Network Technical Guideline Supplement to Austroads Guide to Road Design (AGRD)

Part 1: Objectives of Road Design (2021)

Version 3.0, April 2021



Department of Transport

Supplement to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 1: Objectives of Road Design (2021)

This Supplement must be read in conjunction with the Austroads Guide to Road Design.

Reference to any Department of Transport or VicRoads or other documentation refers to the latest version as publicly available on the Department of Transport's or VicRoads website or other external source.

Document Purpose

This Supplement is to provide corrections, clarifications and additional information to the *Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 1: Objectives of Road Design* (2021). This Supplement refers to the content published in the 5.0 Edition of this part to the guide.

If this Part to the *Austroads Guide to Road Design* is updated, or the information is moved to another Austroads publication, then the content in this supplement should be adopted as supplementary content to the current equivalent Austroads content. Where there is conflicting content in this Supplement with updated content, contact the Department of Transport for clarification as to which content takes precedence.



| Version | Date | Description of Change |
|---------|------------|--|
| 1.0 | July 2010 | Development of Supplement |
| 1.1 | Sept 2010 | Minor updates and edits to text |
| 2.0 | Dec 2012 | Minor updates and edits to text |
| 3.0 | April 2021 | Major changes including document title and scope. See below: |

Additional notes on current version

This document has been updated to align with recent changes to the Austroads Guide to Road Design. AGRD Part 1, Part 2 and Part 8 have been consolidated into AGRD Part 1; Objectives of Road Design. As such, this supplement has been updated as follows:

VRS Supplement to AGRD – Introduction to VicRoads Supplement (v2.0) has been withdrawn and superseded by this Supplement.

VRS Supplement to AGRD Part 2 – Design considerations (v2.0) has been superseded by this Supplement. Content from VRS Supplement to AGRD Part 2 – Design considerations (v2.0) has been significantly updated, including:

- Additional embedment of Safe System principles
- Inclusion of Movement and Place considerations
- Inclusion of Maintainability considerations
- Various editorial changes.

VRS Supplement to AGRD Part 7 – Geotechnical investigation and design (v2.0) has been withdrawn and superseded by Appendix B of this Supplement. This update aligns with recent changes to the Austroads Guide to Road Design.

VRS Supplement to AGRD Part 8 – Process and documentation (v1.2) has been withdrawn and superseded by this Supplement. This update aligns with recent changes to the Austroads Guide to Road Design. Relevant content has been moved to Section 1.5.3 and Appendix A. Please note, this content is largely unchanged in this edition and will be updated in the next edition of this document.

Table of Contents

| 1 | Sco | pe of the Guide to Road Design | .5 |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | 1.1 | Introduction | 5 |
| | 1.2 | Guide to Road Design Purpose | 5 |
| | 1.3 | Application of the Guide to Road Design | 5 |
| | 1.4 | Parts of the Guide to Road Design | 5 |
| | 1.5 | Links to Other Guides | 5 |
| | 1.6 | Jurisdictional supplements | 6 |
| 2 | Roa | d Design across the Transport Management System | . 8 |
| | 2.1 | Road Management Phase Process | 8 |
| | 2.2 | Network Considerations and Outcomes | 8 |
| | 2.3 | Multi-Modal Considerations | 12 |
| 3 | Prir | ciples and Objectives of Road Design | 13 |
| | 3.1 | Definition of Road Design | 13 |
| | 3.2 | Road Design Principles | 13 |
| | 3.3 | Objectives of Road Design | 13 |
| | 3.4 | Geometric Consistency | 13 |
| | 3.5 | Future Technology Considerations | 13 |
| | 3.6 | Performance-based Design | 13 |
| | 3.7 | Community Expectations | 13 |
| | | | |
| 4 | Roa | d Design Application | 14 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 | d Design Application Road Characteristics and Use | 14 14 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 | Id Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design | 14 14 14 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 | Id Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design | 14 14 14 14 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 | A Design Application | 14 14 14 14 17 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 | A Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process | 14 14 14 14 17 22 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability | 14 14 14 17 22 22 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines | 14 14 14 17 22 22 22 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 |
| 5 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations | 14 14 14 17 22 22 22 23 25 |
| 4 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations General | 14 14 14 14 17 22 22 22 23 25 |
| 5 | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 | Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations General Design Reports | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix | Ad Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 26 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix 4 A.1 F | Ad Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations Road Design Process General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 26 26 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix 4 A.1 F A.2 [| Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations Road Design Process General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation Design Development | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 26 27 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix A A.1 F A.2 [A.3 [| Ad Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation Dreparation for Design Design Review, Verification and Validation | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix A.1 F A.2 [A.3 [A.3 [A.4 | ad Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations Road Design Process General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation Design Development Design Review, Verification and Validation Design Audit Process | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 26 27 28 28 |
| 4 5 Apper | Roa 4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5 4.6 4.7 4.8 The 5.1 5.2 ndix , A.1 F A.2 [A.3 [A.3 [A.3 [A.4 A.5 | ad Design Application Road Characteristics and Use Phases of Design Context-Sensitive Design The Design Domain Design Exception Process Design and Legal Liability Coordination of Disciplines Delivery Considerations Road Design Process General Design Reports A – Process and Documentation Design Review, Verification and Validation Design Audit Process Presentation of Outputs | 14 14 14 17 22 22 23 25 25 25 25 26 27 28 29 |

