessment.

Preliminary indicative cost estimates have been prepared for the construction of the bike paths on Reynolds Road and Bruxner Highway, as follows:

- Bruxner Highway - \$1,267,488 (ex GST)
- Reynolds Road - \$1,497,477 (ex GST)

The costs identified above are associated with the provision of physically separated bike paths in accordance with the criteria displayed in Figure 5.1.

### 5.2 Public transport

As displayed in Section 2.2, the current public transport services (bus and train) in Casino are infrequent and provide little utility to the RJP area or UGIAs. Further, there are no bus stops in proximity to the RJP subject sites.

If there is a significant increase in patronage demand associated with the employees of commercial/industrial developments associated with the RJP or residential dwellings associated with the UGIAs, it is recommended that bus services be reviewed to determine the feasibility of providing services (including appropriately located bus stops) to the RJP subject sites.

A summary of the public transport recommendations for the RJP, are as follows:

- Prepare a bus improvement strategy and funding submission.
- Assess potential bus services demand associated with the RJP/UGIA.
- If funding is available, trial improved bus services in Casino and its surrounds.
- Advocate to make the improved bus services permanent.
- Continue to monitor the operation of bus services and advocate for route upgrades to account for changes in population densities, demographics and geographic distribution (if required).

Appendices

# Appendix A 

 Traffic survey outputsTURNING MOVEMENT SURVEY
Intersection of Bruxner Hwy and Cassino Dr, Casino

| GPS | $-28.861113,153.068773$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | Tue 25/10/22 |
| Weather: | Overcast |
| Suburban: | Casino |
| Customer: | GHD |


| North: | Cassino Dr |
| :--- | :--- |
| East: | Bruxner Hwy |
| South: | N/A |
| West: | Bruxner Hwy |


| Survey <br> Period | AM: | $6: 00$ AM-9:00 AM |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | PM: | $4: 00$ PM-7:00 PM |
| Traffic | AM: | $7: 45$ AM-8:45 AM |
| Peak | PM: | $4: 00 \mathrm{PM}-5: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |


| Time | North Approach Cassino DrEast Approach Bruxner Hwy Nest Approach Bruxner Hwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hourly Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start Period End | U | R | L | $u$ | R | WB | U | EB | L | Hour | Peak |
| 6:00 6:15 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 60 | 19 | 562 |  |
| 6:15 6:30 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 79 | 34 | 590 |  |
| 6:30 6:45 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 0 | 63 | 20 | 607 |  |
| 6:45 7:00 | 0 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 44 | 0 | 77 | 15 | 644 |  |
| 7:00 7:15 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 79 | 20 | 679 |  |
| 7:15 7:30 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 0 | 100 | 18 | 732 |  |
| 7:30 7:45 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 55 | 0 | 75 | 26 | 774 |  |
| 7:45 8:00 | 0 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 64 | 0 | 87 | 28 | 784 | Peak |
| 8:00 8:15 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 69 | 0 | 79 | 18 | 781 |  |
| 8:15 8:30 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 78 | 0 | 89 | 25 |  |  |
| 8:30 8:45 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 63 | 0 | 69 | 26 |  |  |
| 8:45 9:00 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 54 | 0 | 98 | 29 |  |  |
| 16:00 16:15 | 0 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 83 | 0 | 77 | 13 | 810 | Peak |
| 16:15 16:30 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 85 | 0 | 72 | 8 | 778 |  |
| 16:30 16:45 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 127 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 785 |  |
| 16:45 17:00 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 73 | 0 | 60 | 10 | 727 |  |
| 17:00 17:15 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 71 | 0 | 66 | 9 | 714 |  |
| 17:15 17:30 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 116 | 0 | 51 | 7 | 642 |  |
| 17:30 17:45 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 132 | 0 | 45 | 9 | 558 |  |
| 17:45 18:00 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 93 | 0 | 36 | 5 | 432 |  |
| 18:00 18:15 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 56 | 0 | 34 | 5 | 346 |  |
| 18:15 18:30 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 29 | 6 |  |  |
| 18:30 18:45 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 19 | 2 |  |  |
| 18:45 19:00 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 20 | 2 |  |  |


| Peak Time |  | North Approach Cassino |  |  | o DrEast Approach |  | Bruxner H |  | 促 |  | Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | R | L | U | R | WB | U | EB | L | total |
| 7:45 | 8:45 | 0 | 69 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 274 | 0 | 324 | 97 | 784 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 0 | 76 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 368 | 0 | 299 | 41 | 810 |



