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#### Abstract

Growth in land development in South Africa resulted in large increase in traffic volumes. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), as a traffic engineering tool, is commonly used to assess the possible effects of a land development project on the transportation and traffic system. During the TIA process, capacity analysis is performed to indicate the measures of effectiveness of the intersection. Intersection capacity analysis in South Africa by engineers is done on the basis of default values of the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) provided by the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) or limited traffic counts. However, the default value of PHF may be significantly affected by new developments in the neighbourhood of the intersection.

This study aimed at investigating the impact land-use change has on the existing intersection PHF, thus predicting values per land-use type. Intersections with traffic counts conducted before and after land-use change in vicinity were selected and investigated. The results showed that change in land-use has an impact on the existing PHF. They also assist in identifying the appropriate intersections to predict the PHF per land-use type.

Intersections were identified and analysed, and this led to the development of a design chart showing the predicted PHF per land-use type selected and measures to consider during traffic analysis. Intersection capacity analysis was performed to compare the results using the predicted PHF and the HCM default values. The results showed that traffic flow rate was adjusted by up to $26 \%$ when using the default values, 0.92 and 0.95 . The results also showed that the default values could overestimate the volume to capacity ratio and the average delay by up to $15 \%$ and $35 \%$, respectively. It was then concluded that the use of HCM default values of the PHF for every land-use type will have an effect of the final roadway design results. The computed PHF values for each land-use type were then recommended to be used to ensure fairness and consistency in traffic analysis.
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# NOMENCLATURE, TERMS AND CONCEPTS 

## Nomenclature

CBD - Central Business District
CoT - City of Tshwane
HCM - Highway Capacity Manual
NCHRP - National Cooperation Highway Research Program
PHV - Peak Hour Volume
SIDRA - Signalised and Un-signalised Intersection Design and Research Aid
NMT - Non-Motorised Transport

## Terms and Concepts

Delay - The additional travel time experienced by a driver, passenger, or pedestrian. Capacity - The maximum sustainable flow rate at which vehicles or persons reasonably can be expected to traverse a point or uniform segment of a lane or roadway during a specified time period under given roadway, geometric, traffic, environmental, and control conditions; usually expressed as vehicles per hour, passenger cars per hour, or persons per hour.

Degree of Saturation - The ratio of arrival (demand) flow rate to capacity during a given traffic flow period. It is also known as the volume to capacity ratio.
Level of Service (LOS) - A qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as speed and travel time, freedom to manoeuvre, traffic interruptions, comfort, and convenience.
Peak Hour Factor (PHF) - A measure of traffic demand fluctuation within the peak hour which can be computed by dividing the peak hourly volume by the hourly equivalent of the peak 15-min flow rate within that peak hour.
Saturation Flow Rate - The equivalent hourly rate at which previously queued vehicles can traverse an intersection approach under prevailing conditions, assuming that the green signal is available at all times and no lost times are experienced, in vehicles per hour or vehicles per hour per lane.

Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) - A traffic engineering tool commonly used to assess the possible effects of a land development project on the transportation and traffic system.
Traffic Flow Rate - The equivalent hourly rate at which vehicles, bicycles, or persons pass a point on a lane, roadway, or other traffic way; computed as the number of vehicles, bicycles, or persons passing the point, divided by the time interval (usually less than 1 h ) in which they pass; expressed as vehicles, bicycles, or persons per hour.

## CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General background

Over the last decade, South Africa has experienced development in many areas including transport infrastructure resulting in sudden increase in traffic volume. Road transportation affects land-use, and on the other hand, land-use affects transportation. As a result, it is important to coordinate transportation and land-use planning decisions so that they are complementary rather than contradictory (Litman, 2010b). Therefore, there is need for both transport planning and land-use to support each other. Thus, the existing guidelines for traffic impact study require that all new developments generating more than 50 vehicular trips during the morning and the afternoon peak hour traffic volumes need to be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment report (City Council of Pretoria, 1998; National Department of Transport, 1995).

A traffic impact assessment (TIA) is a traffic engineering tool commonly used to assess the possible effects of a land development project on the transportation and traffic system. The TIA determines whether any transportation improvements are necessary to accommodate the new traffic volumes generated by the development (City Council of Pretoria, 1998).

One of the most important pieces of information in traffic analysis is current traffic volumes. Traffic volume counts should show turning volumes as well as through traffic. Traffic volumes can either be obtained by setting out traffic recorders or by using existing traffic counts that are not more than two years old. The traffic volumes are then adjusted to obtain the peak hour of travel at each key location by using peak hour factors. However, in the absence of field data, peak hour factor default values as provided in the Highway Capacity Manual (2000) can be used during capacity and Level of Service (LOS) analysis. The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) is a well researched document which takes other countries traffic operation into consideration.

The HCM provides methodologies for evaluating highway, transit and pedestrian facilities that require input parameters that depend on detailed site-specific data. The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) recommends that local traffic data collection be performed for more accurate intersection performance results. The accuracy and the validity of the prediction for performance measures should be considered when applying the results of the analysis (High Capacity Manual, 2000).

This research investigated the effect of land-use change on peak hour factor (PHF). This investigation aimed at establishing local default values of peak hour factor for each land-use type within City of Tshwane Municipality. Such values could replace the default values as recommended in the HCM and use them to suit South African conditions.

### 1.2 Problem statement

Design of traffic intersection in South Africa by Traffic Engineers and Planners is done on the basis of HCM default values of the PHF and limited traffic counts. The default value of PHF may be significantly affected by a new development in the neighbourhood of the intersection thus underestimating the design flow rate. PHF is one of the input parameters, out of the 63 default values, provided in the HCM that has a high degree of sensitivity (National Cooperation Highway Research Program, 2008).

The LOS arising from such intersection may affect the obligation or the responsibility of the developer and/or the authorities to undertake mitigation measures proposed in the TIA recommendations. The question then is "what value of PHF should be used in roadway design and traffic analysis per land-use type?" The question is important because an estimate from data collected in a single day is not sufficient to answer this question. This, therefore, underscores the need of such a study so as to determine the effect that land-use change will have on the PHF and hence produce national default values.

### 1.3 Objectives of the study

The overall objective of this study was to investigate the effect of land-use change on traffic peak hour factor within the City of Tshwane Boundaries.

The specific objectives of the study were:
a. To determine the peak hour factor for different land-use types.
b. Develop design charts of PHF which might be considered for inclusion in the National Data Manual.
c. Compare designs using the existing PHF and the proposed PHF values.

### 1.4 Justification of the study

Highway Capacity Manual (2000) defines the peak hour factor as the hourly traffic volume during the maximum traffic volume hour of the day divided by the peak 15min flow rate within the peak hour. It further states that the PHF is a measure of traffic demand fluctuation within the peak hour. Traffic demands vary by time of day, hence making use of the PHF. However, PHF has an effect where the final design results could be underestimated and/or overestimated. The application of local PHF values for each land-use type to ensure consistency in traffic analysis and roadway design is recommended.

## CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Relationship between transportation and land-use

Land-use (also called development, community design, urban form, spatial planning, and urban geography) refers to how the earth's surface is used, including the location, type and design of human development (Litman, 2010a). On the other hand, transportation is the movement of people and goods from one place to another using rail, air and road. For the purpose of this study, the focus will be on road transportation.

Over the past decade, there has been a growing interest in integrating transportation and land-use planning, with the view that land-use not only influences transportation outcomes but that transportation investments also influence land-use decisions (Waddell, 2001). The reason for integrated transportation-land use models is that land-use and transportation are inter-reliant and need to be treated as such during travel-demand forecasting (Avin, 2007).

It is important to note that the manner in which we use our land (i.e., for agriculture, residential, commercial, industrial development) impacts on our transportation facilities, modes of travel (i.e., cars, buses, bicycles or walking), services and vice versa. This land-use and transportation relationship or cycle is illustrated by describing what commonly occurs when a road is built or improved. Land along the road becomes more accessible. This increased accessibility makes the land more valuable and attractive to developers. As land along the road is developed, traffic volumes and the number of driveways increase. This results in more congestion and a deterioration of the capacity of the road to efficiently move people and goods. The reduced efficiency of the road eventually necessitates roadway capacity improvements that may encourage additional development and the start of a new cycle (Strafford Regional Planning Commission, 2003).

The above concept is also supported by lacono et al. (2008) who reckon that transportation networks and the spatial patterns of land-use they serve are assumed to mutually influence each other over time. Changes to transportation networks, such
as the construction of a new link or expansion of an existing one, eventually influence the location of investment in land, which in turn influences the demand for travel to and from a particular location.

Litman (2008) stated that different land-use patterns favour different types of accessibility thereby affecting the transportation system performance. This is as a result of distribution of destinations, land-use mix, network connectivity and walking conditions. This shows that land-use is as important as mobility in a transportation system. The physical location of transportation infrastructure such as road, rail, and other types of networks, along with the level of accessibility that they provide exert a strong influence on patterns of urban settlement and activity. In turn, the location of activity, particularly new activities such as new housing and commercial development, can influence the location of additions or expansion of transportation networks (lacano and Levison, 2009).

Transportation and land-use are unavoidably connected. Everything that happens to land use has transportation implications and every transportation action affects land use (Hanson, 1995). Land use and transportation are two sides of the same coin. Decisions that affect one also affect the other. As a result, it is important to coordinate transportation and land use planning decisions so that they are complementary rather than contradictory. This ensures that transport planning decisions support land use planning objectives and land use planning decisions support transport planning objectives. This requires an understanding of how specific land use patterns affect travel (Litman, 2010b).

### 2.2 Impacts of land-use change on transportation

Changes in land-use systems can modify the travel demand patterns and induce changes in transportation systems. Transportation system evolution, on the other hand, creates new accessibility levels that encourage changes in land-use patterns (Chung and Zhao, 2004). Different types of land-use have different accessibility features. The most significant impact of transportation on land development occurs when access is provided to land. Increased access to land raises its potential for development, and more development generates additional travel. The increased
access to land provided by new or upgraded transportation facilities can either induce new development or change existing development patterns (Hanson, 1995).

Land use patterns also affect mobility and accessibility in various ways (Litman, 2008):
a. Density (number of people or jobs per unit of land area) increases the proximity of common destinations, and the number of people who use each mode, increasing demand for walking, cycling and transit.
b. Land use mix (locating different types of activities close together, such as shops and schools within or adjacent to residential neighbourhoods) reduces the amount of travel required to reach common activities.
c. Non-motorized conditions. The existence and quality of walking and cycling facilities can have a major effect on accessibility, particularly for non-drivers.
d. Network connectivity (more roads or paths that connect one geographic area with another) allows more direct travel.

The impact land-use change has on transportation patterns has been extensively researched. Choice of travel patterns can thus be informed by the land-uses in the vicinity of such transportation system. This clearly shows that land-use change has an impact on the travel pattern and traffic flow on the road system.

### 2.3 Assessment of land development effect on transportation systems

### 2.3.1 Traffic impact assessment

It was not until in the 1980s that the use of impact studies to assess the amount of traffic generated by a new development became widespread (Dunphy, 2000). Various undesirable consequences of urbanization in many cities have made planners realize that attempts to only encourage city growth by improving facility performances impose greater social costs than benefits. Hence, the need to efficiently manage the usage of existing transportation systems and to minimize the construction of new networks. As a result, many planning tools have been developed
and applied to accomplish this task, one of which is a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for land development control (Limapornwanitch et al; 2005).

A TIA is a traffic engineering study meant to determine the effect land-use change or transportation infrastructure may have on existing and future conditions. A complete analysis includes an estimation of future traffic with and without the proposed development, analysis of the traffic impacts, and recommended roadway improvements which may be necessary to accommodate the expected traffic (National Department of Transport, 1995). The existing guidelines for traffic impact study requires that all new developments generating more than 50 vehicular trips during the morning and the afternoon peak hour traffic volumes need to be accompanied by a traffic impact assessment report (City Council of Pretoria, 1998; National Department of Transportation, 1995). These TIA reports have the following intentions (Mohave County, 2007):
a. Identify present and future traffic safety and operational deficiencies without the proposed development.
b. Ascertain operational conditions on the adjacent roadway network when a proposed development is accommodated within the existing transportation infrastructure.
c. Determine whether access to/from the proposed development and generated traffic will degrade traffic safety and operational conditions in the area surrounding the site and impacted by the development.
d. Identify transportation improvements required to maintain traffic safety and operational conditions prior to build-out and occupancy of the proposed development.
e. Provide Authorities with a basis for assessing the transportation implications of approving a subdivision or land development application.
f. Provide a basis for determining a developer's "fair share" of potential transportation improvement costs required to achieve performance expectations for roadways serving site-generated traffic to/from various regional destinations or adjacent State highway facilities.

Traffic counts data is the basis of all analysis in a traffic impact assessment and careful consideration should be given to the locations, types of counts and duration of counts. Any study can only be as accurate as the data it is based on. For this reason it is important that all traffic studies make special efforts to be thorough and accurate in the collection of traffic counts (Gresham and Partners, 2002).

### 2.3.2 Level of service and capacity analysis at intersections

Capacity analysis is a set of procedures used to estimate the traffic carrying capacity of transportation facilities over a range of defined operational conditions. The procedures typically result in determination of a Level of Service (LOS). Capacity analysis is carried out in order to design a signalized intersection or to carry out an operational analysis of an existing intersection (Abidin, 2007). LOS is a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, freedom to manoeuvre, traffic interruptions, and comfort and convenience (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000).

Traffic engineers use capacity analysis and LOS to do the following (Laragan, 2003):
a. Determine the number and width of lanes needed for new facilities or for expanding existing facilities.
b. Assess service levels and operational characteristics of existing facilities that are being considered for upgrading.
c. Identify traffic and roadway changes needed for new developments.
d. Provide base values for determining changes in fuel consumption, air pollutant emissions, road-user costs, and noise associated with proposed roadway changes.

Intersections are among the most important elements of a transportation system. It must be appropriately designed to optimize operations based on traffic flow conditions, and to minimize delay for those vehicles passing through the intersection (Kyte et al; 1995). Intersection performance as measured by delay is a function of many factors including, signal timing plan, turning movement traffic demands, traffic stream composition, pedestrian volumes, intersection geometry, temporal variation in traffic demands, the headway distribution of each traffic stream, driver
characteristics, weather and road surface conditions and visibility. The impact on intersection performance of day-to-day variability of other factors such as the PHF and turning movement proportions should be examined to make informed decisions on any anticipated movement (Abdy and Hellinga, 2007).

### 2.4 Peak hour factor use in traffic analysis

The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) defines PHF as "a measure of traffic demand fluctuation within the peak hour" which can be computed by dividing the peak hourly volume by the hourly equivalent of the peak 15 -min flow rate within that peak hour. In practice, traffic engineers typically collect traffic movement volume count data in 15 minute intervals over a peak period. On the basis of these data, the peak hour is identified, the peak hour volumes are extracted, and the PHF is computed (or a default value of PHF calibrated for the local condition if used) (Abdy and Hellinga, 2007).

The relationship between the peak 15 -min flow rate and the full hourly volume is given by the PHF. Whether the design hour is measured, established from the analysis of peaking patterns, or based on modelled demand, the PHF is applied to determine design-hour flow rates. PHF in urban areas generally range between 0.80 and 0.98 . PHF over 0.95 are often indicative of high traffic volumes, sometimes with capacity constraints on flow during the peak hour (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000). The HCM further alerts the analyst to recognize that the quality of the results depends on the quality of the input data. Default values will produce less accurate results than field-measured data due to diverse traffic conditions of a specific place. Table 1 shows typical default values that can be used in the absence of local values.

Table 1: Typical default values for PHF, K, and D

| Factor | AREA |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Urban | Rural |
| PHF | 0.92 | 0.88 |
| $K$ | 0.09 | 0.10 |
| $D$ | 0.60 | 0.60 |

(Source, Highway Capacity Manual 2000)
where, $K$ is the proportion of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) occurring in the peak hour and $D$ is the proportion of peak-hour traffic in the peak direction (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000).

PHF is one of the major parameters in traffic engineering planning, design and operational analysis, either of existing freeways, expressways, and urban arterials or other forms of intersection used to address the effect of traffic flow fluctuation on the highway system (Jimoh and Yusuf, 2006). Abdul Kareem (2006) asserts that a PHF is an important traffic parameter used as measure to justify the improvement of urban streets in terms of the number of lanes speed, limit imposition and turning movements amongst others.