| Appendix C – Contract Review Checklist | 31 |
|--|----|
| Contract Review Checklist - Client Relationship | |
| Contract Review Checklist - Technical Relationship | 34 |
| Appendix D – Design Checklist and Aids | 37 |
| Horizontal Alignment Checklist | |
| Vertical Alignment | 40 |
| Coordination of Horizontal and Vertical Geometry | 42 |
| Intersection Functional Layouts | 46 |
| Drainage | 51 |
| Commentary 7 | 56 |



1 Scope of the Guide to Road Design

1.1 Introduction

No additional information

1.2 Guide to Road Design Purpose

Additional Information

The Austroads Guide to Road Design (AGRD) allows the Department of Transport (DoT) to develop supplementary material.

Where supplementary information is provided it will take precedence over the Austroads Guide to Road Design. The Department of Transport Supplements (##) have been developed to provide additional clarification to information within the guide and/or information to assist in the designing of roads and associated infrastructure that have not been addressed in the Austroads Guide to Road Design (AGRD).

All DoT Supplements to AGRD are freely available on the website.

V.1.2.1 Updates and Reviews

DoT will review and update the Supplements as required. These updates will be available on the website.

V.1.2.2 Contacts

Information or queries regarding the Supplements to Austroads Guide to Road Design can be obtained by emailing: safesystemengineering@roads.vic.gov.au

Further information about the Austroads Guides can be obtained from the Austroads website: www.austroads.com.au

1.3 Application of the Guide to Road Design

Additional Information

The Supplements must be read in conjunction with the corresponding Austroads Guide(s).

V.1.3.1 Inclusion by exception

Information has been included in the Supplement when DoT believes there is a need to provide local jurisdictional position or guidance, the topic was not sufficiently covered in the Austroads Guides, or further clarification was required.

V.1.3.2 Conflicting directions – precedence

Where a DoT Supplement is provided, it will take precedence over the Austroads Guide to Road Design.

1.4 Parts of the Guide to Road Design

No additional information

1.5 Links to Other Guides

No additional information

1.5.1 Guide to Road Safety

No additional information



1.5.2 Guide to Traffic Management

Additional Information

Refer to the Department of Transport's Traffic Engineering Manual (TEM) Volume 1 for the supplements to the Austroads Guide to Traffic Management.