TRANS TRAFFIC SURVEY 르N ( ㄹ
TURNING MOVEMENT SURVEY
Intersection of Bruxner Hwy and East St, Casino


| Survey <br> Period | $\mathrm{AM}:$ | 6:00 AM-9:00 AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM | 4:00 PM-7:00 PM |
| Traffic <br> Peak | $\mathrm{AM}:$ | $8: 00 \mathrm{AM}-9: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
|  | PM | $4: 30 \mathrm{PM}-5: 30 \mathrm{PM}$ |


| Time |  | North Approach East St |  |  |  | East Approach Bruxner Hwy |  |  |  | South Approach East St |  |  |  | West Approach Bruxner Hwy |  |  |  | Hourly Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | R | SB | L | U | R | WB | L | U | R | NB | L | U | R | EB | L | Hour | Peak |
| 6:00 | 6:15 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 5 | 691 |  |
| 6. 15 | 6:30 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 7 | 745 |  |
| 6.30 | 6.45 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 766 |  |
| 6.45 | 7:00 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 10 | 816 |  |
| 7:00 | 7:15 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 15 | 844 |  |
| 7:15 | 7:30 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 10 | 880 |  |
| 7:30 | 7:45 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 3 | 983 |  |
| 7:45 | $8: 00$ | 0 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 87 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 9 | 1041 |  |
| 8:00 | $8: 15$ | 0 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 111 | 10 | 1089 | Peak |
| 8. 15 | $8: 30$ | 0 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 121 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 15 |  |  |
| $8: 30$ | 8.45 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 109 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 10 |  |  |
| 8:45 | 9:00 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 97 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 147 | 13 |  |  |
| 16:00 | 16. 15 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 130 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 17 | 1119 |  |
| 16:15 | 16.30 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 107 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 14 | 1093 |  |
| 16:30 | 16.45 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 159 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 130 | 18 | 1121 | Peak |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 110 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 11 | 1051 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 130 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 21 | 1013 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 148 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 83 | 11 | 930 |  |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 138 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 14 | 807 |  |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 105 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 63 | 14 | 671 |  |
| 18:00 | 18.15 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 92 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 61 | 6 | 560 |  |
| $18: 15$ | 18.30 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 15 |  |  |
| 18:30 | 18.45 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 13 |  |  |
| 18:45 | 19.00 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 3 |  |  |


| Peak Time |  | North Approach East St |  |  |  | East Approach Bruxner Hwy |  |  |  | South Approach East St |  |  |  | West Approach Bruxner Hwy |  |  |  | Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | R | SB | L | U | R | WB | L | U | R | NB | L | U | R | EB | L | total |
| 8:00 | 9:00 | 0 | 43 | 9 | 37 | 1 | 17 | 418 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 495 | 48 | 1089 |
| 16:30 | 17:30 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 547 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 411 | 61 | 1121 |



## TRANS TRAFFIC SURVEY

TURNING MOVEMENT SURVEY
Intersection of Summerland Way and Reynolds Rd, Casin


| Survey <br> Period | AM: | 6:00 AM-9:00 AM |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | PM | 4:00 PM-7:00 PM |
| Traffic | $\mathrm{AM}:$ | 8:00 AM-9:00 AM |
| Peak | $\mathrm{PM}:$ | 4:00 PM-5:00 PM |


| Time |  | North Approach Reynolds Rett Approach Summerland V/ist Approach Summerland W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hourly Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | R | L | U | R | WB | U | EB | L | Hour | Peak |
| 6:00 | 6:15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 186 |  |
| 6:15 | 6:30 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 215 |  |
| 6:30 | 6:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 230 |  |
| 6:45 | 7:00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 258 |  |
| 7:00 | 7:15 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 31 | 1 | 287 |  |
| 7:15 | 7:30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 328 |  |
| 7:30 | 7:45 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 37 | 2 | 362 |  |
| 7:45 | 8:00 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 35 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 374 |  |
| 8:00 | 8:15 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 0 | 54 | 1 | 379 | Peak |
| 8:15 | 8:30 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 38 | 0 | 42 | 0 |  |  |
| 8:30 | 8:45 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 51 | 0 |  |  |
| 8:45 | 9:00 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 0 | 46 | 0 |  |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 41 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 359 | Peak |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 356 |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 50 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 348 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 316 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 7 | 47 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 302 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 31 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 257 |  |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 217 |  |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 175 |  |
| 18:00 | 18:15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 138 |  |
| 18:15 | 18:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 0 |  |  |
| 18:30 | 18:45 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0 |  |  |
| 18:45 | 19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 1 |  |  |


| Peak Time |  | Worth Approach Reynolds Rett Approach Summerland V/st Approach Summerland W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Peak <br> total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | R | L | U | R | WB | U | EB | L |  |
| 8:00 | 9:00 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 0 | 25 | 121 | 0 | 193 | 1 | 379 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 23 | 162 | 0 | 135 | 2 | 359 |



TRAANS TTRAEFMC SUTMVEM
TURNING MOVEMENT SURVEY
Intersection of Access Driveway and Summerland Way, Casino


| Time |  | North Approach Summerland Way |  |  |  | East Approach Access Driveway |  |  |  | South Approach Summ erland Way |  |  |  | Approach Private Co-Operative Acces Hourly Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Star | Period End | $u$ | R | SB | L | U | R | WB | L | U | R | NB | L | $u$ | R | EB | L | Hour | Peak |
| 6:00 | 6.15 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 275 |  |
| 6:15 | 6.30 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 297 |  |
| 6:30 | 6.45 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 327 |  |
| 6.45 | 7.00 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 351 |  |
| 7:00 | 7:15 | 0 | 5 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 387 |  |
| 7:15 | 7:30 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 438 |  |
| 7:30 | 7.45 | 0 | 5 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 469 |  |
| 7:45 | 8:00 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 501 | Peak |
| 8:00 | 8:15 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 493 |  |
| 8:15 | 8:30 | 0 | 1 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| 8:30 | 8:45 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| 8:45 | 9:00 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 16:00 | 16.15 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 472 | Peak |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 458 |  |
| 16:30 | 16.45 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 447 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 396 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 64 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 377 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 328 |  |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 292 |  |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 250 |  |
| 18:00 | 18:15 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 207 |  |
| 18:15 | 18:30 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 18:30 | $18: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 18:45 | 19:00 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |



TRANS TRAFFIC SURVEY
TURNING MOVEMENT SURVEY
Intersection of Summerland Way and Hillcrest Ln, Casino


| Survey <br> Period | AM: | 6:00 AM-9:00 AM |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | PM: | 4:00 PM-7:00 PM |
|  | AM: | $8: 00 \mathrm{AM}-9: 00 \mathrm{AM}$ |
|  | PM: | 4:00 PM-5:00 PM |


| Time |  | ast Approach Summerland WSouth Approach Hillcrest Ln st $^{\text {S }}$ Approach Summerland W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hourly Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | WB | L | U | R | L | U | R | EB | Hour | Peak |
| 6:00 | 6:15 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 196 |  |
| 6:15 | 6:30 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 223 |  |
| 6:30 | 6:45 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 244 |  |
| 6:45 | 7:00 | 0 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 268 |  |
| 7:00 | 7:15 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 295 |  |
| 7:15 | 7:30 | 0 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 337 |  |
| 7:30 | 7:45 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 368 |  |
| 7:45 | 8:00 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 382 |  |
| 8:00 | 8:15 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 65 | 389 | Peak |
| 8:15 | 8:30 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 48 |  |  |
| 8:30 | 8:45 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |  |  |
| 8:45 | 9:00 | 1 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 54 |  |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 358 | Peak |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 355 |  |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 349 |  |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 1 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 316 |  |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 301 |  |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 257 |  |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 217 |  |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 177 |  |
| 18:00 | 18:15 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 138 |  |
| 18:15 | 18:30 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |  |  |
| 18:30 | 18:45 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |  |  |
| 18:45 | 19:00 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  |  |


| Peak Time |  | sst Approach Summerland WSouth Approach Hillcrest Ln ${ }_{\text {S }}$ st Approach Summerland W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Peak total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period Start | Period End | U | WB | L | U | R | L | U | R | EB |  |
| 8:00 | 9:00 | 2 | 144 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 229 | 389 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 1 | 184 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 358 |

Note: Site sketch is for illustrating traffic flows. Direction is indicative only, drawing is not to scale and not an exact streets configuration.


Appendix B SIDRA outputs 2022

MOVEMENT SUMMARY
$\nabla$ site: 1 [2022|AM | Existing | Summerland Way - Reynolds Road (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Summerland Way \& Reynolds Road
Site Category: Existing Design
Give-Way (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Mov} \\ & \mathrm{ID} \end{aligned}$ | Tum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INP } \\ & \text { [Total } \\ & \text { vehih } \end{aligned}$ | HV1 vehin | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEM } \\ & \text { ITotal } \\ & \text { vehth } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { HV1 } \\ \text { \% } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg } \\ \text { SStn } \\ \text { vic } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver, } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { sec } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \% \text { B } \\ & \text { I Veh } \\ & \text { veh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UEEUE } \\ \text { Disi] } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop } \\ & \text { Que } \end{aligned}$ | Effective Stop Rate | Aver No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \mathrm{kmh} \end{aligned}$ |
| SouthEast Summeriand Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 121 | 11 | 127 | 9.1 | 0.069 | 0.0 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| 6 | R2 | 25 | 8 | 26 | 32.0 | 0.027 | 8.7 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.33 | 0.60 | 0.33 | 52.1 |
| Approach |  | 146 | 19 | 154 | 13.0 | 0.069 | 1.5 | NA | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 73.2 |
| NorthEast Reynolds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 38 | 9 | 40 | 23.7 | 0.036 | 5.3 | Los A | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.14 | 0.50 | 0.14 | 45.3 |
| 9 | R2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 6.1 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.36 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 45.8 |
| Approach |  | 39 | 9 | 41 | 23.1 | 0.036 | 5.3 | Los A | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.15 | 0.50 | 0.15 | 45.3 |
| NorthWest Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.030 | 6.9 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 74.4 |
| 11 | T1 | 193 | 22 | 203 | 11.4 | 0.082 | 0.1 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| Approach |  | 194 | 22 | 204 | 11.3 | 0.082 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| All Vehicles |  | 379 | 50 | 399 | 13.2 | 0.082 | 12 | NA | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 71.7 |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ site: 1 [2022| PM | Existing | Summerland Way - Reynolds Road (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Summerland Way \& Reynoids Road
Site Category. Existing Design