Highway Capacity Manual (2000) defines a default value as a representative value that may be appropriate for estimating an input parameter in the absence of local data. It further states that default values are to be used for planning applications to estimate the LOS, the volume that can be accommodated, or the number of lanes required. Dowling (1994) studied the effect of using default values rather than measured values of the peak hour factor. The study concluded that the use of local values for the peak hour factor, saturation flow rate, and signal progression factor considerably reduced the errors in the delay estimates when the traffic stream was stronger than 85 percent of capacity.

Khatib and Kyte (2000) investigated the sources of error in using default values and their impacts on LOS. The report concluded that one of the important sources of uncertainty was the input data which was propagated through to the final results. The investigation found that errors in the input parameters were responsible for significant bias in the results when they analysed intersections operated at high delays.

Perez-Cartagena and Tarko (2004) in their research concluded that PHF was sensitive to fluctuations in demand, and the PHF measured day after day at a certain intersection during the same rush period varied significantly. PHF has a significant impact on the capacity and quality of service analysis results (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 2008). The report concluded that PHF has a direct
impact on the magnitude of the input demand. After applying a PHF of 0.90 to a demand volume of $1,000 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ it increased the demand volume by over $11 \%$. Varying the PHF from 0.60 to 1.00 resulted in a significant increase in delay especially when the demand is high or near saturation as shown in Table 2 (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 2008).

Table 2: PHF Sensitivity on delay at signals

| Measures | Low Demand |  |  |  | Average Demand |  |  |  | High Demand |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 250 (Veh/approach) |  |  |  | 700 (Veh/approach) |  |  |  | 900 (Veh/approach) |  |  |  |
| PHF | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.92 | 1 |
| \% Default Change | -35 | -13 | 0 | 9 | -35 | -13 | 0 | 9 | -35 | -13 | 0 | 9 |
| Intersection delay s/Veh | 20.2 | 19.5 | 19.2 | 19.1 | 95.7 | 34.3 | 28.8 | 27.0 | 353 | 100.1 | 66.8 | 47.3 |
| LOS | C | B | B | B | F | C | C | C | F | F | E | D |
| \% Change in Results | 5 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 232 | 19 | 0 | -6 | 279 | 50 | 0 | -29 |

(Source National Cooperation Highway Research Program, 2008)

PHF can range from a low of 0.25 , indicating all of the peak hour traffic occurs during one fifteen interval, to a high of 1.00 , which indicates the peak hour traffic is spread out evenly throughout the hour (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000). Jimoh and Yusuf (2006) concluded that the average volumes obtained from volume studies show that PHF is not a function of the magnitude of the volume but of the demand variation of the facility during the peak hour. While, Perez-Cartagena and Tarko (2005) recommended that PHF should be estimated based on several days of vehicle counting to improve the precision of the average PHF estimated.

The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) specifies a methodology for estimation of average vehicular delay at intersections based on a combination of theoretical and empirical data. This methodology calls for use of a Peak Hour Factor, which extracts the peak $15-\mathrm{min}$ traffic volume from the hourly volume. The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) also advises its users that the methodologies in the Highway Capacity Manual are based on calibrated national average traffic characteristics observed over a range of facilities. Observations of these characteristics at specific locations will vary somewhat from national averages because of unique features. The Highway Capacity Manual (2000) also recommends that due to variation in data as well as prevailing conditions, local data collection should be performed to
determine saturation flow rates and lost times, which in turn can lead to more accurate computations.

### 2.5 Signalised and Un-signalised Intersection Design and Research Aid Solution

Signalised and Un-signalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA) is an intersection-based program developed by Australian Road Research Board (ARRB) Transport Research, Ltd. It is an aid for capacity, timing and performance analysis of isolated traffic intersections. SIDRA is a very powerful analytical program for signalized intersections; roundabouts; and yield controlled, two-way stop, or all-way stop-controlled intersections, with up to eight approaches (Sabra et al; 2000).

Typical areas of application are (Sabra et al; 2000):
a. SIDRA can be used to perform lane-by-lane analysis, lane flow calculations, shared lanes and lane blockage, right turn on red, capacities of short lanes, performance measures, variable cycle lengths, variable flow scale, and modelling of unequal lane utilization.
b. The variable cycle length profiles allows agencies to determine the best cycle length and phase sequence based on user-determined criteria for signal optimization. Such functions include minimizing stops and delay, queues, vehicle emissions, fuel consumption, or operating cost.
c. SIDRA has the capability to model upstream and downstream short lanes, slip lanes, shared lanes, and opposed turns with multiple green periods.
d. SIDRA is perhaps the richest Measure of Effectiveness (MOE) based intersection program. It offers MOEs such as total and average delay, degree of saturation, queues, stops, speeds, fuel consumption, emissions, and operating costs.
e. SIDRA is the only program that calculates capacity-based MOEs on a lane-by lane basis for all approaches, in addition to the total intersection MOEs.
f. SIDRA is designed for single time periods, random arrival patterns (but with provision for platoon arrivals generated by coordinated signals), and pre-timed or actuated signals.
g. For roundabout intersections, SIDRA can analyze intersections with up to eight approaches and also has provisions to assume either random or platoon arrivals (bunched vehicles) to analyze the effect of progression from nearby signalized intersections.

Due to the above strength of SIDRA, it was selected to be used in this research.

### 2.6 Inferences from the literature review

The literature review has extensively covered the concepts of Land-use and Transportation. As a broad term, transportation was simplified to bring out the issue of sensitivity and impact of the peak hour factor on the final results during capacity analysis. The following were covered by the literature:
a) Land-use change has the ability to adjust the traffic demand and distributions thereby encouraging changes in the transportation systems. Therefore, landuse and transportation planning need to be treated as a unit rather than in isolation.
b) A traffic impact assessment is widely used as a tool to propose mitigating measures to accommodate new development trips on the road network.
c) Peak hour factor is an important input parameter that influences the results during capacity and level of service analysis.
d) Local PHF values should be predicted and used to prevent bias on intersection capacity and LOS results. The results arising from such intersections may affect the obligation or the responsibility of the developer and/or the authorities to undertake mitigation measures indicated in the TIA recommendations. The question then is "what value of PHF should be used in roadway design and traffic analysis per land-use type?" The aim of this study is to answer the question and develop local default values to be used during traffic analysis.

The subsequent Chapters detail the methodology employed, data collected, details on the analysis done, discussion of results, and the conclusions arrived at and recommendations made.

## CHAPTER 3 - STUDY AREA AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Study area

The City of Tshwane (CoT) is the largest municipality in Gauteng, and is among the six biggest metropolitan municipalities in South Africa as shown in Figure 1. It covers an area of 6368 square kilometres. It is located at Coordinates: $25^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 0^{\prime \prime} S 28^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 0 " E$ - Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality. The following towns and townships form part of the Municipality's area: Pretoria, Centurion, Akasia, Soshanguve, Mabopane, Atteridgeville, Ga-Rankuwa, Winterveld, Hammanskraal, Temba, Pienaarsrivier, Crocodile River, Metsweding, Kungwini and Mamelodi. The CoT was established on $5^{\text {th }}$ December 2000 when the local authorities which had previously served the greater Pretoria and surrounding areas were integrated. In 2010, Metsweding and Kungwini municipalities were merged with the City of Tshwane.


Figure 1: Municipalities in the Gauteng Province Map
(Source: Gauteng Map 2010)

### 3.2 Data collection

In this section, it is indicated how the specific objectives were achieved. It details what data was required and how it was obtained, analysed and the tools used for the analysis.

### 3.2.1 Secondary data collection

This step involved collection of all existing traffic counts data and CoT Arc Map information. Traffic counts conducted between 2005 and 2010 and information on the zoning history of the properties where land-use change or extension of rights took place were obtained.

The data collection was accomplished by:

- Visits to the Traffic Engineering and Operations Section of CoT;
- Visits to the City Planning Department of CoT and
- Visits to ITS Engineers, EDS Engineers and Civil Concepts Engineers offices.

The data collected from CoT officials and during site visits included:

- Traffic counts data;
- Zoning certificates before and after development;
- Land-use maps and
- Current intersection operation and configuration.

The information collected was used to select intersections with traffic counts data taken before and after change in land-use or extension of development rights. The information gave a good representation on how land-use change influences the existing traffic peak hour at the intersection.

### 3.2.2 Identification of intersections

Traffic counts obtained and the CoT Arc Map were used to identify intersections. Arc Map is a geospatial processing program, and is used primarily to view, edit, create,
and analyze geospatial data. The CoT Arc Map was used to view changes in landuse at the vicinity of intersection with traffic counts data. Traffic counts conducted before 2005 were not used since the CoT Arc Map could only show aerial photos for the years 2005, 2007 and 2009.

A locality map indicating all road intersections within CoT where traffic counts were conducted was used. The locality map was obtained from the CoT traffic counting team. Land-use changes in the vicinity of such intersections were identified by conducting site inspections and using the CoT Arc Map. Choice of intersection study sites was thus informed by specific land-uses of interest that had substantial traffic information already available.

The methodology followed to select the intersections with existing traffic counts and change in land-use was based on the following criteria:

- Change in land-use next to intersections with traffic counts.
- Intersections with traffic counts taken before and after any change in land-use.

To identify the intersections, changes in land-use using the Arc Map for all traffic counts conducted in 2005 to 2008 were investigated. Intersections with traffic count data taken before and after any land-use change were selected. Traffic operations and historical information of the intersections selected were investigated. The information collected included the previous and current intersections configuration and traffic signal settings, if signalised. The following intersections that conformed to the criterion used were selected:
a. John Vorster Drive and Nellmapius Drive Intersection (Figure 2)
b. Lynnwood Road and Hans Strijdom Drive Intersection (Figure 3)
c. Zambesi Drive and Breed-Visvanger Streets Intersection (Figure 4)
d. Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road Intersection (Figure 5)
e. Atterbury Road and Manitoba-Alsatian Streets Intersection (Figure 6) and
f. Rietspruit Road and Yen Street Intersection (Figure 7)


Figure 2: John Vorster Drive and Nellmapius Drive Intersection Map


Figure 3: Lynnwood Road and Hans Strijdom Drive Intersection Map


Figure 4: Zambesi Drive and Breed / Visvanger Street Intersection Map


Figure 5: Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road Intersection Map


Figure 6: Atterbury Road and Manitoba / Alsatian Street Intersection Map


Figure 7: Rietspruit Road and Yen Street Intersection Map

Traffic counts data obtained were captured on an already prepared excel spreadsheet. Appendix A shows an example of the spreadsheet used. The purpose of the spreadsheet was to automatically calculate the peak hourly traffic volume, the peak 15-min traffic volume thereby producing the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) at each intersection. The directional splits at each intersection approach were calculated to indicate inbound and outbound stream traffic distinction. Equation 1 obtained from the Highway Capacity Manual (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000) was used to calculate the traffic PHF. This is the only formula used to calculate the traffic PHF as prescribed in various traffic engineering manuals.

$$
\begin{equation*}
P H F=\frac{V}{4 V_{15}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where:
PHF = Peak Hour Factor
V = Hourly traffic volume (Veh/h)
$\mathrm{V}_{15}=$ Traffic Volume during the peak 15 minute of the peak hour (Veh/15min)

The results obtained were used to signify the impact land-use change and/or expansion of land development had on the existing PHF at the intersection. The results were also used as a guide in selecting appropriate intersections to predict PHF for each land-use type. These implications are discussed in Chapter 4.

### 3.2.3 Land-uses and intersections to compute PHF

Land-uses that were constantly established and having an impact on the day-to-day traffic operations on the road network were identified. This was done in consultation with the City of Tshwane city planning department and traffic engineering firms operating within the city. The land-uses identified were as shown in Table 3. Table 3 also shows the intersections selected at different locations closer to such land-uses. Maps of intersections selected are shown in Appendix B. Results obtained from the methodology in sub-section 3.2 .2 were used as a guide to select the intersections. A minimum of three intersections per land-use type were used to determine PHF variation and traffic manoeuvre at different locations and to eliminate individual bias.

Table 3: Intersections per land-use type

| Land-use | Intersections | Area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | Church Street and Strachan/Rod Street | Lotus Garden |
|  | Zambesi Drive and Zambesi Estate Street | Montana |
|  | Brits Road and Doreen Avenue | Amandasig |
|  | Hebron Road and Umphafa Street | Soshanguve |
|  | Cura Avenue and Stellenberg Road | Willowglen |
|  | Stonewall Boulevard and Old Farm Road | Faerie Glen |
|  | Old Farm Road and Hans Strijdom Drive | Faerie Glen |
|  | Witch Hazel Avenue and Eco Park Boulevard | Highveld |
|  | John Vorster Drive and Karee Street | Irene |
| Office | Meiring Naude and Quitin Brand Street | Persequorpark |
|  | Meiring Naude Street and CSIR Entrance | Lynnwood Manor |
|  | Soutpansberg Road and Foreign Affairs Access | Rietondale |
|  | Meiring Naude and Hotel Street | Persequor |
|  | Witch Hazel Avenue and Eco-park Boulevard | Highveld |
|  | Matroosberg Street and River Walk Park Access | Ashlea Gardens |
| Industrial | Waltoo Road and Kuit Street | Waltloo |
|  | Pretoria Street and Fakkel Street | Silverton |
|  | Ernest Opperheimer and R566 | Rosslyn |
|  | Dykor Street and Moreleta Street | Silverton |
|  | Voortrekker Road (R55) and Ellman Street | Sunderland Ridge |
| Institutional: <br> Schools | Boeing Street and Hans Strijdom Road | Erasmuskloof |
|  | Soutpansberg Road and Wren Street | Hillcrest |
|  | Daan de Wet Nel Drive and Rene Road | Winternest |
|  | Anthesis Street and Cyme Crescent | Lotus Garden |
| Retail | Garstfontein Road and Philadelphia Avenue | Pretoriuspark |
|  | De Villebois Mareuil Drive and Woodlake Boulevard | Pretoriuspark |
|  | Heinrich Drive and Madelief Avenue | Karenpark |
|  | Maphalla Drive and J Letwaba Street | Mamelodi |
| Medical: <br> Hospital | Church Street and Kalafong | Atteridgeville |
|  | Simon Vermooten and Lynnwood Drive | Die Wilgers |
|  | Cliffton Avenue and Cantonment Road | Lyttelton Manor |
|  | Voortrekker Road and Malan Street | Capital Park |
| Places of <br> Public <br> Worship | De Villebois Mareuil Drive and Feverwood Road | Moreletapark |
|  | Genl. Louis Botha Drive and Hatfield Christian Church Access | Waterkloof Glen |
|  | Nellmapius Drive and Jan Smuts Avenue | Doornkloof |

The availability of traffic counts data at the selected intersection was investigated. Where there were no traffic counts data readily available, field data collection was conducted. Manual traffic count method was used during data collection. This was because manual counts collect specific information that cannot be efficiently obtained through automated means. Tally sheets were used to record the traffic volumes. Traffic Observers recorded data with ticks on a pre-prepared form from 06 H 00 during the AM Peak period to 18 H 00 during the PM Peak period.

An investigation was conducted prior to collecting traffic data to allow for the determination of a typical range of peak hour traffic movements on a roadway facility. A count interval of $15-\mathrm{min}$ in an hour was used to obtain the traffic volumes. This was because of the PHF equation, as shown in equation 1, which uses the 15-min interval to calculate the PHF. The following steps for manual traffic volume counting were followed (Gresham and Partners, 2002):
a. Preparation: determined the type of equipment to use, the field procedures to follow, and the number of observers required. Labelled and organized tally sheets. Each sheet included information about the location, time and date of observation, and weather conditions.
b. Selected observer location(s). Data collectors positioned where they have a clear view of traffic and were safely away from the edge of the roadway.
c. Labelled data forms and recorded observations on site. The observers recorded the location, time and date of observation, and weather conditions. Data collectors recorded the traffic volume passing an intersection approach for each hour at 15 minutes intervals.

Traffic counts data obtained were captured into an excel spreadsheet mentioned in sub-section 3.2.2. The results for each land-use type produced were presented in Chapter 5 using tables. The results presented were only at intersection approaches able to relate a PHF to a particular land-use type. The results obtained were further analysed and summarized using the STATA data analysis and statistical software where the PHF per land-use type was determined, thus meeting the first specific objective.