https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/traffic-engineering

1.5.3 Terminology

Additional Information

| Design Brief | A document detailing the scope, content, and the design outputs of a project or design task. |
|-----------------------|---|
| Design Review | The planned and formally documented process carried out at appropriate stages of design where representatives of all functions and specialist disciplines evaluate the total design for function, safety, constructability, project specific requirements, aesthetics and economy. |
| Distinct Work Package | A design task or section of design for which all design data, acceptance criteria has been obtained, and the extent of the design work can be clearly defined. |
| Concept Design | A schematic drawing that may show the approximate location of the road alignment, and road configuration but does not necessarily fully consider all design controls or specify any dimensions or geometry set out details. Concept design is used to develop a functional layout. |
| Functional Design | Is a dimensioned drawing that shows the location of the road alignment, and complete road/lane configuration and may include geometry set out details. Functional design is sufficiently resolved and detailed to enable detail design to proceed without further significant changes to functionality. |
| Project Leader | Person responsible for managing the project resources and design activities. |
| Quality Plan | A document setting out the specific quality practices, resources, project responsibilities and sequence of activities, and cross reference to the design brief. |
| Verification | The formal documented processes carried out at appropriate stages of design by suitably qualified and competent persons to ensure that the design stage output has been accurately produced and meets the design stage input requirements. |

1.6 Jurisdictional supplements

Additional Information

DoT provides a Supplement for each part of the Austroads Guide to Road Design.

V1.6.1 Road Design Notes

The Department of Transport's RDN's (previously VicRoads Road Design Notes) are considered part of the Supplements to AGRD. They provide extra information to a specific topic that requires much more detail than can be provided in the Supplement.

RDN's are numbered so that the first two digits correspond to the relevant AGRD part.

V1.6.2 Technical Drawings for Roadworks

Technical drawings are intended to support the DoT Supplements to AGRD.

Guideline drawings

These drawings enhance the information provided in the Austroads and DoT guidelines. They provide a visual representation of specific road design elements to assist practitioners to develop design solutions for contexts being addressed. As such, they will often require site-specific customisation and engineering judgement to be applied in order to develop detailed design drawings.



Standard drawings

These drawings provide construction details commonly used by the Department of Transport. These drawings are highly repeatable and require very little site-specific customisation. They often form part of the tender documents for contracts. They should be used for construction and installation. They should be specified in the design/contract when and where they are suitable for use.



2 Road Design across the Transport Management System

2.1 Road Management Phase Process

No additional information

2.1.1 Road Planning

No additional information

2.2 Network Considerations and Outcomes

No additional information

2.2.1 The Safe System Approach

Additional Information

In accordance with Victoria's Road Safety Strategy and Action Plan, DoT is committed to the Safe System approach and Towards Zero objectives. At the core of this approach are three guiding principles:

- We all make mistakes, but this should not result in death or serious injury on our roads and road environments
- Our bodies can only withstand so much crash force before being seriously injured or killed, with some people being more vulnerable
- Everyone shares the responsibility to make our road system safer



Figure 1: The Safe System Approach

To achieve a meaningful transition towards Safe System, all DoT and Victorian Government road infrastructure projects are required to consider adoption and implementation of outcomes to reduce fatal and serious injuries.

Designing for a Safe System, requires road designers to apply standards, guidelines and best practice information such that those involved in the process acknowledge that the end product contributes to the vision to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries.

Designing for a Safe System is not the same as designing a road which simply meets a set of desirable values. By adopting good design process, road designers should feel confident that their design has optimised safety outcomes and will enable safe operation.



To assist designers, the following Safe System objectives have been developed for assimilation into the design process:

- **Application** ensure the application of Safe System principles, with prescribed standards and guidelines (but not limited to), are applied such that the ultimate solution aims to eliminate harm in combination with the other Safe System pillars.
- Shared Responsibility ensure that all parties involved in the planning, development, design, construction and operation of the road and/or roadside are aware and acknowledge that they have a responsibility to support wellbeing and provide a transport system that is forgiving when people make mistakes, so they are not fatally or seriously injured.
- **Evaluation** ensure that post project completion evaluations are undertaken to consider how effective a solution has been in aligning with Safe System principles and to capture any learnings during the planning and delivery stages to evolve and normalise current practice.

2.2.2 Design Considerations

No additional information

2.2.3 Designing for Safety

Road Safety Audits

Additional Information

Road Safety Audits (RSA) are to be undertaken in accordance with the *Austroads Guide to Road Safety -Part 6* and *Part 6a* and DoT's Road Safety Audit Policy and Procedure, by a company prequalified with DoT at the Road Safety Audit Level.