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Mov }}{10}$ | Tum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mpel } \\ & \text { ITotel } \\ & \text { veth } \end{aligned}$ | IES HVI vehth | $\begin{gathered} \text { DeN } \\ \text { (Tytal } \\ \text { vehth } \end{gathered}$ | HVI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dep } \\ & \text { Sent } \\ & \mathrm{vc} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Delsy } \\ & \text { sect } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Selvice | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \% \text { B } \\ & \text { I Veh } \\ & \text { veh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TUEUE } \\ & \mathrm{D}=11 \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop. } \\ & \text { cire } \end{aligned}$ | Efloctive Stop Rate | Aver No Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { kmik } \end{aligned}$ |
| SouthEast. Summeriand Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 162 | 8 | 171 | 4.9 | 0.090 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| 6 | R2 | 23 | 2 | 24 | 8.7 | 0.020 | 78 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.26 | 0.58 | 026 | 59.1 |
| Approach |  | 185 | 10 | 195 | 5.4 | 0.090 | 1.0 | NA | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 76.6 |
| NorthEast Reynolds Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 12 | 35 | 3 | 37 | 8.6 | 0.030 | 5.0 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 45.7 |
| 9 | R2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.002 | 6.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.34 | 0.52 | 0.34 | 458 |
| Approach |  | 37 | 3 | 39 | 8.1 | 0.030 | 5.0 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.12 | 0.50 | 0.12 | 45.7 |
| NorthWest Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.021 | 6.9 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 74.0 |
| 11 | T1 | 135 | 11 | 142 | 8.1 | 0.057 | 0.1 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| Approach |  | 137 | 11 | 144 | 8.0 | 0.057 | 02 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 797 |
| All Vehicles |  | 359 | 24 | 378 | 6.7 | 0.090 | 1.1 | MA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 72.5 |

MOVEMENT SUMMARY
(10) Site: 2 [2022|AM | Existing | Summerland Way - Hillcrest Lane (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]

Summerland Way \& Hillcrest Lane
Site Category: Existing Design
Stop (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Tum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inp } \\ & \text { I Total } \\ & \text { vehth } \end{aligned}$ | HV] veh'h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEN } \\ & \text { ITotal } \\ & \text { vehth } \end{aligned}$ | HV1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Ssin } \\ & \text { vic } \end{aligned}$ | Aver. Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% I Veh. veh | UUEUE Disi] m | Prop. Que | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Aver. Spect Speed kmh |
| Southeast Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 60.0 | 0.004 | 8.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 46.8 |
| 11 | T1 | 144 | 17 | 152 | 11.8 | 0.083 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 80.0 |
| Approach |  | 149 | 20 | 157 | 13.4 | 0.083 | 0.3 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 77.7 |
| NorthWest Summeriand Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 229 | 29 | 241 | 12.7 | 0.134 | 0.0 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 6 | R2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.003 | 10.2 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.33 | 0.56 | 0.33 | 46.3 |
| Approach |  | 231 | 31 | 243 | 13.4 | 0.134 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.3 |
| SouthWest: Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100.0 | 0.003 | 12.9 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.32 | 0.93 | 0.32 | 40.4 |
| 9 | R2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 80.0 | 0.012 | 15.3 | Los B | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.48 | 0.95 | 0.48 | 41.2 |
| Approach |  | 7 | 6 | 7 | 85.7 | 0.012 | 14.6 | Los B | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.44 | 0.94 | 0.44 | 41.0 |
| All vehicles |  | 387 | 57 | 407 | 14.7 | 0.134 | 0.4 | NA | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 77.2 |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

© Site: $\mathbf{2}$ [2022 | PM | Existing | Summerland Way - Hillcrest Lane (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Summeriand Way \& Hillcrest Lane
Site Category Existing Design
Stop (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Tun | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INF } \\ & \text { ITotal } \\ & \text { veth } \end{aligned}$ | HV] <br> vehth | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEN } \\ & \text { [Totil } \\ & \text { veh } h \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HV1 } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg } \\ & \text { Sogth } \\ & \text { vic } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Duelay } \\ & \text { sec } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95\% B } \\ & \text { IVeh } \\ & \text { veh } \end{aligned}$ | UEUE Dist 1 <br> m | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop } \\ & \text { Oue } \end{aligned}$ | Effective Stop Rate | Aver No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { moh } \end{aligned}$ |
| SouthEast. Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 6.9 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 53.5 |
| 11 | T1 | 184 | 10 | 194 | 5.4 | 0.102 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| Apprcach |  | 185 | 10 | 195 | 5.4 | 0.102 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| NorthNest Summeriand Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 170 | 14 | 179 | 8.2 | 0.097 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 6 | R2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 7.7 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 0.29 | 51.9 |
| Apprcach |  | 171 | 14 | 180 | 8.2 | 0.097 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.8 |
| SouthWest: Hillcrest Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.001 | 8.3 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.29 | 0.83 | 0.29 | 44.1 |
| 9 | R2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.003 | 9.5 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.39 | 0.83 | 0.39 | 43.7 |
| Apprcach |  | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.003 | 9.1 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.36 | 0.83 | 0.36 | 43.8 |
| All vehicles |  | 359 | 24 | 378 | 6.7 | 0.102 | 0.1 | NA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 79.1 |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ Site: $\mathbf{3}$ [2022 | AM | Existing | Summerland Way - Co-op Access Road (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Summerland Way \& Co-op access road
Site Category: Existing Design
Vehicle Movement Performance