Specific parameters associated with each land-use type in relation to the produced PHF were identified from the summarized results. The specific parameters included the peak hours, peak periods, days of the week and the traffic directional splits. These specific parameters could be a guide during traffic analysis for each land-use when employing the produced PHF. A design chart in the form of a table showing the PHF for each land-use type with the appropriate specific parameters was developed, thus meeting the second specific objective.

One intersection for each land-use was used to analyse the capacity and Level of Service (LOS) using the SIDRA intersection software. The computed PHF values for each land-use and the HCM default values of the PHF were separately used to compare the intersections measure of effectiveness. The comparison was performed to show the differences in traffic flow rate, intersection delays, degree of saturation and the LOS, thus meeting the third specific objective.

The implications of the results obtained and how the overall objective of the study was met are as discussed in Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER 4 - INTERSECTION DATA ANALYSIS DUE TO LAND-USE CHANGE

### 4.1 Selection of intersection for the study

Traffic data collected and the CoT Arc Map were used to select the appropriate intersections for the study. This information was used to identify the intersection with traffic counts conducted before and after land development took place in the vicinity. Six intersections were selected for analysis. Traffic data from the identified intersections was used to indicate the impact new developments could have on the existing traffic operating conditions at the intersection as well as assisting in selecting appropriate locations to predict the PHF. The following intersections were identified:
a. John Vorster Drive and Nellmapius Drive Intersection
b. Lynnwood Road and Hans Strijdom Drive Intersection
c. Zambesi Drive and Breed-Visvanger Streets Intersection
d. Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road Intersection
e. Atterbury Road and Manitoba-Alsatian Streets Intersection and
f. Rietspruit Road and Yen Street Intersection

The aerial photos and geometric layout of each intersection selected showed the following results:

## a. Nellmapius John Vorster Drive Intersection

This intersection is situated in the Southern Region of Tshwane in Centurion. The pictures in Figures 8 show the development growth in the area between 2005 and 2009. The data collected from the CoT City Planning Department was used to indicate the zoning rights before and after development. The properties were zoned as retail, offices and residential before and after development.


Figures 9 and 10 show the intersection geometric layout before and after it was upgraded. The intersection was upgraded to provide access to school, offices, retail and residential developments that took place south east of the intersection.


Figure 9: Nellmapius Drive and John Vorster Drive Intersection Configuration before upgrading


Figure 10: Nellmapius Drive and John Vorster Drive Intersection Configuration after Upgrading

The traffic counts at the intersection were conducted on the $28^{\text {th }}$ May 2007 and $21^{\text {st }}$ April 2010 when it was entirely upgraded. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.
b. Lynnwood Road and Hans Strijdom Drive Intersection

This intersection is situated in the Eastern Region of CoT in Willow Glen. Figure 11 shows the growth in development in the vicinity of the intersection between 2005 and 2009. The zoning rights obtained from the CoT City Planning Department indicated that new developments in the area were for motor dealership, service centre, residential and retail.


Figure 12 show the intersection geometric layout affected by development in the area. No road improvement took place at the intersection since 2005 although traffic signal settings were done to accommodate new development trips.


Figure 12: Lynnwood Drive and Hans Strijdom Drive Intersection Configuration Traffic counts at the intersection were conducted on the $15^{\text {th }}$ June 2006, $15^{\text {th }}$ April 2008 and $29^{\text {th }}$ April 2010. Motor dealership, service centre, residential and retail developments took place at the eastern side of the intersection over time hence it was selected. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.

## c. Zambesi and Breed / Visvanger Street Intersection

This intersection is situated in the North Eastern Region of CoT in Montana. Figure 13 shows the development growth in the vicinity of the intersection. The information obtained from the CoT City Planning Department indicated that the nearby properties were zoned for shops, business buildings, showrooms, warehouses, motor dealerships, place of refreshment including take-away restaurants and garden centres.


Figures 14 and 15 show the intersection geometric layout before and after it was upgraded. It is the first four-legged intersection from the N1 highway along Zambesi Drive. The intersection is signalised and carries high traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak periods.


Figure 14: Zambesi Drive and Visvanger / Breed Street Intersection Configuration before Upgrading


Figure 15: Zambesi Drive and Visvanger / Breed Street Intersection Configuration after Upgrading

Traffic counts at the intersection were conducted on $30^{\text {th }}$ May 2005 and $17^{\text {th }}$ November 2008. Due to new developments in the vicinity the intersection was
upgraded to accommodate the traffic volumes. The intersection was selected on the basis of it being affected by new developments in the area. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.

## d. Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road Intersection

This intersection is situated in the Eastern Region of CoT in Die Wilgers. Figure 16 shows the development growth next to the intersection. The properties in the vicinity of the intersection had retail and motor dealership buildings rights before and after development.


Figures 17 and 18 show the intersection geometric layout before and after development took place. The intersection was upgraded as part of the development proposal and it was completed before the development could open. The intersection
carries high traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak periods. It is a link between the Tshwane Central Business District (CBD) and the eastern suburban area of the City.


Figure 17: Simon Vermooten Configuration before Upgrading


Figure 18: Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road Intersection Configuration after Upgrading

Traffic counts at the intersection were conducted on $19^{\text {th }}$ May 2005, $06^{\text {th }}$ March 2006 and $13^{\text {th }}$ October 2010. The counts were conducted before and after the intersection
was upgraded, hence it was selected for analysis. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.

## e. Atterbury Road and Manitoba / Alsatian Street Intersection

This intersection in situated in the Eastern Region of CoT in Faerie Glen. Figure 19 shows development growth at the north western side of the intersection. Data collected from the CoT City Planning Department indicated that the property had development right for a filling station, shops, offices and place of refreshment.


Figures 20 and 21 show the intersection geometric layout before and after it was upgraded. The intersection carries high traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak periods. It is surrounded by mix land-use developments. The upgrading at the intersection took place as a result of the new development north west of the intersection.


Figure 20: Atterbury Road and Manitoba / Alsatian Street Intersection Configuration before Upgrading


Figure 21: Atterbury Road and Manitoba / Alsatian Street Intersection Configuration after Upgrading

Traffic counts at the intersection were conducted on $3^{\text {rd }}$ May 2005 and $12^{\text {th }}$ June 2008. The intersection was selected as it had change in land-use before and after
traffic counts were conducted. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.

## f. Rietspruit Road and Yen Street Intersection

This intersection is situated in the Southern Region of CoT in Kosmosdal. Figure 22 shows the development growth in the area. The data collected from the CoT City Planning Department indicated that the properties east of the intersection had development rights for offices and light industrials.


Figure 23 shows the intersection geometric layout and no upgrading took place as part of development expansion. The intersection is three-way stop controlled with priority on north-east and south-west movements. With growth in development rights,
the traffic from south-east of the intersection find it difficult to access and exit the main stream due to high traffic volume during the AM peak and PM peak periods.


Figure 23: Rietspruit Street and Yen Street Intersection Configuration

Traffic counts were conducted on $10^{\text {th }}$ March 2005, $19^{\text {th }}$ April 2007 and $18^{\text {th }}$ January 2011. Due to development expansion over time and an increase in traffic volumes, the intersection was selected. The traffic counts results are presented and discussed in sub-section 4.2.

### 4.2 Traffic data analysis obtained before and after land-use change

The main source of information for this research was traffic counts data. Any traffic study requires accurate traffic counts. Determining how many vehicles may use a section of road or an intersection is necessary for analysing and timing traffic signals, determining capacity and estimating the LOS that will be needed. Traffic counts data from the six (6) selected intersections were captured into a Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet as shown in Appendix A. The purpose of the spreadsheet was to calculate the peak hourly traffic volume, the peak $15-\mathrm{min}$ volume and the PHF. It was also important to indicate the peak hours where the peak hourly traffic volumes were likely to occur. Equation 2, similar to equation 1 in sub-section 3.2.2, obtained from
the Highway Capacity Manual (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000) was used to calculate the traffic PHF.

$$
\begin{equation*}
P H F=\frac{V}{4 V_{15}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where:
PHF = Peak Hour Factor
$\mathrm{V}=$ Hourly traffic volume (Veh/h)
$\mathrm{V}_{15}=$ Traffic Volume during the peak 15 minute of the peak hour (Veh/15min)

The ratio of hourly traffic volume divided by maximum rate of flow, PHF, was used to capture the stability of traffic volume distribution in an hour. In broad-spectrum, PHF was used to display the evenness of peak-hourly flow in 15-min intervals. Small values of the PHF show that the incoming traffic flow during a peak hour is not evenly distributed. Values of PHF close to 1.0 indicate that the incoming traffic flow is evenly distributed. The peak hour traffic volume, the 15 -min peak traffic volume, the PHF and the peak hours at each intersection were determined. Only the affected approaches results are presented because other intersection approaches indicated results that could not be related to any land-use in the surrounding area.

Two intersections with two different scenarios were analysed. Scenario 1 represents land-uses that gained access from one intersection whereas scenario 2 represents the land-uses that gained access from two or more intersections on the road network.

## a. Scenario 1

Scenario 1 represents the land-uses that gained access from one intersection in the surrounding area. Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection as shown in Figure 24 was used to discuss scenario 1. Similar behavioural patterns at other selected intersections were noted. The intersections included Rietspruit Road and Yen Street, and Hans Strijdom Drive and Lynnwood Road intersections. The intersection was upgraded from a three legged to a four legged signalised intersection as a result of new development trips from the eastern side of the
intersection (Figure 9 and 10). Nellmapius Drive serves as a link road whereas John Vorster Drive from north-west of the intersection is where mix land-use developments and the Centurion Central Business District (CBD) are. Land-uses found on the eastern side of the intersection were residential, school, offices and retail development.


Figure 24: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Turning Movements
where:
RT = Right Turning movement
ST $=$ Straight Through movement
LT = Left Turning movement

Traffic movement 10-LT, 11-ST and 12-RT represented the outbound stream while traffic movement 3-RT, 5-ST and 7-LT represented the inbound stream at the affected intersection approach. Table 4 shows the results for the traffic count data conducted in 2007 and 2010 at the affected South Eastern approach of the intersection.

The outbound stream peak hour traffic volume increased from 126 Veh/h in 2007 to $553 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ in 2010 during the AM peak period and from 377 Veh/h in 2007 to 486 Veh/h in 2010 during the PM peak period. The increase in traffic volumes was as a result of new developments from the east of the intersection. While there was an
increase on the peak hour traffic volumes the PHF decreased. It decreased from 0.81 to 0.61 and 0.87 to 0.81 during the AM and PM peak, respectively. It was also noted that there was change in the peak hour during the AM and PM peak periods. It changed from 08:00 - 09:00 to 07:15-08:15 and 16:45-17:45 to 15:30-16:30 during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.

The inbound stream peak hour traffic volume increased from 108 to 598 Veh/h during the AM peak period and from 196 to $414 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ during the PM peak period for 2007 and 2010, respectively. The major increase in traffic volumes was as a result of the school, offices and the retail development. A slight increase on the PHF was experienced during the AM and PM peak periods. This implies that there was an improvement in the evenness of the peak hour traffic volumes distribution. The peak hour changed from 07:45-08:45 to 07:00 - 08:00 and from 16:00-17:00 to 15:45 - 16:45 during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.

Table 4: Nellmapius Drive and John Vorster Drive Intersection Results for the affected Approach

| Peak Period |  |  | AM Peak | Morning | Midday | Afternoon | PM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour |  |  | 06:00 to 09:00 | 09:00 to 12:00 | 12:00 to 14:00 | 14:00 to 15:30 | 15:30 to 18:00 |
|  | Outbound traffic flow | PHV | 126 | 194 | 291 | 260 | 377 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 39 | 60 | 84 | 77 | 108 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.87 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 08:00 to 09:00 | 10:45 to 11:45 | 12:30 to 13:30 | 14:30 to 15:30 | 16:45 to 17:45 |
|  | Inbound traffic flow | PHV | 108 | 145 | 165 | 165 | 196 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 33 | 48 | 47 | 53 | 58 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.82 | 0.76 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.84 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 07:45 to 08:45 | 10:45 to 11:45 | 12:15 to 13:15 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 |
|  | Inbound Split (\%) | PHV | 46 | 43 | 36 | 39 | 34 |
|  | Outbound traffic flow | PHV | 553 | 386 | 494 | 532 | 486 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 228 | 116 | 130 | 181 | 150 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.73 | 0.81 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 07:15 to 08:15 | 11:00 to 12:00 | 12:30 to 13:30 | 14:15 to 15:15 | 15:30 to 16:30 |
|  | Inbound traffic flow | PHV | 598 | 348 | 449 | 399 | 414 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 170 | 100 | 139 | 113 | 118 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 07:00 to 08:00 | 11:00 to 12:00 | 12:45 to 13:45 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 |
|  | Inbound Split (\%) | PHV | 52 | 47 | 48 | 43 | 46 |

Figures 25 and 26 show the variation in peak hourly traffic volumes for inbound and outbound traffic streams during the peak periods. It shows that there was an increase of over $50 \%$ for the inbound traffic stream. The two Figures show that there
was an increase in peak hour traffic volumes from 2007 to 2010 due to new land development trips. This implies that a change in land-use and extension of development can negatively affect and change the existing traffic conditions at an intersection.


Figure 25: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Inbound Traffic PHV


Figure 26: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Outbound Traffic PHV

Figures 27 and 28 show the PHF variation for inbound and outbound traffic stream during the peak periods at the affected approach. The variation was as a result of additional traffic volumes generated and attracted by new developments. The inbound stream indicated uniformity in traffic flow distribution during the critical peak periods (the AM and PM peak). The outbound traffic stream during the AM peak had a major drop of the PHF (from 0.81 to 0.61 ) and PHF values of more than 0.80 during the PM peak period. The drop on the AM peak PHF can be attributed to more traffic volume that is concentrated during a single 15-min peak with less traffic
volumes during the other three 15-min during a peak hour. The PM peak stability can be attributed to traffic volumes distributed evenly during an hour. The following factors might contribute to the stability of the PHF at an intersection:
a) A proportion of the previously expected vehicular trips from the affected approach were absorbed by working opportunities created by the new developments;
b) Bulk of the trips could be concentrated to a specific 15 minute peak during the peak hour;
c) The operational times of different land-use types;
d) An accident in the vicinity of the intersection and
e) Road maintenance in the vicinity


Figure 27: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Inbound PHF


Figure 28: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Outbound PHF

Figure 29 shows the directional split at the affected approach for 2007 and 2010. The inbound traffic stream experienced an increase in traffic volumes after completion of land development. The percentage split between the inbound and the outbound traffic stream for both 2007 and 2010 indicates that the outbound stream carried more traffic volumes. However, there was an increase at the inbound stream during year 2010 due to land-uses that could attract traffic from the east of the intersection. The land-use types included a school, offices and a retail complex.


Figure 29: Nellmapius and John Vorster Drive Intersection Traffic Split

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that:
a) Developments with its major traffic volumes subjected to one intersection approach for access indicated substantial increases in peak hour traffic volumes.
b) The stability of the PHF was minimally affected due to land-use change and growth in land development focused at a single intersection approach. Mix land-uses also contributed to the slight instability of the PHF. Different landuses had different peak periods which influenced the traffic flow distribution at the affected approach. The variability depended on the traffic flow distribution encouraged by a particular land-use type after land-use change.
c) An increase in traffic volumes at both the inbound and outbound approach streams during the different peak periods as a result of land-use change and growth in land development was experienced. The directional split difference at the affected approach was influenced by the type of land-use.

## b. Scenario 2

Scenario 1 as discussed in sub-section 4.2(a) represented intersections that gain access from one intersection whereas scenario 2 represents the intersections where access to a development could be gained from two or more intersections on the road network. Zambesi and Breed-Visvanger Street Intersection was used to discuss scenario 2 as shown in Figure 30. Similar behavioural patterns at other selected intersections were noted. They included Atterbury Drive and Manitoba-Alsatian Street, and Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road intersections.

Zambesi Drive is an east-west major arterial class 3 route that links Lavender Drive from the west with N1 national route in the east. The road carries high traffic volumes during the peak periods. Breed and Visvanger Streets are class 4 routes providing access to mixed land-use developments in the north and south of the intersection. The intersection was upgraded to accommodate additional development trips (Figure14 and 15).