A RSA plan should be created at the beginning of the project's development lifecycle. The RSA plan should include;

- the number of RSA's that should be conducted over the project's development lifecycle
- at what project development stage the audit should be conducted

The RSA plan will depend on the nature, complexity and risk of the project. The RSA plan should also include the reasons for selecting RSA's at various stages of a project. In addition to this, the RSA plan should also include any exemptions to the requirement for Road Safety Audits.

Table 1 indicates when Road Safety Audits must be undertaken:

| Project Cost | Audit Stages Required |
|-----------------|--|
| >\$10.0m | Audits should be undertaken at all stages |
| \$0.5m to \$10m | Risk factors should be considered when determining the stages of audit. In general, at a minimum, audits should be undertaken at one of the design stages. |
| < \$0.5m | Risk factors should be considered when determining the stages of audit that should be carried out. |

Table 1: Project Requirements for a RSA

(Source: DoT RSA Policy and Procedure, October 2011, Rev 3)

Safe System Assessment

Additional Information

The Safe System Assessment (SSA) process has been developed to assess the extent to which a proposed infrastructure project aligns with Safe System principles and the objective to eliminate fatal and serious injuries. The process allows project options to be compared with a base case (i.e. existing conditions) and with each other.



SSA will identify areas where the risk of Fatal and Serious Injury (FSI) crashes is high and identifies design changes which, if adopted, improves alignment with the Safe System approach. If Safe System principles are being followed and applied correctly, there should be a trend towards zero in the SSA scores when progressing from existing conditions to the initial design options and, finally, to the adopted design.

Safe System Assessments must be undertaken in accordance with DoT's Safe System Assessment guidelines. https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/safe-system-engineering.

Safe System Assessments are also the current methodology for setting and measuring M&P performance indicators and targets for safety (Refer to Section 1.2).

| Project Cost | SSA Requirements | Type of Assessment |
|-----------------|--|---|
| >\$5m | A SSA must be conducted (including all projects submitted to DoT Governance Working Groups and Committees). | Full SSA for ALL projects |
| \$2m to \$5m | A SSA is desirable and is the preferred process to consider alignment of the project and design options with Safe System principles. Where a SSA is not undertaken, documentation of how the project has considered Safe System alignment shall be provided within the Project Review or relevant governance report, design report, or other suitable record. | Full SSA for: Complex projects Projects with a significant risk of FSI crashes Innovative projects Raid SSA for: Projects with a low risk of FSI crashes Repeat assessments for projects for which a Full SSA has been undertaken at an earlier stage |
| < \$2m | A SSA is optional. The benefits of conducting a SSA and the risk factors associated with the project should be considered in determining the need for a SSA. Where a SSA is not undertaken, documentation of how the project has considered Safe System alignment shall be provided within the Regional Review Committee (RRC) report, design report or other suitable record. | Rapid SSA where is has been determined that a formal assessment is required. |

Table 2: DoT Requirements for Safe System Assessments

(Source: DoT's Safe System Assessment Guideline, April 2019)

Undertaking Safe System Assessments (SSA) and Road Safety Audits (RSA)

The *DoT Safe System Assessment Guideline* outlines the appropriate stages of a project to undertake Safe System Assessments and/or Road Safety Audits. SSA and RSA should complement each other to optimise the road safety outcomes of a project.

A SSA will evaluate a project's alignment with Safe System principles and identify ways to improve the alignment with a focus on minimising fatal and serious injuries. It investigates the inherent risk of the infrastructure and includes consideration of road user exposure. SSA also look further to consider solutions or strategies that address all pillars of the Safe System. RSAs usually focus on the likelihood of a crash, regardless of severity, to ensure that no hazards are built into the road environment when a project is implemented.

2.2.4 Nature and Magnitude of Transport Demand

No additional information

2.2.5 Strategic Fit

Additional Information

Strategic fit of a project is vital for establishing design criteria, meeting competing network requirements and aligning with other projects in the wider network. Projects within Victoria must consider the following frameworks, strategies and plans:

Movement and Place (M&P)

M&P is a decision-making framework that outlines the competing interests on the transport links and reports performance in terms of movement, place, environment and safety outcomes. The Framework translates transport and land use plans and frameworks/network functions into 'one integrated network view' to guide projects and operational initiatives in a co-ordinated way. It sets out the classifications and performance levels that are needed to achieve transport network outcomes and objectives, and provides decision making guidance when considering how to balance movement, place, safety and environment.