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Tum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INF } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { wehh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \text { weth } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEN } \\ & \text { ITotal } \\ & \text { veh/h } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WS } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \text { \& } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg } \\ & \text { Sath } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver. } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { sect } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95\% I } \\ & \text { IVeh. } \\ & \text { veh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UEUE } \\ & \text { Dist1 } \\ & \mathrm{m} \end{aligned}$ | Prop. Que | Effective | Aver No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h} \end{aligned}$ |
| SouthEast Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 26 | 1 | 27 | 3.8 | 0.015 | 7.0 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 64.1 |
| 11 | T1 | 175 | 25 | 184 | 14.3 | 0.103 | 0.0 | Losa | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| Approach |  | 201 | 26 | 212 | 12.9 | 0.103 | 0.9 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 77.5 |
| NorthWest Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 266 | 33 | 280 | 12.4 | 0.162 | 0.1 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 79.7 |
| 6 | R2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 40.0 | 0.162 | 9.1 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 59.4 |
| Approach |  | 271 | 35 | 285 | 12.9 | 0.162 | 0.2 | NA | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 79.2 |
| SouthWest: Co-op Access Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.032 | 5.1 | LOS A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.36 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 45.7 |
| 9 | R2 | 23 | 2 | 24 | 8.7 | 0.032 | 6.4 | Los A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.36 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 45.6 |
| Approach |  | 29 | 2 | 31 | 6.9 | 0.032 | 6.2 | Los A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.36 | 0.59 | 0.36 | 45.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 501 | 63 | 527 | 12.6 | 0.162 | 0.8 | NA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 75.3 |

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

$\nabla$ site: 3 [2022 | PM | Existing | Summerland Way - Co-op Access Road (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Summerland Way and Co-op access road
Site Category: Existing Design
Give-Way (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline 1 \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | Tum | INPUT VOLUMES[Total <br> vehh$\quad$HVI <br> vehih |  | DEMAND FLOWS[TDEA, <br> vehhHV] |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dey } \\ \text { Satn } \\ \text { Satic } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { sec } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | 95\% BACK OF QUEUE[ Veh.Dist] |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop. } \\ & \text { oue } \end{aligned}$ |  | Aver No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \mathrm{kmh} \end{aligned}$ |
| SouthEast. Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 16 | 3 | 17 | 18.8 | 0.010 | 4.7 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 46.4 |
| 11 | T1 | 216 | 10 | 227 | 4.6 | 0.119 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 50.0 |
| Approach |  | 232 | 13 | 244 | 5.6 | 0.119 | 0.4 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 49.7 |
| NorthWest. Summerland Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | T1 | 198 | 15 | 208 | 7.6 | 0.113 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| 6 | R2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.113 | 7.9 | Los A | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 74.1 |
| Approach |  | 199 | 15 | 209 | 75 | 0.113 | 0.0 | NA | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 79.9 |
| SouthWest Co-op Access Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.043 | 7.7 | Los A | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.36 | 0.66 | 0.36 | 63.7 |
| 9 | R2 | 33 | 2 | 35 | 6.1 | 0.043 | 8.6 | LOSA | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.36 | 0.66 | 0.36 | 61.8 |
| Approach |  | 42 | 2 | 44 | 4.8 | 0.043 | 8.4 | LOSA | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.36 | 0.66 | 0.36 | 62.2 |
| All Vehicles |  | 473 | 30 | 498 | 6.3 | 0.119 | 0.9 | NA | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 | 60.4 |

MOVEMENT SUMMARY
. Site: 4 [2022 | AM | Existing | Bruxner Highway - East Street (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Bruxner Highway and East Street
Site Category: Existing Design
Vehicle Movement Performance


MOVEMENT SUMMARY
(4it) Site: $\mathbf{4}$ [2022| PM | Existing | Bruxner Highway - East Street (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Bruxner Highway and East Street
Site Category: Ex
Stop (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{ID}^{\mathrm{Mov}}$ | Tum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INP } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { veht } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \text { vehKh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEM } \\ & \text { ITotal } \\ & \text { veh/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WS } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Saln } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Delay } \\ & \text { sece } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | 95\% B I Veh veh | $\begin{gathered} \text { UEUE } \\ \text { Disis! } \\ \mathrm{m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop, } \\ & \text { Que } \end{aligned}$ | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \text { kmhih } \end{aligned}$ |
| South: East Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.040 | 10.2 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.67 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 26.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.040 | 19.1 | Los B | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.67 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 44.6 |
| 9 | R2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.040 | 12.7 | Los A | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.67 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 40.0 |
| Appr |  | 15 | 0 | 16 | 0.0 | 0.040 | 14.2 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.67 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 37.7 |
| East. Bruxner Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 42.9 | 0.310 | 7.9 | LOSA | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 51.2 |
| 11 | T1 | 506 | 17 | 533 | 3.4 | 0.310 | 0.3 | Los A | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 51.7 |
| 6 | R2 | 25 | 1 | 26 | 4.0 | 0.310 | 8.0 | LOSA | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 53.2 |
| Appr |  | 538 | 21 | 566 | 3.9 | 0.310 | 0.8 | NA | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 51.9 |
| North: East Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 26 | 2 | 27 | 7.7 | 0.211 | 10.8 | LOSA | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 37.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.211 | 19.9 | Los B | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 42.5 |
| 9 | R2 | 31 | 2 | 33 | 6.5 | 0.211 | 24.8 | Los B | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 31.8 |
| Appr |  | 61 | 4 | 64 | 6.6 | 0.211 | 18.5 | LOS B | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 35.1 |
| West Bruxner Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L2 | 60 | 1 | 63 | 1.7 | 0.283 | 4.6 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 54.6 |
| 5 | T1 | 444 | 22 | 467 | 5.0 | 0.283 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 56.3 |
| 6 | R2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.283 | 7.8 | Los A | 0.0 | 02 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 53.9 |
| Appr |  | 505 | 23 | 532 | 4.6 | 0.283 | 0.6 | NA | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.01 | 55.9 |
| All V |  | 1119 | 48 | 1178 | 4.3 | 0.310 | 1.8 | NA | 0.7 | 5.2 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 50.3 |