Figure 30: Zambesi Drive and Visvanger / Breed Street Intersection Turning Movements
where:
RT = Right Turning movement
ST = Straight Through movement
LT = Left Turning movement

The North approach was represented by traffic movement 2-ST, 4LT and 12RT for the inbound stream and 7-LT, 8-ST and 9-RT for the inbound stream. Traffic counts at the intersection were conducted in years 2005 and 2008.

Table 5 shows the results obtained at the affected North approach of the intersection. New developments north of the intersection consisted of motor dealerships, retail centre and residential developments. Due to the nature of these developments, traffic flow distribution was affected because of different peak periods associated with each development. The outbound stream during the AM peak period experienced a decrease in peak hour traffic volume from 553 to 482 Veh/h while the PM peak period increased from 516 to $798 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$.

A similar pattern was also experienced on the PHF during the critical peak periods, AM and PM peak periods. The AM peak period had a decrease from 0.91 to 0.79 while the PM peak period had an increase from 0.89 to 0.98 of PHF. This could also be attributed to the types of land-uses north of the intersection. The directional split at the approach showed that outbound stream carried high traffic volumes.

The inbound stream experienced minimal increase in traffic volumes during the AM and PM peak periods. This was due to traffic diverting to other nearby streets to access the new developments avoiding the already congested main road, Zambesi Drive. The AM and PM peak periods increased from 305 to $311 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ and from 475 to $535 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$, respectively.

Major variations on PHF due to traffic diversion at the inbound stream were experienced. PHF varied from 0.87 to 0.80 and from 0.85 to 0.94 during the AM and PM peak periods. This meant that the AM peak traffic flow was not evenly distributed whereas the PM peak traffic flow was evenly distributed during the peak hour.

Table 5: Zambesi Drive and Visvanger-Breed Street Intersection Results for the Affected Approach

| Peak Period |  |  | AM Peak | Morning | Midday | Afternoon | PM Peak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour |  |  | 06:00 to 09:00 | 09:00 to 12:00 | 12:00 to 14:00 | 14:00 to 15:30 | 15:30 to 18:00 |
|  | Outbound traffic flow | PHV | 553 | 286 | 229 | 329 | 516 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 152 | 77 | 65 | 92 | 145 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.91 | 0.93 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 06:30 to 07:30 | 09:30 to 10:30 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 14:30 to 15:30 | 16:15 to 17:15 |
|  | Inbound traffic flow | PHV | 305 | 247 | 255 | 293 | 475 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 88 | 65 | 74 | 81 | 139 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.87 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 0.85 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 07:30 to 08:30 | 09:45 to 10:45 | 12:30 to 13:30 | 14:30 to 15:30 | 16:30 to 17:30 |
|  | Inbound Split (\%) | PHV | 36 | 46 | 53 | 47 | 48 |
|  | Outbound traffic flow | PHV | 482 | 498 | 590 | 612 | 798 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 153 | 146 | 177 | 184 | 204 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.98 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 08:00 to 09:00 | 10:15 to 11:15 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 14:15 to 15:15 | 16:30 to 17:30 |
|  | Inbound traffic flow | PHV | 311 | 331 | 423 | 425 | 535 |
|  |  | 15-Min Vol. | 97 | 99 | 133 | 112 | 142 |
|  |  | PHF | 0.80 | 0.84 | 0.80 | 0.95 | 0.94 |
|  |  | Peak Hour | 07:15 to 08:15 | 11:00 to 12:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 14:30 to 15:30 | 15:30 to 16:30 |
|  | Inbound Split (\%) | PHV | 39 | 40 | 42 | 41 | 40 |

As discussed, traffic growth was extensively experienced during the PM peak periods at the outbound stream as shown in Figures 31. This can be attributed to retail developments which generate high traffic volumes during the PM peak periods.


Figure 31: Outbound Zambesi Drive and Visvanger-Breed Street Intersection PHV per Peak Period.

The inbound stream experienced minimal growth in traffic volume as shown in Figure 31. The traffic growth due to new development could be diverted to nearby intersection avoiding the congested main road.


Figure 32: Inbound Zambesi Drive and Visvanger-Breed Street Intersection PHV per Peak Period

Figures 32 and 33 show the PHF variability at the affected approach. Variations on the PHF were experienced during the critical peak periods, AM and PM peak periods. The inbound stream experienced major variations on PHF due to traffic diversion from the main road, Zambesi Drive. This showed that sufficient accessibility to any land-use type could affect the traffic patterns at an intersection thus influencing the PHF stability.


Figure 33: Outbound Zambesi Drive and Visvanger-Breed Street Intersection PHF per Peak Period


Figure 34: Inbound Zambesi Drive and Visvanger-Breed Street Intersection PHF per Peak Period

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that:
a) Developments that gained access from other intersections in the vicinity showed minimal growth on the peak hour traffic volumes. Development trips could be diverted to other intersections closer to the development avoiding the congested intersection along major routes like the Zambesi Drive.
b) The PHF indicated major variations due to diverted traffic volumes to other street in the vicinity for access to developments. This can be attributed to the remaining traffic volumes being focused to a particular 15-min peak within a peak hour. Road improvements could also contribute where traffic volumes clear quickly due to sufficient capacity at an intersection.

As demonstrated, land-use change could affect the existing PHF at an intersection as well as the traffic flow. The PHF variation differs from intersection to intersection and from day to day as a result of the land-uses in the vicinity and traffic conditions on the road system. The variability of the PHF shows the importance of producing local default values that could be used during traffic analysis for a particular land-use type. To assist in selecting the appropriate locations to predict such default values, an intersection approach which is the main access to a land-use should be used. Chapter 5 aims at predicting PHF relating to a specific land-use type.

## CHAPTER 5 - COMPUTATION OF PHF AT SELECTED LAND-USES

### 5.1 Traffic data analysis to predict PHF per land-use

Land-uses that were frequently established and those having an impact on the day-to-day traffic operations on the road network were identified. The land-uses identified for analyses were residential; offices; industrial; institutional: schools; retail; medical: hospitals and places of worship. For each land-use, intersections located in the vicinity or located in such a way that they were able to clearly produce realistic PHF values were used. The traffic data from intersection approaches to and from the land-uses were used to predict the appropriate PHF values. Where traffic counts data were not readily available, new traffic counts were conducted.

The overall results for each land-use obtained from the spreadsheet prepared for this purpose were tabulated. The STATA data analysis and statistics software was used to further analyse the tabulated results where tables and figures were produced to assist with the final analysis. An example of the results produced by the STATA data analysis and statistics software is shown in Appendix C. Design chart in a table format showing the produced PHF values for each land-use type was developed. The design chart also indicated the most critical peak hours to be considered during traffic analysis. The results as obtained from each land-use consisted of residential, office, industrial, institutional, retail and medical types.

## a. Residential developments

Table 6 shows the results of the intersections selected to predict the PHF for residential developments. Nine intersections were identified and selected for analysis. The critical AM and PM peak periods traffic volumes were used to predict the possible PHF value to be associated with residential developments. Traffic counts at residential developments with different livelihood standards were obtained. Different livelihood standards come as a result of the different types of residential developments. These types could include single dwelling, apartments and flats, simplexes and duplexes, multi-level townhouses and retirement villages.

Table 6: Selected Intersections Results Representing Residential Developments

| Residential |  | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | $\begin{aligned} & 15-\mathrm{min} \\ & \mathrm{PV} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | PHF | Inbound Split (\%) |
| Church Street and Strachan Street | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:30 to 07:30 | 1846 | 475 | 0.97 | 18 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:45 to 17:45 | 904 | 242 | 0.93 | 63 |
| Zambesi Drive and Zambesi Estate Street | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 350 | 98 | 0.89 | 40 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 332 | 94 | 0.88 | 53 |
| Brits Road and Doreen Avenue | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:30 to 07:30 | 266 | 78 | 0.85 | 38 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 | 267 | 74 | 0.90 | 57 |
| Hebron Road and Umphafa Street | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:00 to 07:00 | 719 | 210 | 0.86 | 36 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 765 | 210 | 0.91 | 63 |
|  | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:00 to 07:00 | 283 | 108 | 0.66 | 35 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 176 | 55 | 0.80 | 68 |
| Cura Avenue and Stellenberg Road | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 252 | 84 | 0.75 | 15 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:30 to 17:30 | 168 | 49 | 0.86 | 71 |
| Stonewall <br> Boulevard and <br> Old Farm Road | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 447 | 129 | 0.87 | 21 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:45 to 17:45 | 584 | 177 | 0.83 | 69 |
| Old Farm Road and Hans Strijdom Drive | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 1531 | 435 | 0.88 | 29 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 1561 | 423 | 0.92 | 52 |
| Witch Hazel Avenue and Eco-park Boulevard | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 402 | 113 | 0.89 | 12 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 17:00 to 18:00 | 445 | 138 | 0.81 | 62 |
| John Vorster and Karee Street | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07;00 to 08:00 | 218 | 63 | 0.86 | 24 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:45 to 17:45 | 208 | 65 | 0.80 | 60 |

On the basis of the data in Table 6, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the $15-\mathrm{min}$ traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 7. From the twenty observations, a low PHF standard deviation of 0.069 was found. This implies that the values obtained are very close to the average PHF of 0.86 . A low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be very close to the average, whereas high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread out over a large range of values. The PHF ranged between 0.66 and 0.97 during both the AM and PM peak periods. As a result, it shows that at any given time while conducting traffic counts, any value of the PHF within the range indicated could be obtained and be used in traffic analysis. Any PHF value used in traffic analysis could have an impact on the final results. Different conditions on the road network in a particular day could affect the intersection operation, thereby producing unrealistic
results. The defaults values, 0.92 and 0.95 , normally used in traffic analysis fall within the ranged obtained.

The minimum and the maximum Peak Hour Traffic Volume were found to be 168 and $1846 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$, respectively. The average of $584 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ showed that residential developments carried high traffic volumes during the peak periods. With such a huge difference between the minimum and the maximum peak hour volumes, any PHF could be produced.

Table 7: Summary of Residential Development Results

| Variable | Min PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 168 | 1846 | 584 | 503 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 49 | 475 | 166 | 132 |
| PHF | 0.66 | 0.97 | 0.86 | 0.069 |

The spread of PHF in relation to the peak hour traffic volume and the peak 15-min traffic volume obtained in Table 6 was illustrated as shown in Figure 35. It showed that the PHF ranged more between 0.80 and 1.00 . This meant that residential development could generate evenly distributed traffic during the peak periods. However, different values could be obtained at any given day thus affecting the final design results of an intersection. Therefore, a default value to represent residential developments was required.


Figure 35: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Residential Developments

The PHF obtained in Table 6 was summarized further as shown in Figure 36 to illustrate the PHF variation during the AM and PM peak periods. Minimal variations between the different peak periods were experienced. This can be attributed to the same activity of residing found at residential developments. However, with the range obtained, a single PHF value must be determined for traffic analysis purposes. Consistency and fairness could be improved during traffic analysis for design purposes.


Figure 36: Residential AM and PM peak PHF Variation
The inbound directional split obtained in Table 6 was further summarized as shown in Figure 37. It shows the approach inbound directional split with the outbound stream during the AM and PM peak periods. The AM peak directional split indicates that fewer vehicles were entering the developments. As can be expected during the AM peak, higher traffic volumes will exit any residential development to different personal and business activities.


Figure 37: Residential AM and PM peak Traffic Split

Table 8 shows the PHF frequency from the twenty PHF values obtained in Table 6. It shows the frequency of the PHF obtained during the AM and PM peak periods. The results showed that the rate of occurrence of PHF was found to be at 0.86 . This value was also equal to the average PHF value of 0.86 obtained. It was therefore concluded that the PHF of 0.86 must be considered during traffic analysis at residential developments.

## Table 8: PHF Frequency at Residential Development

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.66 | 1 |
| 0.75 | 1 |
| 0.80 | 2 |
| 0.81 | 1 |
| 0.83 | 1 |
| 0.85 | 1 |
| 0.86 | 3 |
| 0.87 | 1 |
| 0.88 | 2 |
| 0.89 | 2 |
| 0.90 | 1 |
| 0.91 | 1 |
| 0.92 | 1 |
| 0.93 | 1 |
| 0.97 | 1 |
| Total | 20 |

Table 9 shows the frequency of the peak hours and the PHF obtained during such peak hours computed in Table 6. The PHF and the inbound directional traffic split found were also indicated at the critical peak hours. The busiest peak hour during the AM and PM peak periods were found to be 07:00 to 08:00 and 16:45 to 17:45, respectively. Therefore, it is important that during traffic analysis the critical peak hours during the AM and PM peak periods indicated need to be considered. The closest directional split obtained was $70 \%$ and $30 \%$ at the inbound and outbound stream during the AM peak period.

Table 9: Residential Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  |  |  |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $06: 00$ to $07: 00$ | 2 | 0.66 | 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 15$ to $07: 15$ | 2 | 0.80 | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 30$ to $07: 30$ | 2 | 0.85 | 0.97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 45$ to $07: 45$ | 2 | 0.75 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07: 00$ to $08: 00$ | 4 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 12 | 21 | 24 | 29 |
| $15: 45$ to $16: 45$ | 1 | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 2 | 0.88 | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 30$ to $17: 30$ | 1 | 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 3 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.93 |  | 60 | 63 | 69 |  |
| $17: 00$ to $18: 00$ | 1 | 0.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## b. Office Developments

Office developments could be categorized as offices; home offices and undertakings; medical consulting rooms; research centres; conference centres. Table 10 shows the six (6) intersections that were selected to predict the PHF that could be used during traffic analysis for office developments. The critical AM and PM peak periods traffic volumes were used to predict the possible PHF value.

Table 10: Selected Intersections Results Representing Office Developments

| Offices |  |  | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach | Peak Period | Peak Hour | PHV | $15-\mathrm{min}$ PV | PHF | Inbound Split (\%) |
| Meiring Naude Drive and Quitin Brand Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:15 to 08:15 | 702 | 198 | 0.89 | 88 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 620 | 179 | 0.86 | 23 |
| Witch Hazel Avenue and Eco-park Boulevard | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:15 to 08:15 | 473 | 129 | 0.92 | 55 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 503 | 149 | 0.84 | 39 |
| Meiring Naude Drive and CSIR Access | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:45 to 08:45 | 732 | 201 | 0.91 | 84 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17 :00 | 572 | 159 | 0.90 | 21 |
| Matroosberg Street and River Walk | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:30 to 08:30 | 428 | 114 | 0.94 | 93 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 425 | 126 | 0.84 | 2 |
| Soutpansberg Road and OR Tambo Offices | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:30 to 08:30 | 495 | 163 | 0.76 | 82 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 565 | 164 | 0.86 | 7 |
| Meiring Naude Drive and Hotel Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:30 to 08:30 | 550 | 166 | 0.83 | 70 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 474 | 133 | 0.89 | 21 |
|  | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:45 to 08:45 | 561 | 201 | 0.70 | 82 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 369 | 104 | 0.89 | 36 |

On the basis of the data in Table 10, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum, average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the $15-\mathrm{min}$ traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 11. A low PHF standard deviation of 0.064 out of the fourteen observations was found. The PHF average for office developments was found to be 0.86 , where the minimum and the maximum values were 0.70 and 0.94 , respectively. This implies that any value between the minimum and maximum PHF values could be found and be used for traffic analysis. From the 14 observations analysed, the peak hour traffic volume average was found to be $534 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$.

Table 11: Summary of Office Development Results

| Variable | Min PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 369 | 732 | 534 | 103 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 104 | 201 | 156 | 32 |
| PHF | 0.70 | 0.94 | 0.86 | 0.064 |

The PHF spread in relation to the peak hour traffic volume and the 15 -min peak traffic volume obtained in Table 10 is illustrated in Figure 38. It indicates where the PHF during particular peak hour traffic volume and a 15-min peak hour traffic volume occurred. The PHF was found to me more observed between 0.80 and 0.90 . Therefore, a possible PHF for this type of land-use could be 0.80 and 0.90 .


Figure 38: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Office Developments

Figure 39 shows the PHF variability at office developments during the AM and PM peak periods obtained in Table 10. It shows that the PHF differ from intersection to intersection and from location to location as a result of varying traffic flow conditions.