The Movement and Place Framework is underpinned by four modules that build on one another:

- Module 1 Network Classification
- Module 2 Network Performance
- Module 3 Options Development
- Module 4 Options Assessment

The Movement and Place Framework is not a policy or planning document and does not set strategy, but rather consolidates the different plans and strategies into one framework. This framework consists of four themes; movement, place, safety and environment.

Each road and street (and sections of roads and streets) have been assigned M&P classifications associated with the vision for road-users and place attributes. These classifications inform "performance indictors" which are then measured using the specified tools to determine how the existing infrastructure aligns with the vision for the road and road environment. M&P performance indicators are also used to assess any options that are developed to determine how it aligns with this vision.

Relevant information can be found on the Department of Transport (DoT) website.

Cycling

Bicycle planning is driven by both Australian and Victorian strategies.

- The National Cycling Strategy
- The Victorian Cycling Strategy, including Strategic Cycling Corridors (SCCs)
- The Principal Bicycle Network (PBN), Metropolitan Trail Network (MTN) and Municipal Bicycle Network (MBN)

Relevant information can be found on the VicRoads website: https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/traffic-and-road-use/cycling/bicycle-network-planning

Walking

The Principal Pedestrian Network (PPN) was developed by the Victorian Government to facilitate network planning for walking. It aims to support and encourage walking by identifying routes that have the potential to carry more pedestrians walking to key destinations.

Relevant information can be found on the Victoria Walks website: https://www.victoriawalks.org.au/network_planning/

Freight

The Victorian Freight Plan – Delivering the Goods is the state-wide plan for freight. It sets out short, medium and long-term priorities to support our freight and logistics system through a period of unprecedented growth in freight volumes and rapid change in the broader environment, while allowing us to embrace new opportunities in the future.



Relevant information can be found on the Department of Transport (DoT) website: https://transport.vic.gov.au/ports-and-freight/freight-victoria

The heavy vehicle networks maps display roads that have been assessed for heavy vehicle access. These maps are available on the VicRoads website. https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/heavy-vehicle-industry/heavy-vehicle-map-networks-in-victoria.

Road Design Note 04-01 "Heavy Vehicle Network Access Considerations" (July 2019) provides guidance on the minimum requirements to be adopted to maintain the current and future performance of the network for large and heavy vehicles.

2.3 Multi-Modal Considerations

2.3.1 Freight

Additional Information

Refer to RDN 04-01 Heavy Vehicle Access Requirements for additional information about access requirements. https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/road-design

Refer to the VicRoads website for more information about Heavy Vehicle maps and considerations. https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/heavy-vehicle-industry

2.3.2 Public Transport

No additional information

2.3.3 Provision for Cyclists and Pedestrians

Additional information

DoT's M&P Framework uses cycling and pedestrian facilities and infrastructure as key inputs to assessing the performance of these modes.

2.3.4 Provision for Motorcyclists

Additional information

Refer to "Making roads motorcycle friendly" for guidance on designing for motorcyclists. https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/road-design

3 Principles and Objectives of Road Design

3.1 Definition of Road Design

No additional information

3.2 Road Design Principles

No additional information

3.3 Objectives of Road Design

No additional information

3.4 Geometric Consistency

No additional information

3.5 Future Technology Considerations

No additional information

3.6 Performance-based Design

Additional information

Performance-based design is a key feature of the Context Sensitive Design approach (See Section 4.3 of this supplement).

3.7 Community Expectations

Additional information

Meeting community expectations is a key feature of the Context Sensitive Design approach (See Section 4.3 of this supplement).

4 Road Design Application

4.1 Road Characteristics and Use

4.1.1 Functional Classification and Use

Additional Information

Refer to https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/traffic-and-road-use/road-network-and-performance/victorias-roadnetwork for further information on the classification of freeways and arterial roads within Victoria. DoT consider key principles in the classification of a range of roads, which are outlines in Section 14 of the Road Management Act 2004.