MOVEMENT SUMMARY
(4ite: 5 [2022 |AM | Existing | Bruxner Highway-Cassino Drive (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Bruxner - Cassino Drive
Site Category: Existing Design
Stop (Two-Way)


MOVEMENT SUMMARY
(4ite: 5 [2022 | PM | Existing | Bruxner Highway-Cassino Drive (Site Folder: Existing Scenario)]
Bruxner - Cassino Drive
ite Category: Existing Design
Stop (Two-Way)

| Vehicle Movement Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & { }_{10} \end{aligned}$ | Tun | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INP } \\ & \text { [ Total } \\ & \text { vehth } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MES } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \text { vethh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEM } \\ & \text { ITolal } \\ & \text { vehih } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WS } \\ & \text { HVI } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg } \\ & \text { Soln } \\ & \text { vic } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Delsy } \\ & \text { sece } \end{aligned}$ | Level of Service | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \% \text { E } \\ & \text { IVeh } \\ & \text { veh } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UEUE } \\ & \text { Disi] } \\ & \mathrm{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prop, } \\ & \text { ave } \end{aligned}$ | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Aver } \\ & \text { Speed } \\ & \mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h} \end{aligned}$ |
| NorthEast Bruxner Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | T1 | 368 | 14 | 387 | 3.8 | 0.172 | 0.3 | LOSA | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 59.6 |
| 26b | R3 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 7.7 | 0.172 | 8.7 | LOSA | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 57.8 |
| Approach |  | 381 | 15 | 401 | 3.9 | 0.172 | 0.6 | NA | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 59.5 |
| North: RoadName |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 b | L3 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 7.7 | 0.017 | 10.4 | LOSA | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.40 | 0.86 | 0.40 | 44.2 |
| 9 a | R1 | 76 | 4 | 80 | 5.3 | 0.264 | 20.1 | LOS B | 1.0 | 7.6 | 0.75 | 1.09 | 0.85 | 39.9 |
| Approach |  | 89 | 5 | 94 | 5.6 | 0.264 | 18.7 | LOS B | 1.0 | 7.6 | 0.70 | 1.06 | 0.79 | 40.5 |
| SouthWest: Bruxner Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30a | L1 | 41 | 5 | 43 | 12.2 | 0.024 | 4.7 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 53.8 |
| 5 | T1 | 299 | 22 | 315 | 7.4 | 0.169 | 0.0 | LOSA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59.9 |
| Approach |  | 340 | 27 | 358 | 7.9 | 0.169 | 0.6 | NA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 59.1 |
| All Vehicles |  | 810 | 47 | 853 | 5.8 | 0.264 | 2.6 | NA | 1.0 | 7.6 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 56.4 |

# Appendix C SIDRA outputs 2031 

## Appendix D SIDRA outputs 2041

Appendix E Lot 320 SIDRA outputs

Costing breakdown

|  |  |  | 2.4 km Bruxner Highway Bike Path |  |  | 2.0 km Reynolds Road Bike Path |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay Item | Description | Unit | Qty | Rate | Total | Qty | Rate | Total |
| 1 | General Requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Site Establishment | Lump sum | 1 | \$26,406 | \$26,406 | 1 | \$30,483 | \$30,483 |
| 1.2 | Traffic Control | Lump sum | 1 | \$39,609 | \$39,609 | 1 | \$68,587 | \$68,587 |
| 1.3 | Project Management | Lump sum | 1 | \$118,827 | \$118,827 | 1 | \$137,174 | \$137,174 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Road works |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1.1 | Earthworks | Cum | 1600 | \$25 | \$40,000 | 2000 | \$35 | \$70,000 |
| 2.1.2 | Preparation, trim and compaction of existing surface | Sqm | 4000 | \$6 | \$24,000 | 5000 | \$6 | \$30,000 |
|  | Sand 50 mm | Cu.m | 230 | \$90 | \$20,700 | 288 | \$90 | \$25,875 |
| 2.1.3 | Supply, place and compact 150mm thick concrete | Cu.m | 1,380 | \$350 | \$483,000 | 1,725 | \$350 | \$603,750 |
| 2.3 | Additional works |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3.1 | Turf | m | 2400 | \$8.00 | \$19,200 | 2400 | \$8.00 | \$19,200 |
| 2.3.2 | Driveways | each | 60 | \$1,000.00 | \$60,000 |  |  |  |
| 2.3 .5 | E\&S | each | 1 | \$8,000 | \$8,000 | 1 | \$8,000 | \$8,000 |
| 2.3.6 | Signs | each | 15 | \$350 | \$5,250 | 15 | \$350 | \$5,250 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$844,992 |  |  | \$998,318 |
|  | Contingency | \% | 50 |  | \$422,496 | 50 |  | \$499,159 |
|  | Grand Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$1,267,488 |  |  | \$1,497,477 |