Figure 39: Office AM and PM peak PHF Variation

The traffic directional split at the affected intersection approach during the AM and PM peak periods obtained in Table 10 are illustrated in Figure 40. It shows the traffic directional split percentage between the inbound stream and the outbound stream. The AM peak period experienced higher traffic volumes entering the development and lower traffic volumes entering during the PM peak period. This can be attributed to office development being employment focused.


Figure 40: AM and PM peak Traffic Split at Office Developments
The PHF computed in Table 10 are shown in Table 12 to illustrate the frequency. It shows that the rate of occurrence of the PHF was found to be at 0.89 during the AM and PM peak periods. Based on this, it is therefore concluded that the PHF of 0.89 be considered during traffic analysis for office developments.

Table 12: Overall Office Development PHF Frequency Results

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.70 | 1 |
| 0.76 | 1 |
| 0.83 | 1 |
| 0.84 | 2 |
| 0.86 | 2 |
| 0.89 | 3 |
| 0.90 | 1 |
| 0.91 | 1 |
| 0.92 | 1 |
| 0.94 | 1 |
| Total | 14 |

The peak hours at each peak hour traffic volume were computed in Table 10. Table 13 shows peak hours and the PHF obtained during such peak hours. This was to determine the critical peak hours during the AM and PM peak periods to be considered during traffic analysis. The peak hours 07:30 to 8:30 and 16:00 to 17:00
during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively should be considered the most critical hours for office developments. The inbound traffic splits during a critical peak hour were indicated. The purpose was to indicate the distribution in traffic flow at an intersection approach.

Table 13: Office Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  |  |  |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $07: 15$ to $08: 15$ | 2 | 0.89 | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07: 30$ to $08: 30$ | 3 | 0.76 | 0.83 | 0.94 |  |  | 70 | 82 | 93 |  |  |
| $07: 45$ to $08: 45$ | 2 | 0.70 | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 5 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 21 | 36 | 39 | 2 | 7 |
| $16: 15$ to $17: 15$ | 2 | 0.86 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## c. Industrial Developments

Industrial developments are land-uses that include service industry, manufacturing, warehousing and distributions. Table 14 shows the results of the intersections selected to predict the appropriate PHF for industrial developments. Five intersections were selected for analysis. The AM and PM peak periods, as the critical peak periods for this type of land-use, were used to predict the appropriate PHF. The off-peak periods are mostly characterised by heavy vehicles due to deliveries, hence they were not presented.

Table 14: Selected Intersections Results Representing Industrial Developments

| Industrial |  | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | 15-min PV | PHF | Inbound <br> Split (\%) |
| Waltloo Road and Kuit Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 211 | 66 | 0.80 | 82 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 123 | 41 | 0.75 | 33 |
| Pretoria Road and Fakkel Street | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:45 to 08:45 | 587 | 165 | 0.89 | 49 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 652 | 177 | 0.92 | 49 |
| R566 and Ernest <br> Opperheimer <br> Street | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:30 to 07:30 | 1311 | 557 | 0.59 | 80 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 792 | 228 | 0.87 | 20 |
|  | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:15 to 07:15 | 795 | 261 | 0.76 | 57 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 484 | 140 | 0.86 | 36 |
| Dykor Street and Moreleta Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 514 | 146 | 0.88 | 56 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 17:00 to 18:00 | 645 | 180 | 0.90 | 37 |
|  | East | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:15 to 08:15 | 916 | 256 | 0.90 | 56 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 | 890 | 282 | 0.89 | 54 |
| Voortrekker Road (R55) and Ellman Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 825 | 227 | 0.91 | 80 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 895 | 254 | 0.88 | 22 |

On the basis of the data in Table 14, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the 15-min traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 15. The PHF values obtained at the selected intersections were close to the average PHF of 0.84 . This was illustrated by the standard deviation of 0.09 obtained, where the minimum and maximum PHF were 0.59 and 0.92 , respectively. Any value obtained within the range could be used in traffic analysis and thereby affecting the final design results. The average peak hour traffic volume of $688 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ shows that industrial developments generate high traffic volumes during the peak periods. The minimum and the maximum values of the peak hour traffic volume and the $15-\mathrm{min}$ traffic volume could produce any PHF. As a result, a single PHF value to represent all industrial developments must be determined.

Table 15: Summary of Industrial Development Results

| Variable | Mini PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 123 | 1311 | 688 | 303 |
| $15-M i n ~ V o l . ~$ | 41 | 557 | 213 | 122 |
| PHF | 0.59 | 0.92 | 0.84 | 0.090 |

The PHF spread in relation to the traffic peak hour volume and the 15 -min peak volume computed in Table 14 are illustrated in Figure 41. The PHF was observed to be stronger between 0.80 and 0.90 during both the AM and PM peak periods for industrial developments. The interesting thing noted is that the highest peak hour traffic volume of $1311 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ gave the lowest PHF value of 0.59 . This can be attributed to traffic flow being focused more on one 15-min within a particular peak hour and traffic conditions on the road network. Figure 41 should be viewed with Figure 42, which shows the variation of PHF at industrial developments.


Figure 41: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Industrial Developments


Figure 42: Industrial AM and PM peak PHF Range

Figure 43 shows the traffic flow directional split at the affected intersection approaches associated with industrial developments computed in Table 14. The results show that higher traffic volumes were experienced at the inbound stream during the AM peak hour and at the outbound stream during the PM peak hour. The same as office developments, industrial developments are classed as an employment sector.


Figure 43: Industrial AM and PM peak Traffic Split

Table 16 shows the frequency of the PHF computed in Table 14. The rate of occurrence of the PHF was found to be at $0.88,0.89$ and 0.90 . The average PHF of 0.84 obtained which was not equal to at least one of the three values obtained. The best possible way to arrive at the most appropriate PHF for industrial developments was to take the average of the three values which was found to be 0.89 . Based on the above, it is therefore concluded that the PHF of 0.89 be considered during traffic analysis for industrial developments.

Table 16: Overall Industrial Development PHF Results

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.59 | 1 |
| 0.75 | 1 |
| 0.76 | 1 |
| 0.80 | 1 |
| 0.86 | 1 |
| 0.87 | 1 |
| 0.88 | 2 |
| 0.89 | 2 |
| 0.90 | 2 |
| 0.91 | 1 |
| 0.92 | 1 |
| Total | 14 |

Based on the computed peak hour, Table 17 shows the peak hour that could be associated with industrial development in relation to the PHF. It shows that the 07:00 to 08:00 peak hour and the 16:00 to 17:00 peak hour during the AM and PM peak periods could be considered as the most critical peak hours during traffic analysis. The most likely directional split was found to be $80 \%$ and $20 \%$ at the inbound and outbound stream, respectively during the AM peak periods.

Table 17: Industrial Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $06: 15$ to $07: 15$ | 1 | 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 30$ to $07: 30$ | 1 | 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 45$ to $07: 45$ | 1 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07: 00$ to $08: 00$ | 2 | 0.80 | 0.91 |  | 80 | 82 |  |
| $07: 15$ to $08: 15$ | 1 | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $07: 45$ to $08: 45$ | 1 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15: 45$ to $16: 45$ | 1 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 3 | 0.75 | 0.86 | 0.87 | 20 | 33 | 36 |
| $16: 15$ to $17: 15$ | 2 | 0.88 | 0.92 |  |  |  |  |
| $17: 00$ to $18: 00$ | 1 | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |  |

## d. Institutional: Schools

Table 18 shows results from the intersections selected to predict the PHF for schools. Four intersections were selected for analysis. The AM, the Midday and Afternoon peak periods were used for analysis. This was based on the schooling hours at the primary schools in the vicinity of the selected intersections.

Table 18: Selected Intersections Results Representing Schools

| School |  | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | 15-min PV | PHF | Inbound <br> Split (\%) |
| Boeing Street and Hans Strijdom Drive | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 1789 | 557 | 0.80 | 50 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 632 | 262 | 0.60 | 40 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 661 | 288 | 0.57 | 33 |
| Soutpansberg <br> Road and Wren <br> Street | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 712 | 213 | 0.84 | 31 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 323 | 96 | 0.84 | 43 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 398 | 115 | 0.87 | 49 |
| Daan de Wet <br> Nel Drive and Rene Road | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 897 | 290 | 0.77 | 36 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 220 | 79 | 0.70 | 45 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 239 | 87 | 0.69 | 36 |
| Anthesis Street and Cyme Crescent | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 270 | 83 | 0.81 | 31 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:15 to 13:15 | 185 | 49 | 0.94 | 40 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:15 to 15:15 | 147 | 44 | 0.84 | 50 |

On the basis of the data in Table 18, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the $15-$ min traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 19. The PHF indicated a standard deviation of 0.111 from the twelve observations done. This implied that the PHF values obtained were fairly close to the average of 0.77 . A wide range between the minimum and the maximum PHF of 0.57 and 0.94 , respectively were obtained. The primary schools showed high traffic volume during the peak periods with an average of 539 Veh/h.

Table 19: Summary of School Results

| Variable | Min PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 147 | 1789 | 539 | 462 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 44 | 557 | 180 | 150 |
| PHF | 0.57 | 0.94 | 0.77 | 0.111 |

Figure 44 shows the PHF variation in relation to the peak hour traffic volume and the 15-min peak traffic volume obtained in Table 18. It shows scattered values of the PHF however fairly close to 0.80 . The Figure shows that there is no stable PHF value that could be used for traffic analysis.


Figure 44: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at School

In support of Figure 44, Figure 45 shows the PHF variation at intersections in the vicinity of primary schools from the computed PHF in Table 18. It shows the variation between the selected peak periods for schools activities. With such a scattered range it is important to have a single PHF value to be used during traffic analysis at schools.


Figure 45: School AM and PM peak PHF Range

Travelling patterns at schools are characterised by dropping off of pupils. Figure 46 shows the directional split fairly close to each other from the computed inbound split in Table 18. This can be attributed to same trips going in and out of the school premises after dropping off scholars. The average inbound split during the selected peak periods was found to be close to $40 \%$.

AM, Midday and Afternoon Peak Inbound Traffic Split


Figure 46: School AM and PM peak Traffic Split
Table 20 shows the PHF frequency at selected intersection computed in Table 18. The rate of occurrence of the PHF was found to be at 0.84 from the twelve observations done. It can therefore be concluded that the PHF of 0.84 should be considered when conducting traffic analysis for schools.

Table 20: Overall School PHF Frequency Results

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.57 | 1 |
| 0.60 | 1 |
| 0.69 | 1 |
| 0.70 | 1 |
| 0.77 | 1 |
| 0.80 | 1 |
| 0.81 | 1 |
| 0.84 | 3 |
| 0.87 | 1 |
| 0.94 | 1 |
| Total | 12 |

The computed peak hours in Table 18 indicates that the peak hour to be considered during traffic analysis for this type of land-use is from 06:45 to 07:45 during the AM
peak period as shown in Table 21. The AM peak is the most critical peak period at this land-use.

Table 21: School Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  |  |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $06: 45$ to $07: 45$ | 4 | 0.77 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.84 | 31 | 31 | 36 | 50 |
| $12: 15$ to $13: 15$ | 1 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $13: 00$ to $14: 00$ | 3 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.84 |  | 40 | 43 | 45 |  |
| $14: 00$ to $15: 00$ | 3 | 0.57 | 0.69 | 0.87 |  | 33 | 36 | 49 |  |
| $14: 15$ to $15: 15$ | 1 | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## e. Retail Developments

Table 22 shows the results of the intersections selected to predict the PHF for retail developments. Four intersections in the vicinity of retail developments and providing access to such land-uses were selected for analysis. Saturday Morning, Midday and Afternoon peak periods were used for predict the appropriate PHF for retail development as well as the Friday PM peak periods traffic data. Retail developments include shopping centres; hardware and paint stores; motor dealerships; value retail; wholesale trades and building material stores.

Table 22: Selected Intersections Results Representing Retail Development

| Retail Development |  | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | 15-min PV | PHF | Inbound Split (\%) |
| Garstfontein <br> Road and Philadelphia <br> Avenue | North | 09:00 to 12:00 | 09:45 to 10:45 | 2123 | 569 | 0.93 | 64 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 2385 | 676 | 0.88 | 46 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:30 to 15:30 | 1876 | 541 | 0.87 | 47 |
| De Villa Bois Marueil Drive and Woodlake Boulevard | East | 09:00 to 12:00 | 11:00 to 12:00 | 1748 | 527 | 0.83 | 58 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:00 to 13:00 | 1554 | 415 | 0.94 | 48 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 1347 | 338 | 1.00 | 47 |
| Heinrich Drive and Madelief Avenue | West | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:00 to 11:00 | 650 | 175 | 0.93 | 50 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:30 to 13:30 | 674 | 178 | 0.95 | 54 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:15 to 15:15 | 624 | 184 | 0.85 | 53 |
|  | East | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:45 to 11:45 | 1360 | 386 | 0.88 | 61 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:00 to 13:00 | 1348 | 375 | 0.90 | 66 |
|  |  | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:15 to 15:15 | 1318 | 353 | 0.93 | 60 |
| Maphalla Drive and J Letwaba Street | West (Sat) | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:15 to 11:15 | 1334 | 336 | 0.91 | 56 |
|  |  | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:00 to 13:00 | 1279 | 341 | 0.94 | 56 |
|  | West (Fri) | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:00 to 17:00 | 1266 | 336 | 0.94 | 54 |

On the basis of the data in Table 22, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the $15-\mathrm{min}$ traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 23. Retail developments showed high PHF values and traffic volumes. The minimum and maximum PHF found were 0.83 and 1.00 , respectively which resulted to an average of 0.91 . The standard deviation obtained was 0.044 indicating that the PHF values were close to the average PHF value.

Table 23: Summary of Retail Development Results

| Variable | Min PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 624 | 2385 | 1392 | 508 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 175 | 676 | 382 | 147 |
| PHF | 0.83 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.044 |

The computed PHF values in Table 22 show that scattered PHF values were obtained with more values ranging between 0.90 and 1.00 as shown in Figure 47. This therefore shows that a single PHF representing retail developments is required during traffic analysis.


Figure 47: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Retail Developments

Figure 48 show the PHF variation at retail developments as computed in Table 22. High PHF values of up to 1 were realised indicating the evenness of traffic flow within a peak hour.


Figure 48: Retail AM and PM peak PHF Range

The computed inbound and outbound traffic flow in Table 22 indicated an equal spread of traffic within a peak hour as shown in Figure 49 during the different peak periods. This can be attributed to different activities associated with retail developments like shopping and entertainment.


Figure 49: Retail AM and PM peak Traffic Split

Table 24 shows the frequency of the PHF computed in Table 22. The rate of occurrence of the PHF was found to be at 0.93 and 0.94 from the fifteen observations done. This showed that retail developments have a uniform traffic flow distribution during a specific peak hour. In order to select the appropriate value to be used during traffic analysis, Table 25 was used. The most likely peak hour to be associated with retail developments was from 12:00 to 13:00. The PHF of 0.94 also occurred twice within the peak hour mentioned. It is therefore concluded that the PHF of 0.94 and the 12:00 to 13:00 peak hour be used for retail developments during traffic analysis.

Table 24: Overall Retail Development PHF Frequency Results

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.83 | 1 |
| 0.85 | 1 |
| 0.87 | 1 |
| 0.88 | 2 |
| 0.90 | 1 |
| 0.91 | 1 |
| 0.93 | 3 |
| 0.94 | 3 |
| 0.95 | 1 |
| 1.00 | 1 |
| Total | 15 |

Table 25: Retail Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency |  | PHF |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $09: 45$ to $10: 45$ | 1 | 0.93 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10: 00$ to $11: 00$ | 1 | 0.93 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10: 15$ to $11: 15$ | 1 | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $10: 45$ to $12: 00$ | 1 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ | 1 | 0.83 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $12: 00$ to $13: 00$ | 3 | 0.90 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 48 | 56 | 66 |
| $12: 30$ to $13: 30$ | 1 | 0.95 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $13: 00$ to $14: 00$ | 1 | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $14: 00$ to $15: 00$ | 1 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $14: 15$ to $15: 15$ | 2 | 0.85 | 0.93 |  |  |  |  |
| $14: 30$ to $15: 30$ | 1 | 0.87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 1 | 0.94 |  |  |  |  |  |

## f. Medical: Hospitals

Table 26 shows the selected intersection and the results to predict the appropriate PHF for medical institutions. Five intersections in the vicinity of hospitals were used for analysis. The AM and PM peak periods were used to predict the possible PHF that could be used during traffic analysis. Medical institutions include private and public hospitals, nursing homes and medical clinics.