The M&P Framework is used to define movement and place functionality for both urban and rural roads.

4.1.2 Factors that Influence Design Standards

Additional Information

Human factors

It is important for road designers and traffic engineers to understand the limitations and capabilities of a wide range of road users when interacting with the asset to effectively make appropriate transport decisions when developing design solutions for infrastructure. Consideration of human factors also aligns with the philosophy of the Safe System approach discussed in Section 2.2.1 where it is recognised that humans are fallible and will inevitably make mistakes on the road.

DoT is developing further guidance on the concepts of human factors and specifically the considerations within Road Design.

4.2 Phases of Design

Additional Information

Many projects begin with an assessment of the network requirements through an M&P assessment and strategic planning study. Designers are being engaged to support this early phase of the design development. This phase is noted as 'Phase 0' to align with Figure 4.1.

Figure 2: Phases of Design



4.3 Context-Sensitive Design

Additional Information

Context Sensitive Design (CSD) is an approach which engages road-users and stakeholders to develop a site-specific design that best meets the objectives of the network, corridor or project (as appropriate) while minimising the impact on constraints. For some solutions, this will require designers to explore flexible design options that are not covered or recommended within existing guidance.

All designs are considered 'context-sensitive'. All solutions should be founded on consistent option comparison and decision-making, and must be developed using the following components:

- 1. Set 'Performance-Based Criteria' where relevant
- 2. Apply 'DoT Design Decision Making Principles'



- 3. Explore 'Flexible Design Solutions' where appropriate
- 4. Support 'Road-user Requirements and Stakeholder Engagement'

The key components of CSD and their application to developing design solutions are introduced below and further detailed in *RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects*.

V4.3.1 Performance-based criteria

Road design is rarely unconstrained and decisions must be made to balance the network-wide vision, the project purpose, best practice and site-specific constraints.

When possible, setting clear performance-based criteria for a project will enable the design team to compare multiple options, assess the effect on performance and determine which design option/decision is most suitable.

Performance-based criteria should be established based on Table 3 and adopted for all design projects.

| Criteria | Key Concepts |
|---------------------------|--|
| Network-wide Design | How well does the option align with the ultimate vision for the route and the transportation network? Network-wide objectives may be generic or detailed in nature, based on the current network plan and/or corridor plan. |
| Project Objectives | How well does the option meet the project objectives? Project objectives are typically defined in the scope, from the investment logic map or are the primary reasons for a project being initiated. |
| Road Design Objectives | How well does the option meet the road design objectives for safety, mobility, access, economy and environment? Road design objectives are discussed in Section 3.3 and are contained within relevant Standards and Guidelines. Road design objectives are set to achieve 'best practice' for a reasonable range of contexts and are constantly evolving. Road design objectives can be set for an overall design solution (macro) or a specific design element (micro). |
| Impact on constraints | What constraints does the option impact; to what extent are they impacted; what is the cost and consequence of the impact? Every project will have constraints, whether they are physical, cost or time, and the importance of these constraints will vary by project and site. |

Table 3: Performance-based criteria

Unless specified in the Design Brief, the relevant performance-based criteria must be sourced from relevant documents, such as the Client Requirements Document. The criteria should be documented in the Design Report and agreed to by the client. Ideally, there would be descriptors on how the designer should meet the criteria and the methodology for determining whether solutions achieve objectives using both quantitative and qualitative measures.

Refer RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects for additional guidance.

V4.3.2 DoT Design Decision Making Principles

DoT recommends a consistent and transparent principles-based approach to decision making. This encourages solutions tailored to particular situations and in compliance with reasonable engineering principles. Most of the DoT's decision-making principles have been embedded in the M&P framework.