|  | Project: Richmond Valley SAP Client: DRNSW |  | Prepared By: GHD Pty Ltd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Estimate Type: Strategic Cost Estimate |  | Date: 11/25/20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Bruxner Hwy/Arthur St T-Junction |  |  | Bruxner Hwy/East St Roundabout |  |  | Bruxner Hwy/Arthur St Roundabout |  |  |
| Pay Item | Description | Unit | aty | Rate | Total | Caty | Rate | Total | aty | Rate | Total |
| 1 | Ceneral Requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Site Establishment | Lump sum | 1 | \$44,151 | \$44,151 | 1 | \$48,626 | \$48,626 | 1 | \$85,662 | \$85,662 |
| 1.2 | Traffic Control | Lump sum | 1 | \$66,226 | \$66,226 | 1 | \$72,939 | \$72,939 | 1 | \$128,493 | \$128,493 |
| 1.3 | Project Management | Lump sum | 1 | \$198,679 | \$198,679 | 1 | \$218,816 | \$218,816 | 1 | \$385,480 | \$385,480 |
|  | Road works |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1.1 | EarthworksPreparation, trim and compaction of existing surface | Cum | 2720 | \$25 | \$68,000 | 2677.5 | \$25 | \$66,938 | 5025 | \$25 | \$125,625 |
| 2.1.2 |  | Sqm | 5440 | \$6 | \$32,640 | 5355 | \$6 | \$32,130 | 10050 | \$6 | \$60,300 |
|  | Select subgrade, 300 mm thick <br> Supply, place and compact min 300 mm thick DGS20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 1,877 | \$90 | \$168,912 | 1,847 | \$90 | \$166,273 | 3,467 | \$90 | \$312,053 |
| 2.1.3 |  | Cu.m | 1,877 | \$115 | \$215,832 | 1,847 | \$115 | \$212,460 | 3,467 | \$115 | \$398,734 |
| 2.1.4 | Supply, place and compact min 200 mm thick DGB20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 1,251 | \$130 | \$162,656 | 1,232 | \$130 | \$160,115 | 2,312 | \$130 | \$300,495 |
| 2.1.5 | Prime seal | Sqm | 5,440 | \$6 | \$32,640 | 5,355 | \$6 | \$32,130 | 10,050 | \$6 | \$60,300 |
| 2.1.6 | Asphalt Drainage | Sqm | 5,440 | \$30 | \$163,200 | 5,355 | \$30 | \$160,650 | 10,050 | \$30 | \$301,500 |
| 2.2 |  | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2.1 | Pipes <br> Pits | m | 300 | \$450 | \$135,000 | 400 | \$450 | \$180,000 | 600 | \$450 | \$270,000 |
| 2.2.2 |  | each | 8 | \$3,000 | \$24,000 | 10 | \$3,000 | \$30,000 | 15 | \$3,000 | \$45,000 |
| 2.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pits } \\ & \hline \text { Additional works } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 .1 | Kerb and gutter | m |  |  |  | 990 | \$85.00 | \$84,150 | 2030 | \$85.00 | \$172,550 |
| 2.3.2 | Lines | m | 2505 | \$3.00 | \$7,515 | 1400 | \$3.00 | \$4,200 | 3600 | \$3.00 | \$10,800 |
| 2.3 .3 | Medians | Sqm | 1125 | \$65.00 | \$73,125 | 600 | \$110.00 | \$66,000 | 520 | \$110.00 | \$57,200 |
| 2.3.4 | Chevrons | each |  | \$65 | \$0 |  | \$65 | \$0 |  | \$65 | \$0 |
| 2.3 .5 | E\&S | each | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | 1 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |
| 2.3.6 | Signs | each | 15 | \$350 | \$5,250 | 16 | \$350 | \$5,600 | 20 | \$350 | \$7,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total (ex. CST) |  |  |  | \$1,412,826 |  |  | \$1,556,025 |  |  | \$2,741,192 |
|  | Contingency | \% | 50 |  | \$706,413 | 50 |  | \$778,012 | 50 |  | \$1,370,596 |
|  | Grand Total (ex. CST) |  |  |  | \$2,119,238 |  |  | \$2,334,037 |  |  | \$4,111,788 |