Table 26: Selected Intersections Results Representing Medical Institutions

| Medical Institutions |  | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | $\begin{aligned} & 15-\mathrm{min} \\ & \mathrm{PV} \end{aligned}$ | PHF | Inbound Split (\%) |
| Church Street and Kalafong Street | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 824 | 212 | 0.97 | 38 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 | 600 | 174 | 0.86 | 28 |
| Simon <br> Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road (1) | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 07:15 to 08:15 | 524 | 150 | 0.87 | 70 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 | 707 | 212 | 0.83 | 35 |
| Simon <br> Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Road (2) | South | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:30 to 07:30 | 505 | 151 | 0.84 | 69 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:30 to 16:30 | 677 | 179 | 0.95 | 36 |
| Cliffton Avenue and Cantonment Road | North | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 1237 | 348 | 0.89 | 57 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:15 to 17:15 | 1140 | 321 | 0.89 | 54 |
| Voortrekker Road and Malan Street | West | 06:00 to 09:00 | 06:15 to 07:15 | 807 | 224 | 0.90 | 77 |
|  |  | 15:30 to 18:00 | 15:45 to 16:45 | 493 | 136 | 0.91 | 24 |

On the basis of the data in Table 26, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the 15-min traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 27. The PHF values indicate that they are close to the average PHF of 0.89 . This was as a result of the low standard deviation of 0.044 obtained. The average PHF of 0.89 also showed that medical institutions have a uniform traffic flow distribution within a peak hour. High traffic volumes at medical institutions could be expected as indicated by the average peak hour traffic volume of 751 Veh/h obtained.

Table 27: Summary of Hospital Results

| Variable | Average | Std. Dev. | Minimum PHF | Max PHF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 751 | 259 | 493 | 1237 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 211 | 72 | 135 | 348 |
| PHF | 0.89 | 0.044 | 0.83 | 0.97 |

The computed PHF in Table 26 showed scattered PHF values for medical institutions are shown on Figure 50. The PHF could vary significantly at this type of land-use. A similar variation is also shown in Figure 51. A single PHF value for medical institutions is therefore required for traffic analysis purposes.


Figure 50: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Hospital


Figure 51: Hospital AM and PM peak PHF Range

The directional traffic split computed in Table 26 at the affected approaches achieved high traffic volumes at the inbound stream during the AM peak periods as shown in Figure 52. High traffic volumes were also realised during the PM peak periods at the outbound stream. It is therefore important to use both the AM and PM peak periods for traffic analysis for this types of land-use.


Figure 52: Hospital AM and PM peak Traffic Split

Table 28 shows the PHF frequency for medical institutions as computed in Table 26. The rate of occurrence of the PHF was found to be at 0.89 . It should also be noted that the average PHF obtained was equal to 0.89 . It is therefore recommended that the PHF of 0.89 be considered for medical institutions during traffic analysis.

Table 28: Overall Medical PHF Frequency Results

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.83 | 1 |
| 0.84 | 1 |
| 0.86 | 1 |
| 0.87 | 1 |
| 0.89 | 2 |
| 0.90 | 1 |
| 0.91 | 1 |
| 0.95 | 1 |
| 0.97 | 1 |
| Total | 10 |

In support of the recommended PHF of 0.89, Table 29 shows the peak hour that should be considered for traffic analysis. It shows that the 06:45 to 07:45 and the 15:45 to 16:45 could be considered important during medical institutions traffic analysis.

Table 29: Medical Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $06: 15$ to $07: 15$ | 1 | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 30$ to $07: 30$ | 1 | 0.84 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $06: 45$ to $07: 45$ | 2 | 0.89 | 0.97 |  | 38 | 57 |  |
| $07: 15$ to $08: 15$ | 1 | 0.87 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15: 30$ to $16: 30$ | 1 | 0.95 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15: 45$ to $16: 45$ | 3 | 0.83 | 0.86 | 0.91 | 24 | 28 | 35 |
| $16: 15$ to $17: 15$ | 1 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |

## g. Institutional: Places of public Worship

Table 30 shows the intersection and results obtained from places of public worship. The land-use is mostly characterised by Sunday activities. Traffic counts were conducted on a Sunday. Three intersections in the vicinity of the land-uses were selected and used for analysis. Different peak periods were used for analysis owing to the time associated with each land-use time of worship. There were instances where two or more church services were held at a single place at different times for the day.

Table 30: Selected Intersections Results Representing Places of Public Worship

| Places of Public Worship | Peak Period | Development Inbound and Outbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Intersection | Approach |  | Peak Hour | PHV | $15-\mathrm{min}$ <br> PV | PHF | Inbound <br> Split (\%) |
| De Villebois <br> Mareuil Drive <br> and Feverwood <br> Street | East | $06: 00$ to 09:00 | $08: 00$ to 09:00 | 1103 | 383 | 0.72 | 98 |
|  |  | $10: 00$ to $11: 00$ | 1139 | 552 | 0.52 | 1 |  |
|  |  | $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 825 | 255 | 0.81 | 96 |  |
| General Louis <br> Botha Drive and <br> Hatfield Christian <br> Church Access | West | $06: 00$ to 09:00 | $08: 00$ to 09:00 | 102 | 38 | 0.67 | 96 |
| Nellmapius Drive <br> and Jan Smuts <br> Avenue |  | $09: 00$ to $12: 00$ | $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ | 819 | 359 | 0.57 | 12 |

On the basis of the data in Table 30, the summary of the computed minimum, maximum average and standard deviation of the traffic Peak Hour Volume (PHV), the $15-$ min traffic Peak Volume and the Peak Hour Factor (PHF) results are presented in Table 31. The PHF ranged between 0.52 and 0.89 where the average was found to be 0.70 . The standard deviation of 0.13 showed that the PHF values
obtained were fairly close to the average value. Places of worship carried high traffic volumes as indicated by the average of $691 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ obtained.

Table 31: Summary of Place of Public Worship Results

| Variable | Min PHF | Max PHF | Average | Std. Dev. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHV | 102 | 1139 | 691 | 390 |
| 15-Min Vol. | 38 | 552 | 265 | 180 |
| PHF | 0.52 | 0.89 | 0.70 | 0.13 |

Scattered PHF values were found as shown in Figure 53 from the computed PHF in Table 30. It shows that it is important to produce a single PHF value that could be used for traffic analysis.


Figure 53: Relationship between PHF, PHV and 15-min Peak Volume at Places of Public Worship

Table 32 shows the frequency of the computed PHF in Table 30. A variety of PHF values were obtained where no value appeared more than once. A PHF to represent the places of worship could not be selected from one of the seven values obtained as it would not be a true representative of this land-use type. Arriving at the appropriate PHF value, the average PHF of 0.70 was selected as it could represent all the seven observations. It was therefore concluded that the PHF of 0.70 be used during traffic analysis for places of worship.

# Table 32: Overall Places of Public Worship PHF Frequency Results 

| PHF | Frequency |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.52 | 1 |
| 0.57 | 1 |
| 0.67 | 1 |
| 0.72 | 1 |
| 0.74 | 1 |
| 0.81 | 1 |
| 0.89 | 1 |
| Total | 7 |

Table 33 shows the peak hour and the inbound traffic split as computed in Table 30. Since places of worship operate in different peak periods the appropriate peak hour was not determined. It was therefore recommended that the use of the peak hour associated with the time schedule of each place of public worship should be considered during traffic analysis. The directional traffic split also shows that before services, more traffic volumes were experienced at the inbound stream and more traffic at the outbound stream after church services.

Table 33: Places of Public Worship Peak Hour Frequency

| Peak Hour | Frequency | PHF |  | Inbound Traffic Split (\%) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $07: 15$ to $08: 15$ | 1 | 0.89 |  | 84 |  |
| $08: 00$ to $09: 00$ | 2 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 96 | 98 |
| $09: 00$ to $10: 00$ | 1 | 0.74 |  | 58 |  |
| $10: 00$ to $11: 00$ | 1 | 0.52 |  | 1 |  |
| $11: 00$ to $12: 00$ | 1 | 0.57 |  | 12 |  |
| $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 1 | 0.81 |  | 96 |  |

### 5.2 Development of PHF design chart

The analysis and recommendations done in sub-section 5.1, assisted in determining the PHF per land-use type as shown in Table 34. The table was developed as a design chart showing the recommended PHF values associated with each land-use type as well as the peak hours to be considered during traffic analysis. The peak hours shown should be used as a guide for the appropriate peak period to conduct traffic counts for traffic analysis purposes. The possible directional splits at each land-use were indicated.

Table 34: Peak Hour Factor per Land-use type

| Land-Use <br> Type | Peak Hour Factor | Peak Periods to Consider During Analysis |  |  | Directional Split |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Week days |  | Weekend |  |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| Residential | 0.86 | 07:00 to 08:00 | 16:45 to 17:45 |  | 70/30 |
| Office | 0.89 | 07:30 to 08:30 | 16:00 to 17:00 |  | 70/30 |
| Industrial | 0.89 | 06:30 to 07:30 | 16:00 to 17:00 |  | 80/20 |
| Retail | 0.94 |  | Friday PM peak | 12:00 to 13:00 | 60/40; 50/50 |
| Medical | 0.89 | 06:45 to 07:45 | 15:45 to 16:45 |  | 70/30; 60/40 |
| School | 0.84 | 06:45 to 07:45 | Midday and Afternoon Peak |  | 50/50 |
| Church | 0.70 | The use of appropriate peak hour relating to the analysed Church to be considered |  |  | 95/05 |

### 5.3 PHF comparison in traffic analysis

Intersection capacity analysis was conducted to compare the HCM PHF default value and the computed PHF for each land-use type. The purpose was to indicate the impact a PHF could have on the final design results. SIDRA intersection software was used to analyse the intersections. One intersection for each land-use was used to indicate the possible changes in intersection capacity analysis using a different PHF.

The saturation flow rate of $2050 \mathrm{Veh} / \mathrm{h}$ was used in the capacity analysis. Saturation flow rate is the equivalent hourly rate at which previously queued vehicles can traverse an intersection approach under prevailing conditions, assuming that the green signal is available at all times and no lost times are experienced (Highway Capacity Manual, 2000).

Table 35 shows the results obtained using the same input parameters with different PHF values. The PHF of 0.95 recommended for highly congested traffic conditions was also used. The differences in traffic flow rate, the degree of saturation also known as the volume to capacity ratio (c/v), average delay in second and the Level of Service (LOS) are shown. An example of the results produced by the SIDRA Solution Software is shown in Appendix D.

Table 35: Traffic capacity analysis results

| Land-use | Produced PHF for each land-use |  |  |  |  |  | HCM default value, 0.92 |  |  |  | Congested conditions PHF, 0.95 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peak period | PHF | Demand Flow (Veh/h) | V/C | Ave. delay (Sec) | LOS | Demand Flow (Veh/h) | V/C | Ave. Delay (Sec) | LOS | Demand Flow (Veh/h) | V/C | Ave. Delay (Sec) | LOS |
| Residential | AM | 0.86 | 1950 | 0.74 | 22.6 | C | 1823 | 0.66 | 21.3 | C | 1765 | 0.63 | 21.3 | C |
|  | PM |  | 2442 | 1.00 | 19.3 | B | 2283 | 0.96 | 18.3 | B | 2211 | 0.96 | 18.1 | B |
| Office | AM | 0.89 | 4253 | 1.10 | 23.6 | C | 4114 | 1.09 | 21.5 | C | 3984 | 1.09 | 20.6 | C |
|  | PM |  | 4322 | 0.94 | 28.6 | C | 4182 | 0.91 | 23.7 | C | 4049 | 0.88 | 20.6 | C |
| Industrial | AM | 0.89 | 3892 | 1.00 | 25.2 | C | 3765 | 1.00 | 25.1 | C | 3646 | 1.00 | 24.4 | C |
|  | PM |  | 2998 | 0.78 | 22.3 | C | 2900 | 0.75 | 21.4 | C | 2808 | 0.74 | 20.8 | C |
| School | AM | 0.84 | 4211 | 1.00 | 24.0 | C | 3845 | 1.00 | 23.2 | C | 3723 | 1.00 | 16.9 | C |
| Retail | Midday | 0.94 | 3874 | 1.35 | 118.4 | F | 3959 | 1.35 | 129.5 | F | 3834 | 1.45 | 113.3 | F |
| Medical | AM | 0.89 | 4310 | 1.38 | 214.1 | F | 4170 | 1.34 | 195.4 | F | 4038 | 1.34 | 178.2 | F |
|  | PM |  | 4449 | 1.34 | 121.8 | F | 4304 | 1.34 | 110.8 | F | 4168 | 1.34 | 101.3 | F |
| Church | AM | 0.70 | 2477 | 0.77 | 9.8 | A | 1885 | 0.69 | 9.9 | A | 1825 | 0.67 | 9.7 | A |
|  | Morning |  | 3976 | 0.86 | 20.8 | C | 3025 | 0.79 | 13.9 | B | 2929 | 0.76 | 13.6 | B |

Table 36 shows the effect of using inappropriate PHF values on the final design results. It shows the extent at which the final results could be underestimated (-ve) or overestimated (+ve). The LOS at the intersection did not indicate any changes for the overall intersection results. However, other intersection performance measures were affected by using different PHF values, 0.92 and 0.95 . The default values adjusted the demand flow rate by up to $26 \%$. The volume to capacity ratio and the delay were overestimated by up to 11 to $15 \%$ and 33 to $35 \%$, respectively.

Table 36: Effect of varying PHF during traffic analysis

| Land-use | Peak period | (\%) Difference to 0.92 |  |  | (\%) Difference to 0.95 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Demand Flow | V/C | Average delay | Demand Flow | V/C | Average delay |
| Residential | AM | 7 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 6 |
|  | PM | 7 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 6 |
| Office | AM | 3 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 13 |
|  | PM | 3 | 3 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 28 |
| Industrial | AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
|  | PM | 3 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| School | AM | 9 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 30 |
| Retail | Midday | -2 | 0 | -9 | 1 | -7 | 4 |
| Medical | AM | 3 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 17 |
|  | PM | 3 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 17 |
| Church | AM | 24 | 10 | -1 | 26 | 13 | 1 |
|  | Morning | 24 | 8 | 33 | 26 | 12 | 35 |

The use of higher PHF on all the land-uses excluding the retail developments will overestimate the intersection measure of effectiveness. Retail developments carries high traffic volumes, hence it is recommended that a PHF of 0.94 be used rather than the default value of 0.92 . PHF should not be adjusted to obtain the required measures of effectiveness at analysed intersection. Adjusting the PHF could affect the obligation of the developer and/or the relevant authority to undertake mitigating measures on the road network proposed in the TIA recommendations. Changes in land-use could affect the existing PHF at nearby intersection thus affecting the performance measure. Improvements on the intersection configuration by introducing additional through and turning movements, where appropriate, should be considered. Other processes like provision of efficient public transport system and Non-Motorised Transport (NMT) could be employed to obtain the required measures of effectiveness. It is therefore recommended that the computed PHF for each landuse be used during traffic analysis.

## CHAPTER 6 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Conclusions

The main aim of the study was to investigate the effect land-use change could have on the traffic peak hour factor. The specific objectives were to determine the peak hour factor for different land-use types, develop a design chart which might be considered for inclusion in the National Traffic Data Manual and to compare the designs using the existing PHF and the proposed PHF values. The produced results will thus enhance the use of the local default values of the PHF per land-use type and to ensure consistency on the final roadway design results during traffic analysis.
a) Land-use change influences the traffic distribution on the road network in the surrounding area where choice of accessibility to a development is immensely available. Due to the change, the peak hours during different peak periods change as well as the peak traffic volumes.
b) Due to the day-to-day variability of the peak hour traffic volumes, a variety of values were obtained. These values can be used to compute input parameters thus producing results that could underestimate or overestimate the intersection performance measures during traffic analysis.
c) Land-uses that could be characterised under employment sector obtained a similar PHF of 0.89 . The land-uses were offices, industrial and medical: hospital. Residential and institutional: schools obtained a PHF 0.86 and 0.84 , respectively. Retail developments which carry high traffic volumes during the weekends indicated a PHF of 0.94 . While places of worship with the traffic flow focused at the last 15-min peak before services obtained a PHF of 0.70
d) A design chart in the form of a table was developed to indicate the predicted PHF per land-use type selected and traffic parameters that should be considered during traffic analysis, the traffic peak hour and directional split.
e) The PHF differ from land-use to land-use and the appropriate value must be used during traffic analysis. The default values overestimated the degree of saturation and the average traffic delay of an intersection by up to $15 \%$ and $35 \%$, respectively as well as the traffic flow rate by up to $26 \%$.