The following DoT Design Decision Making Principles, shown in Table 4, should be used in the development of designs and used to justify and support engineering decisions that are made.



| Principles | Description |
|---|---|
| Safe System Principle | The road and road environment must support a vision of zero deaths and serious injury for all road users. |
| Road Network Efficiency Principle | The efficiency of the transport network will be maintained or enhanced in line with performance objectives including the Movement and Place framework |
| Community Wellbeing Principle | The wellbeing of the community is not adversely affected |
| Environmental Sustainability Principle | The environment – both natural and cultural – is not harmed |
| Utility Services Principle | Access to roadside utilities is preserved |
| Investment Benefit Principle | The project net benefits outweigh the costs |

Table 4: DoT Design Decision Making Principles

In addition, many DoT and Austroads standards and guidelines provide guidance for how to deal with a specific decision or exception. Project officers should adopt a holistic approach when applying guidance for, or assessing design details, seeking technical advice from designers where appropriate.

Refer RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects for additional guidance.

V4.3.3 Flexible Design

Flexible Design is a fundamental concept of the Context Sensitive Design approach. It allows the use of design values from any design domain (e.g. NDD or DE) as long as the combination produces a good design and an acceptable level of expected performance. Using a flexible design approach aligns with the aim of CSD to produce acceptable performance while minimising the impact on agreed constraints, and meeting the requirements and expectations of stakeholders and road-users.

Flexible Design discourages the practice of blindly following a standard or guideline without understanding of performance resulting from the design outcome. While a Normal Design Domain option is recommended for consideration on all projects, it is often found that the application of one or multiple values in the Extended Design Domain is the optimal design option given consideration of relevant performance-based criteria, site constraints and DoT Design Principles.

For example, a design option for an urban arterial road may have Stopping Sight Distance values from the Normal Design Domain, lane widths from the Extended Design Domain and offsets to barriers at pinch points that are Design Exceptions. Documentation of justification for the design decisions made and a record of approvals is required to be managed and maintained as part of the design process.

The application of design values is detailed in Section V4.4.3.1.

V4.3.4 Road-user Requirements and Stakeholder Engagement

Understanding the Road-user Requirements is critical to developing a design which is context-sensitive. The project team should document which road users should be prioritised an how their needs will be addressed in the development of options, including the level of service that is required to meet the minimum performance targets (as developed through a Movement and Place Assessment; Section 2.2.5).

The development of the project should occur in parallel with a road-user and stakeholder engagement plan. The development of a stakeholder engagement plan generally involves four components:

- 1. Identifying stakeholders
- 2. Consulting and engaging stakeholders at key stages
- 3. Selecting appropriate engagement techniques
- 4. Planning for implementation to ensure stakeholders are adequately consulted and support the project



A typical list of stakeholders may include:

- Adjacent property owners (residential, commercial, industrial, institutional—education, religious, government)
- Adjacent property renters (residential, commercial, industrial, institutional)
- Facility users (commuters, heavy vehicle operators, business customers, major regional employers)
- Local jurisdiction elected and appointed officials (city council officers)
- Local jurisdiction transportation or technical professionals (public works directors, traffic engineers, council planners)
- DoT Regional officers
- State transportation professionals (DoT highway designers, traffic engineers, environmental planners)
- Federal transportation professionals
- Transportation service providers
- Neighbourhood organizations
- Business organizations (local and regional Chambers of Commerce, economic development agencies, industry associations)
- Transportation interest groups (public transport, bicycle, pedestrian, motorcycle, heavy vehicles)
- Environmental interest groups
- Historic preservation and scenic conservation groups
- Growth management interest groups

Refer RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects for additional guidance.

4.4 The Design Domain

4.4.1 Normal Design Domain

Additional Information

Road design standards and guidelines such as Austroads Guide to Road Design, the DoT's Supplements and the Department of Transport's Road Design Notes contain a range of values that can be applied in various combinations to best suit the specific project objectives, context and constraints. This range of values are referred to as the Normal Design Domain (NDD). The Normal Design Domain values should be used wherever possible. Many of the values have been developed as a result of research and experience, and demonstrates acceptable performance for safety, mobility and access for a range of infrastructure solutions.