|  | Reynolds Road widening |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay Item | Description | Unit | Qty | Rate | Total |
| 1 | General Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Site Establishment | Lump sum | 1 | \$31,988 | \$31,988 |
| 1.2 | Traffic Control | Lump sum | 1 | \$47,982 | \$47,982 |
| 1.3 | Project Management | Lump sum | 1 | \$143,946 | \$143,946 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Road works |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Roundabout |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 .1 | Earthworks | Cum | 2400 | \$25 | \$60,000 |
| 2.1.2 | Preparation, trim and compaction of existing surface | Sq m | 2400 | \$6 | \$14,400 |
|  | Select subgrade, 300mm thick | Cu.m | 828 | \$90 | \$74,520 |
| 2.1.3 | Supply, place and compact min 300 mm thick DGS20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 828 | \$115 | \$95,220 |
| 2.1 .4 | Supply, place and compact min 200 mm thick DGB20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 552 | \$130 | \$71,760 |
| 2.1 .5 | Lift existing road to suit | cu.m | 840 | \$145 | \$121,800 |
| 2.1.6 | Prime seal | Sq m | 9,600 | \$6 | \$57,600 |
| 2.1.7 | Asphalt | Sq m | 9,600 | \$30 | \$288,000 |
| 2.2 | Additional works |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 .1 | E\&S | each | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| 2.2.2 | Signs | each | 4 | \$350 | \$1,400 |
| 2.2.3 | Linemarking | each | 1 | \$8,000 | \$8,000 |
|  | Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$1,031,616 |
|  | Contingency | \% | 50 |  | \$515,808 |
|  | Grand Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$1,547,424 |


|  |  | Spring Grove Road - preferred access |  |  |  | Spring Grove Road - alternate access |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay Item | Description | Unit | Qty | Rate | Total | Qty | Rate | Total |
| 1 | General Requirements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 | Site Establishment | Lump sum | 1 | \$77,430 | \$77,430 | 1 | \$49,465 | \$49,465 |
| 1.2 | Traffic Control | Lump sum | 1 | \$116,145 | \$116,145 | 1 | \$74,198 | \$74,198 |
| 1.3 | Project Management | Lump sum | 1 | \$348,436 | \$348,436 | 1 | \$222,593 | \$222,593 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Road works |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Roundabout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1 .1 | Earthworks | Cu m | 3500 | \$25 | \$87,500 | 3200 | \$25 | \$80,000 |
| 2.1.2 | Preparation, trim and compaction of existing surface | Sq m | 5440 | \$6 | \$32,640 | 5440 | \$6 | \$32,640 |
|  | Select subgrade, 300mm thick | Cu.m | 1,877 | \$90 | \$168,912 | 1,877 | \$90 | \$168,912 |
| 2.1 .3 | Supply, place and compact min 300 mm thick DGS20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 1,877 | \$115 | \$215,832 | 1,877 | \$115 | \$215,832 |
| 2.1 .4 | Supply, place and compact min 200 mm thick DGB20 (or approved equivalent) | Cu.m | 1,251 | \$130 | \$162,656 | 1,251 | \$130 | \$162,656 |
| 2.1 .5 | Prime seal | Sq m | 5,440 | \$6 | \$32,640 | 5,440 | \$6 | \$32,640 |
| 2.1 .6 | Asphalt | Sq m | 5,440 | \$30 | \$163,200 | 5,440 | \$30 | \$163,200 |
| 2.2 | Drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 .1 | Pipes | m | 300 | \$450 | \$135,000 | 400 | \$450 | \$180,000 |
| 2.2.2 | Pits | each | 8 | \$3,000 | \$24,000 | 10 | \$3,000 | \$30,000 |
| 2.3 | Additional works |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 .1 | Kerb and gutter | m |  |  |  | 990 | \$85.00 | \$84,150 |
| 2.3 .3 | Medians | Sq m | 1125 | \$65.00 | \$73,125 | 600 | \$110.00 | \$66,000 |
| 2.3 .4 | Chevrons | each |  | \$65 | \$0 |  | \$65 | \$0 |
| 2.3 .5 | E\&S | each | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | 1 | \$15,000 | \$15,000 |
| 2.3 .6 | Signs | each | 15 | \$350 | \$5,250 | 16 | \$350 | \$5,600 |
| 2.4 | Easement drainage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 .1 | Supply and install box culvert -6x (1200x900) | m | 20 | \$9,000.00 | \$820,000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$2,477,766 |  |  | \$1,582,886 |
|  | Contingency | \% | 50 |  | \$1,238,883 | 50 |  | \$791,443 |
|  | Grand Total (ex. GST) |  |  |  | \$3,716,650 |  |  | \$2,374,330 |


[^0]:    Source: Richmond Valley Regional Jobs Precinct Draft Structure Plan

[^1]:    Source: Google Maps

[^2]:    Source: Google Maps

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Traffic Impact Assessment for Summerdowns Rail Terminal at Nammoona (Plateway, 2010)

[^4]:    Source: Six Maps modified by GHD

[^5]:    ${ }^{2}$ Advocacy strategies should include goal, objectives, target groups, specific activities, stakeholder roles, time frames and expected outcomes