From the results presented, it is evident that adjusting the PHF will have an effect on the final intersection design results.

### 6.2 Recommendations

a) The computed PHF values for each land-use type should be used during traffic analysis for fair and consistent design results to be obtained.
b) Suitable peak periods and days for the week for each land-use type should be applied during data collection for traffic analysis purposes.
c) Further traffic counts should be obtained from another region within the country to confirm the findings of this study.
d) Surveys and analysis for other land-uses that were not analysed should be conducted.
e) The relationship and the effect of previously queued vehicles on the PHF due to long queues and delays should be investigated. This can be achieved at intersection with a PHF between 0.95 and 1.00.
f) The directional split percentage at an intersection approach for each land-use were not extensively covered in this research, therefore further investigation will be required.
g) The amount of internal trips absorbed in a mix land-use development must be investigated for the purposes of traffic analysis. The PHF for such land-uses should also be determined.
h) Heavy vehicle adjustment factor for industrial and retail developments should be investigated for traffic analysis purposes.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table A1: Intersection Traffic Counts

| $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Enter Date } \\ \text { of Count } \end{array} \\ \hline 25 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | HEBRON ROAD AND UMPHAFA STREET INTERSECTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Compare <br> Totals with Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Enter Land Use Codes for land-use served by the road. Enter "Code" if not serving a land-use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Southern Approach |  |  | Western Approach |  |  | Northern Approach |  |  | Eastern Approach |  |  |  |
| August | 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Code | Land Use |  | 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Code | Land Use |  |  |
| 2010 | UMPHAFA STREET |  |  | HEBRON |  |  | UMPHAFA STREET |  |  | HEBRON |  |  | Sheet |
| Time | 1 LT | 2 ST | 3 RT | 4 LT | 5 ST | 6 RT | 7 LT | 8 ST | 9 RT | 10 LT | 11 ST | 12 RT | Total |
| 06:00 to 06:15 | 36 | 15 | 52 | 11 | 182 | 40 | 50 | 16 | 1 | 30 | 78 | 15 | 526 |
| 06:15 to 06:30 | 35 | 8 | 43 | 5 | 162 | 33 | 43 | 12 | 2 | 20 | 59 | 7 | 429 |
| 06:30 to 06:45 | 32 | 8 | 85 | 11 | 143 | 20 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 19 | 111 | 3 | 467 |
| 06:45 to 07:00 | 34 | 4 | 105 | 7 | 128 | 36 | 20 | 2 | 3 | 29 | 89 | 5 | 462 |
| 07:00 to 07:15 | 27 | 4 | 84 | 2 | 100 | 27 | 21 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 88 | 4 | 371 |
| 07:15 to 07:30 | 38 | 8 | 88 | 2 | 52 | 14 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 65 | 31 | 337 |
| 07:30 to 07:45 | 41 | 4 | 84 | 3 | 62 | 11 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 37 | 4 | 278 |
| 07:45 to 08:00 | 23 | 0 | 47 | 7 | 47 | 32 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 3 | 211 |
| 08:00 to 08:15 | 27 | 5 | 40 | 3 | 51 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 10. | 30 | 1 | 187 |
| 08:15 to 08:30 | 23 | 5 | 41 | 1 | 45 | 22 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 17 | 32 | 2 | 201 |
| 08:30 to 08:45 | 27 | 6 | 33 | 4 | 37 | 29 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 65 | 2 | 227 |
| 08:45 to 09:00 | 20 | 3 | 35 | 1 | 23 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 41 | 4 | 161 |
| 09:00 to 09:15 | 35 | 5 | 40 | 3 | 38 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 17 | 59 | 2 | 229 |
| 09:15 to 09:30 | 33 | 9 | 27 | 6 | 45 | 21 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 43 | 4 | 207 |
| 09:30 to 09:45 | 28 | 6 | 30 | 5 | 43 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 16 | 41 | 4 | 209 |
| 09:45 to 10:00 | 21 | 4 | 23 | 4 | 42 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 40 | 1 | 166 |
| 10:00 to 10:15 | 34 | 4 | 42 | 5 | 50 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 43 | 3 | 226 |
| 10:15 to 10:30 | 31 | 2 | 30 | 8 | 48 | 21 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 58 | 9 | 234 |
| 10:30 to 10:45 | 28 | 3 | 34 | 6 | 47 | 24 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 42 | 1 | 206 |
| 10:45 to 11:00 | 27 | 8 | 35 | 7 | 55 | 28 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 15 | 44 | 3 | 231 |
| 11:00 to 11:15 | 38 | 9 | 41 | 5 | 50 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 46 | 4 | 240 |
| 11:15 to 11:30 | 29 | 4 | 25 | 5 | 48 | 28 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 15 | 36 | 3 | 203 |
| 11:30 to 11:45 | 18 | 2 | 25 | 5 | 28 | 28 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 56 | 1 | 185 |
| 11:45 to 12:00 | 15 | 6 | 32 | 6 | 38 | 27 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 15 | 48 | 6 | 207 |
| 12:00 to 12:15 | 22 | 6 | 28 | 3 | 47 | 33 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 51 | 1 | 210 |
| 12:15 to 12:30 | 25 | 1 | 22 | 2 | 40 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 16 | 48 | 2 | 182 |
| 12:30 to 12:45 | 15 | 7 | 28 | 1 | 27 | 28 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 18 | 27 | 3 | 167 |
| 12:45 to 13:00 | 14 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 55 | 21 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 35 | 1 | 153 |
| 13:00 to 13:15 | 29 | 4 | 27 | 4 | 47 | 27 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 50 | 6 | 213 |
| 13:15 to 13:30 | 27 | 8 | 22 | 3 | 37 | 26 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 60 | 4 | 210 |
| 13:30 to 13:45 | 19 | 5 | 55 | 0 | 46 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 28 | 7 | 211 |
| 13:45 to 14:00 | 24 | 6 | 23 | 2 | 43 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 55 | 0 | 194 |
| 14:00 to 14:15 | 24 | 2 | 52 | 3 | 39 | 34 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 37 | 5 | 216 |
| 14:15 to 14:30 | 19 | 8 | 33 | 1 | 30 | 19 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 49 | 9 | 201 |
| 14:30 to $14: 45$ | 27 | 9 | 26 | 4 | 38 | 26 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 58 | 11 | 229 |
| 14:45 to 15:00 | 26 | 5 | 35 | 2 | 31 | 42 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 31 | 52 | 10 | 248 |
| 15:00 to 15:15 | 33 | 4 | 22 | 1 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 39 | 7 | 161 |
| 15:15 to 15:30 | 24 | 6 | 29 | 2 | 18 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 45 | 6 | 181 |
| $15: 30 \text { to } 15: 45$ | 29 | 8 | 41 | 0 | 27 | 41 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 61 | 7 | 247 |
| 15:45 to 16:00 | 32 | 3 | 37 | 3 | 35 | 35 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 57 | 4 | 234 |
| 16:00 to 16:15 | 37 | 9 | 27 | 5 | 35 | 42 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 53 | 85 | 14 | 315 |
| 16:15 to 16:30 | 36 | 4 | 36 | 4 | 45 | 56 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 61 | 120 | 7 | 380 |
| 16:30 to 16:45 | 40 | 3 | 35 | 2 | 52 | 42 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 73 | 138 | 17 | 414 |
| 16:45 to 17:00 | 19 | 5 | 23 | 3 | 33 | 39 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 62 | 115 | 12 | 321 |
| 17:00 to 17:15 | 36 | 9 | 35 | 7 | 51 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 81 | 119 | 15 | 417 |
| 17:15 to 17:30 | 32 | 2 | 35 | 4 | 48 | 28 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 70 | 181 | 25 | 438 |
| 17:30 to 17:45 | 28 | 5 | 30 | 3 | 40 | 22 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 81 | 203 | 30 | 451 |
| 17:45 to 18:00 | 15 | 2 | 20 | 1 | 38 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 90 | 197 | 19 | 405 |
| Total | 1332 | 256 | 1846 | 184 | 2491 | 1287 | 316 | 222 | 91 | 1239 | 3190 | 344 | 12798 |

Approach and
Turning Directions


Southern Approach

Table A2: Traffic Counts Results

| Street system |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development in + Outbound |  |  |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 | 6:00 to 7:00 | 952 | 260 | 0.915 |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:15 to 11:15 | 390 | 106 | 0.920 |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 366 | 98 | 0.934 |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 334 | 96 | 0.870 |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 | 17:00 to 18:00 | 877 | 243 | 0.902 |


| 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Peak hour of the street system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { South } \\ \hline \text { Inbound } \\ \text { Split } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Period | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development in + Outbound |  |  | Development inbound |  |  | Development Outbound |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol | $15-\mathrm{Min} \mathrm{Vol}$ | PHF | Hour Vol | $15-\mathrm{Min} \mathrm{Vol}$ | PHF | Hour Vol | $15-\mathrm{Min} \mathrm{Vol}$ | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 | 6:00 to 7:00 | 719 | 210 | 0.856 | 262 | 86 | 0.762 | 457 | 143 | 0.799 | 36\% |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:15 to 11:15 | 454 | 132 | 0.860 | 168 | 49 | 0.857 | 286 | 88 | 0.813 | 37\% |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 427 | 126 | 0.847 | 178 | 48 | 0.927 | 249 | 79 | 0.788 | 42\% |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 496 | 142 | 0.873 | 230 | 76 | 0.757 | 266 | 78 | 0.853 | 46\% |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 | 17:00 to 18:00 | 704 | 210 | 0.838 | 455 | 130 | 0.875 | 249 | 80 | 0.778 | 65\% |


| 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Peak hour of the development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | South <br> Inbound <br> Split |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development $\ln +$ Outbound |  |  | Development Inbound |  |  | Development Outbound |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 | 6:00 to 7:00 | 719 | 210 | 0.856 | 262 | 86 | 0.762 | 457 | 143 | 0.799 | 36\% |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:30 to 11:30 | 460 | 132 | 0.871 | 179 | 49 | 0.913 | 281 | 88 | 0.798 | 39\% |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 427 | 126 | 0.847 | 178 | 48 | 0.927 | 249 | 79 | 0.788 | 42\% |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 496 | 142 | 0.873 | 230 | 76 | 0.757 | 266 | 78 | 0.853 | 46\% |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 | $16: 15$ to 17:15 | 765 | 210 | 0.911 | 484 | 130 | 0.931 | 281 | 80 | 0.878 | 63\% |



| Land Use |  |  | Peak hour of the development |  |  | West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P Period | Peak Hour | Development in + Outbound | Development Inbound | Development Outbound | Inbound |
| Peak Hour | Period | (One Hour) | Hour Vol $15-\mathrm{Min}$ Vol PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol PHF | Split |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 |  |  |  |  |  |


| 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Peak hour of the street system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { North } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Inbound } \\ \text { Split } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development in + Outbound |  |  | Development Inbound |  |  | Development Outbound |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | $15-\mathrm{Min}$ Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 | 6:00 to 7:00 | 283 | 108 | 0.655 | 99 | 41 | 0.604 | 184 | 67 | 0.687 | 35\% |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:15 to 11:15 | 103 | 34 | 0.757 | 65 | 19 | 0.855 | 38 | 15 | 0.633 | 63\% |
| Midday | $12: 00$ to 14:00 | 13:00 to 14:00 | 71 | 23 | 0.772 | 49 | 15 | 0.817 | 22 | 9 | 0.611 | 69\% |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 101 | 31 | 0.815 | 69 | 24 | 0.719 | 32 | 14 | 0.571 | 68\% |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 | 17:00 to 18:00 | 175 | 55 | 0.795 | 122 | 38 | 0.803 | 53 | 24 | 0.552 | 70\% |


| 210 Single Dwelling Units |  |  | Peak hour of the development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ <br> Inbound Split |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development in + Outbound |  |  | Development Inbound |  |  | Development Outbound |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol | 15-Min Vol | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 | 6:00 to 7:00 | 283 | 108 | 0.655 | 99 | 41 | 0.604 | 184 | 67 | 0.687 | 35\% |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 | 10:00 to 11:00 | 104 | 34 | 0.765 | 59 | 19 | 0.776 | 45 | 15 | 0.750 | 57\% |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 | 12:30 to 13:30 | 83 | 24 | 0.865 | 46 | 15 | 0.767 | 37 | 13 | 0.712 | 55\% |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 | 14:00 to 15:00 | 101 | 31 | 0.815 | 69 | 24 | 0.719 | 32 | 14 | 0.571 | 68\% |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 | 16:45 to 17:45 | 176 | 55 | 0.800 | 120 | 38 | 0.789 | 56 | 24 | 0.583 | 68\% |


| Code Land Use |  |  | Peak hour of the street system |  |  |  |  | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development in + Outbound | Development Inbound |  | Development Outbound |  | Inbound Split |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Code | Land Use |  | Peak hour of the development |  |  |  |  | East |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Period |  | Peak Hour (One Hour) | Development In + Outbound | Development Inbound |  | Development Outbound |  | Inbound Split |
| Peak Hour | Period |  | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol | PHF | Hour Vol 15-Min Vol | PHF |  |
| AM Peak | 06:00 to 09:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morning | 09:00 to 12:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midday | 12:00 to 14:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afternoon | 14:00 to 15:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:30 to 18:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX B

## Residential Development Intersections



Map B1: Church Street and Strachan-Rod Street Intersection


Map B2: Zambesi Drive and Zambezi Estate Avenue (Avocet) Intersection


Map B3: Brits Road (Rachel De Beer) and Doreen Road Intersection


Map B4: Hebron Road and Umphafa Street Intersection


[^0]

Map B6: Witch Hazel Avenue and Eco Park Boulevard Intersection


Map B7: John Vorster Drive and Karee Street Intersection

## Office Developments Intersections



Map B8: Meiring Naude and Quitin Brand Street Intersection (1)
Meiring Naude and Hotel Street Intersection (2)
Meiring Naude and CSIR Entrance Intersection (3)


Map B9: Soutpansberg Road and Foreign Affairs Intersection


Map B10: Witch Hazel Avenue and Ecopark Boulevard Intersection


Map B11: Matroosberg Street and River Walk Park Entrance Intersection

Industrial Development Intersections


Map B12: Waltloo Road and Kuit Street Intersection


Map B13: Pretoria Road and Fakkel Street Intersection (1)
Dykor Road and Moreleta Street Intersection (2)


Map B14: R566 and Ernest Opperheimer Street Intersection


Map B15: R55 and Ellman Street Intersection

## Institutional: Schools Intersections



Map B16: Hans Strijdom Drive and Boeing Street Intersection


Map B17: Soutpansberg Road and Wren Street Intersection


Map B18: Daan de Wet Nel Drive and Rene Road Intersection


Map B19: Anthesis Street and Cyme Crescent Intersection

## Retail Development Intersection



Map B20: Garstfontein Road and Philadelphia Avenue Intersection
De Villebois Mareuil Drive and Woodlake Boulevard Intersection


Map B21: Heinrich Drive and Madelief Avenue (Angelier) Intersection


Map B22: Maphalla Drive and J Letwaba Street Intersection

## Medical: Hospitals Developments Intersections



Map B23: Church and Kalafong Street Hospital Intersection


## Map B24: Simon Vermooten Drive and Lynnwood Intersection



Map B25: Cliffton Avenue and Cantonment Road Intersection


Map B26: Voortrekker Road and Malan Street Intersection

## Places of Worship Intersection



Map B27: De Villebois Mareuil Drive and Feverwood Road Intersection


Map B28: Genl. Louis Botha Drive and Hatfield Church Entrance Intersection


Map B29: Nellmapius Drive and Jan Smuts Avenue Intersection

APPENDIX C

Table C1: STATA Data Analysis Results


User: MH Phahlane
Project: Effect of land-use change on traffic PHF\{space -18\}

special Eaition
(R)
11.0 Copyright 1984-2009
statacorp
4905 Lakeway Drive
College Station, Texas 77845 USA
800-STATA-PC http://ww.stata.com
979-696-4600 stata@stata.com
979-696-4601 (fax)

30-student Stata 1ab perpetual license:
Serial number: 40110557797
Licensed to: zekele worku School of Business

Notes:

1. (/m\# option or -set memory-) 50.00 MB allocated to data
2. (/v\# option or -set maxvar-) 5000 maximum variables
checking http://www.stata.com for update... connection timed out -- see help r(2) for > troubleshooting
unable to check for update; verify Internet settings are correct.

- use " $\backslash \backslash$ smiicoryf007\private $\backslash$ Roads \& Stormwater $\backslash h e r b e r t p \backslash H e r b e r t \backslash M$-Tech $\backslash$ thesis $\backslash$ Chapt $\epsilon$
> r 4\RES.dta", clear
. list

1. 

| Church Street and Strachansection Street $\begin{gathered}\text { inter }\end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | approach North | peakperiod <br> 06:00 to 09:00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 06:30 | peakhour <br> to 07:30 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { phv } \\ 1846 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv}_{475} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .97 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t $18 \%$ |

2. 

|  | intersection |  | approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakperiod } \\ & 15: 30 \text { to } 18: 00 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour $16: 45 \text { to } 17: 45$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 904 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 242 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .93 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t 63\% |

3. 

| Zambezi Drive and | intersection zi Estate Street |  | approach North | peakperiod <br> 06:00 to 09:00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & 06: 45 \text { to } 07: 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 350 \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{minpv}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .89 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~ $t$ $40 \%$ |

4. 

| intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | approach | peakperiod <br> $15: 30$ to $18: 00$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 332 | 94 | .88 | $53 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

5. 

| Brits Road andintersection <br> Doreen Avenue |  | approach <br> South | peakperiod <br> 06:00 to 09:00 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |
| 06:30 to $07: 30$ | 266 | 78 | .85 | $38 \%$ |


| 6. | intersection |  |  | approach | peakperiod 15:30 to 18:00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | peakhour <br> $15: 45$ to $16: 45$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 267 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv} \\ 74 \end{array}$ | phf | inboun~t 57\% |
| 7. | intersection Hebron Road and Umphafa Street |  |  | approach South | peakperiod 06:00 to 09:00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & 06: 00 \text { to } 07: 00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 719 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv} \\ 210 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .86 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t $36 \%$ |
| 8. |  | intersection |  | approach | peakperiod 15:30 to 18:00 |
|  | $06: 15 \text { to } 07: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 765 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 210 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .91 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t 63\% |
| 9. |  | intersection |  | approach North | peakperiod 06:00 to 09:00 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & 06: 00 \text { to } 07: 00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 283 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 108 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .66 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { inboun~t } \\ 35 \% \end{array}$ |
| 10. |  | intersection |  | approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakperiod } \\ & 15: 30 \text { to } 18: 00 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | peakhour <br> $06: 15$ to $07: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 176 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv} \\ 55 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { phf } \\ .8 \end{array}$ | inboun~t 68\% |
| 11. | intersection <br> Cura Avenue and Stellenberg Road |  |  | approach North | peakperiod 06:00 to 09:00 |
|  | peakhour <br> 06:45 to 07:45 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 252 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv} \\ 84 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .75 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t 15\% |
| 12. |  | intersection |  | approach | peakperiod $15: 30 \text { to } 18: 00$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { peakhour } \\ 16: 30 \text { to } 17: 30 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 168 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 49 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .86 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { inboun~t } \\ 71 \% \end{array}$ |
| 13. | Stonewal1 Boulevard and old Farm Road |  |  | approach North | peakperiod $06: 00 \text { to 09:00 }$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { peakhour } \\ 07: 00 \text { to 08:00 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 447 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 129 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .87 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t $21 \%$ |
| 14. | intersection |  |  | approach | peakperiod |
|  | peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |

15. 

| intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | approach | peakperiod <br> $15: 30$ to $18: 00$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 584 | 177 | .83 | $69 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

16. 

| intersection <br> Farm Road and Hans Strijdom Drive |  |  | approach East | peakperiod $06: 00 \text { to 09:00 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & 07: 00 \text { to 08:00 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { phv } \\ 1531 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 435 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{phf} \\ & 88 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t $29 \%$ |

17. 

| intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | approach | peakperiod <br> $15: 30$ to $18: 00$ |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 1561 | 423 | .92 | $52 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |

18. 

| Witch Hazel Avenu | intersection Eco-park Boulevard |  | approach South | peakperiod $06: 00 \text { to 09:00 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & \text { 07:00 to 08:00 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 402 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \operatorname{minpv} \\ 113 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .89 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t 12\% |

19. 

| intersection |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| approach | peakperiod <br> $15: 30$ to $18: 00$ |  |  |  |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |
| $17: 00$ to $18: 00$ | 445 | 138 | .81 | $62 \%$ |

20. 

| John Vorster and |  | intersection Karee Street | approach East | $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakperiod } \\ & 06: 00 \text { to 09:00 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { peakhour } \\ & 07: 00 \text { to 08:00 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phv } \\ & 218 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { minpv } \\ 63 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phf } \\ & .86 \end{aligned}$ | inboun~t 24\% |

21. 

| intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | approach | peakperiod <br> $15: 30$ to $18: 00$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peakhour | phv | minpv | phf | inboun~t |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 208 | 65 | .8 | $60 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

summarize phv minpv phf

| Variable | obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| phv | 20 | 586.2 | 502.8359 | 168 | 1846 |
| minpv | 20 | 166 | 132.0977 | 49 | 475 |
| phf | 20 | .856 | .0687788 | .66 | .97 |

. tabulate phf, summarize (phf)

| PHF | Summary of PHF <br> Mean |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Std. Dev. | Freq. |  |  |
| .66 | .66000003 | 0 | 1 |
| .75 | .85000001 | 0 | 1 |
| .8 | .800 | 2 |  |
| .81 | .82999998 | 0 | 1 |
| .83 | .85000002 | 0 | 1 |
| .85 | .86000001 | 0 | 1 |
| .86 | .87 | 0 | 3 |
| .87 | .88 | 0 | 1 |
| .89 | .88999999 | 0 | 2 |
| .9 | .89999998 | 0 | 2 |
| .91 | .91000003 | 0 | 1 |
| .92 | .92000002 | 0 | 1 |
| .93 | .93000001 | 0 | 1 |
| .97 | .97000003 | 0 | 1 |
| Tota1 | .85600001 | .06877882 | 1 |

. tabulate peakhour

| Peak Hour | Freq. | Percent | Cum. |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $06: 00$ to $07: 00$ | 2 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| $06: 15$ to $07: 15$ | 2 | 10.00 | 20.00 |
| $06: 30$ to $07: 30$ | 2 | 10.00 | 30.00 |
| $06: 45$ to $07: 45$ | 2 | 10.00 | 40.00 |
| $07: 00$ to $08: 00$ | 4 | 20.00 | 60.00 |
| $15: 45$ to $16: 45$ | 1 | 5.00 | 65.00 |
| $16: 00$ to $17: 00$ | 2 | 10.00 | 75.00 |
| $16: 30$ to $17: 30$ | 1 | 5.00 | 80.00 |
| $16: 45$ to $17: 45$ | 3 | 15.00 | 95.00 |
| $17: 00$ to $18: 00$ | 1 | 5.00 | 100.00 |
| Total | 20 | 100.00 |  |

. tabulate phf inboundsplit

| PHF | 12\% | $15 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { split } \\ & 18 \% \end{aligned}$ | 21\% | 24\% | Tota 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| . 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| . 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| . 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| . 89 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| . 97 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 20 |



APPENDIX D

## Table D1: SIDRA Intersection Capacity Analysis Results, 0.86 PHF

## Brits Road and Doreen Avenue Intersection

New Site
Signals - Fixed Time Cycle Time $=70$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morlis |  | Demand Flow velals | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn vic | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back o Vehicles veh | Queve Distance $\qquad$ m | Prop. Queved | Effective Stop Rate perveh | Average <br> Speed <br> kmik |
| South: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L | 37 | 2.0 | 0.652 | 30.3 | LOS C | 6.5 | 46.2 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 33.4 |
| 2 | T | 79 | 2.0 | 0.652 | 22.1 | LOS C | 6.5 | 46.2 | 0.88 | 0.79 | 34.0 |
| 3 | R | 92 | 2.0 | 0.652 | 30.4 | LOS C | 6.5 | 46.2 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 33.3 |
| Approac |  | 208 | 2.0 | 0.652 | 27.2 | LOS C | 6.5 | 46.2 | 0.88 | 0.85 | 33.6 |
| East: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L | 40 | 2.0 | 0.505 | 22.8 | LOS C | 11.3 | 80.2 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 38.9 |
| 5 | T | 426 | 2.0 | 0.505 | 14.5 | LOS B | 11.3 | 80.2 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 40.5 |
| 6 | R | 173 | 2.0 | 0.737 | 40.7 | LOS D | 6.3 | 45.1 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 28.2 |
| Approac |  | 638 | 2.0 | 0.737 | 22.1 | LOS C | 11.3 | 80.2 | 0.82 | 0.74 | 36.2 |
| North: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L | 352 | 2.0 | 0.716 | 30.0 | LOS C | 14.1 | 100.4 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 33.1 |
| 8 | T | 52 | 2.0 | 0.716 | 21.8 | LOS C | 14.1 | 100.4 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 33.6 |
| 9 | R | 52 | 2.0 | 0.716 | 30.1 | LOS C | 14.1 | 100.4 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 33.0 |
| Approac |  | 457 | 2.0 | 0.716 | 29.1 | LOS C | 14.1 | 100.4 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 33.1 |
| West: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L | 29 | 2.0 | 0.660 | 24.3 | LOS C | 16.3 | 116.0 | 0.83 | 0.92 | 38.2 |
| 11 | T | 580 | 2.0 | 0.660 | 16.0 | LOS B | 16.3 | 116.0 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 39.3 |
| 12 | R | 37 | 2.0 | 0.168 | 28.3 | LOS C | 1.0 | 6.8 | 0.76 | 0.74 | 33.6 |
| Approac |  | 647 | 2.0 | 0.660 | 17.1 | LOS B | 16.3 | 116.0 | 0.83 | 0.75 | 38.9 |
| All Vehic | cles | 1950 | 2.0 | 0.737 | 22.6 | LOS C | 16.3 | 116.0 | 0.85 | 0.79 | 35.9 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
SIDRA Standard Delay Model used.

Table D2: SIDRA Intersection Capacity Analysis Results, 0.92 PHF

## Brits Road and Doreen Avenue Intersection

New Site
Signals - Fixed Time Cycle Time $=70$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mor 10 |  | Demand Flow venh | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back of Vehicles veh | Quelue Bistance m | Prop. Queued | Efiective Siop Rate per veh | Averege Speed kmin |
| South: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L | 35 | 2.0 | 0.548 | 27.9 | LOS C | 5.5 | 39.2 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 34.6 |
| 2 | T | 74 | 2.0 | 0.548 | 19.6 | LOS B | 5.5 | 39.2 | 0.84 | 0.71 | 35.5 |
| 3 | R | 86 | 2.0 | 0.548 | 28.0 | LOS C | 5.5 | 39.2 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 34.6 |
| Approac |  | 195 | 2.0 | 0.548 | 24.8 | LOS C | 5.5 | 39.2 | 0.84 | 0.79 | 34.9 |
| East: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L | 37 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 22.5 | LOS C | 10.3 | 73.5 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 39.0 |
| 5 | T | 398 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 14.2 | LOS B | 10.3 | 73.5 | 0.74 | 0.64 | 40.8 |
| 6 | R | 162 | 2.0 | 0.628 | 35.8 | LOS D | 5.4 | 38.1 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 30.1 |
| Approac |  | 597 | 2.0 | 0.628 | 20.6 | LOS C | 10.3 | 73.5 | 0.79 | 0.72 | 37.1 |
| North: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L | 329 | 2.0 | 0.657 | 28.3 | LOS C | 12.4 | 88.1 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 33.9 |
| 8 | T | 49 | 2.0 | 0.657 | 20.1 | LOS C | 12.4 | 88.1 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 34.6 |
| 9 | R | 49 | 2.0 | 0.657 | 28.5 | LOSC | 12.4 | 88.1 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 33.9 |
| Approac |  | 427 | 2.0 | 0.657 | 27.4 | LOS C | 12.4 | 88.1 | 0.89 | 0.84 | 34.0 |
| West: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L | 27 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 23.8 | LOS C | 14.8 | 105.4 | 0.81 | 0.92 | 38.4 |
| 11 | T | 542 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 15.6 | LOS B | 14.8 | 105.4 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 39.7 |
| 12 | R | 35 | 2.0 | 0.154 | 27.4 | LOS C | 0.9 | 6.2 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 34.1 |
| Approac |  | 604 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 16.6 | LOS B | 14.8 | 105.4 | 0.81 | 0.73 | 39.3 |
| All Vehi |  | 1823 | 2.0 | 0.657 | 21.3 | LOS C | 14.8 | 105.4 | 0.82 | 0.76 | 36.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if v/c>1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). SIDRA Standard Delay Model used.
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Table D3: SIDRA Intersection Capacity Analysis Results, 0.95 PHF

## Brits Road and Doreen Avenue Intersection

New Site
Signals - Fixed Time Cycle Time $=70$ seconds (User-Given Cycle Time)

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov ID |  | Demand Hlow vehila | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg } \\ \text { Sath } \\ \text { v/c } \end{gathered}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back o <br> Vehicles veh | Queue Distance $\qquad$ | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate perveh | Average Speed knul |
| South: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L | 34 | 2.0 | 0.478 | 26.4 | LOS C | 5.1 | 36.0 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 35.4 |
| 2 | T | 72 | 2.0 | 0.478 | 18.2 | LOS B | 5.1 | 36.0 | 0.80 | 0.68 | 36.5 |
| 3 | R | 83 | 2.0 | 0.478 | 26.5 | LOS C | 5.1 | 36.0 | 0.80 | 0.84 | 35.4 |
| Approac |  | 188 | 2.0 | 0.478 | 23.3 | LOS C | 5.1 | 36.0 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 35.8 |
| East: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | L | 36 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 23.1 | LOS C | 10.2 | 72.5 | 0.75 | 0.91 | 38.6 |
| 5 | T | 385 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 14.9 | LOS B | 10.2 | 72.5 | 0.75 | 0.65 | 40.3 |
| 6 | R | 157 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 36.3 | LOS D | 5.2 | 37.0 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 29.9 |
| Approac |  | 578 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 21.2 | LOS C | 10.2 | 72.5 | 0.80 | 0.72 | 36.7 |
| North: Doreen Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L | 319 | 2.0 | 0.605 | 27.1 | LOS C | 11.5 | 82.0 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 34.6 |
| 8 | T | 47 | 2.0 | 0.605 | 18.9 | LOS B | 11.5 | 82.0 | 0.86 | 0.74 | 35.4 |
| 9 | R | 47 | 2.0 | 0.605 | 27.2 | LOS C | 11.5 | 82.0 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 34.6 |
| Approac |  | 414 | 2.0 | 0.605 | 26.2 | LOS C | 11.5 | 82.0 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 34.7 |
| West: Brits Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | L | 26 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 24.5 | LOS C | 14.5 | 103.6 | 0.82 | 0.91 | 38.0 |
| 11 | T | 525 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 16.2 | LOS B | 14.5 | 103.6 | 0.82 | 0.72 | 39.2 |
| 12 | R | 34 | 2.0 | 0.151 | 28.2 | LOS C | 0.9 | 6.1 | 0.75 | 0.74 | 33.7 |
| Approach |  | 585 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 17.3 | LOS B | 14.5 | 103.6 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 38.8 |
| All Vehic |  | 1765 | 2.0 | 0.617 | 21.3 | LOS C | 14.5 | 103.6 | 0.82 | 0.76 | 36.8 |

Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 2010).
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $v / c$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
SIDRA Standard Delay Model used.


[^0]:    Map B5: Old Farm Road and Stonewall Boulevard Intersection (1)
    Hans Strijdom Drive and Old Farm Intersection (2) Cura Avenue and Stellenberg Road (3)