Typically, but not always, higher Normal Design Domain values have higher capital cost and provide greater benefit than lower Normal Design Domain Values (see Figure 3). However, applying Normal Design Domain values in certain circumstances may result in;

- significant impacts to constraints,
- outcomes that limit or prevent project objectives being met
- substantial increases in cost, project scope and project delivery

Options that include design criteria that are below the Normal Design Domain (NDD) may need to be developed (See *RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects Appendix C*). In constrained and existing built-up environments (sometimes referred to as brownfield projects), implementing design standards may significantly impact constraints such as existing buildings and property, utilities and the environment. These impacts on constraints may produce unfavourable and perhaps unacceptable outcomes for stakeholders and road-users. This will require the development of options which use a range of design values, including values that are below that which is stated in guidelines, to address the objectives that have been identified through a problem definition study.

While it is desirable to use Normal Design Domain values wherever possible, particularly where significant levels if demand are being catered for, it may not always be feasible. Section 4.3 of this supplement and



RDN 01-01 Context Sensitive Design (CSD) for Road Projects outlines a framework and states principles to help designers make good decisions using engineering judgement and a systematic approach.

4.4.2 Extended Design Domain

Departure/Substitution

Figure 3 shows that the Department of Transport considers Extended Design Domain to be a sub-set of Design Exceptions for the purpose of assessing and documenting design risk.

The application of Extended Design Domain criteria should be done in accordance with *RDN 01-02 Design Exception Reports (DER)*.

Designs containing Extended Design Domain criteria are required to complete a Design Exception Report (DER) to document the design with justification and assess the risk of adopting the selected design criteria for the project and context.

The decision whether to adopt Extended Design Domain (EDD) criteria is a Department of Transport's corporate responsibility for projects under its control or where the Department of Transport is the ultimate asset owner.

See V4.4.3.3 Acceptance of Design Criteria for information about the procedures for the acceptance of Design Exceptions including Extended Design Domain criteria.

4.4.3 Application of the Design Domains

Departure/Substitution

As shown in Figure 3, the Department of Transport considers Extended Design Domain (EDD) as a subset of Design Exceptions for the purposes of assessing and documenting risk. Designs which incorporate Design Exceptions are required to have the design documented in a Design Exception Report accepted by the client and ultimate asset owner. See *RDN 01-02 Design Exception Reports (DER)*.



Figure 3: Department of Transport's Design Domain Concept



V4.4.3.1 Selecting design values

Road Design requirements contained in guidelines, such as Austroads Guide to Road Design, DoT Supplements and DoT Road Design Notes, should be followed wherever possible, particularly on new (sometimes referred to as greenfield) projects. Road Design criteria provide a range of values, often labelled as minimum and desirable values, to allow designers to select values that best meet the project objectives and balance the impact on constraints.

When developing a design, the designer is required to select a value for each design element (such as horizontal curves, sight distance, geometric layout, lane width). Values for design elements are selected based on the following parameters:

- The 'design speed' that has been selected for the road or section of road (e.g. 60km/h, 80km/h, 100km/h)
- The anticipated or desired performance (safety, mobility and access, economy and environment) that will result from application of the value
- The performance of the design element in combination with other design elements (e.g. horizontal curve and lane width)
- How well the design option (combination of individual values) aligns with the project objectives
- The impact that it has on constraints (such property boundaries, utilities, environment)

Design options are developed by selecting different values and combinations of design elements. These design options may result in different performance outcomes which will be evaluated by the designer and project team to inform which option to proceed with.

All values used for a design, including justification for their selection, should be documented in the Design Report (see Section 5.2).

Where design values that have been selected are below NDD and have not been previously accepted or agreed by the client and ultimate asset owner (either in the project scope document or accepted at an early phase of design), then the design value must be documented in a Design Exception Report (DER) and accepted by DoT (refer to *RDN 01-02 Design Exception Reports (DER)*). Selecting Design Exception values based only on capital cost or budget constraints is not adequate justification for adopting Design Exceptions.

V4.4.3.2 Project Type and Design Criteria

The project type directly relates to the purpose of the project, which is defined as part of the project scope. The purpose of the project may be to transform the existing road environment, upgrade the road environment, undertake rehabilitation work on the existing road or do maintenance work on existing assets. The project type categorises the typical changes and associated design criteria that could be expected for the project. The decision to concentrate on a particular project type informs the designer of what changes to existing geometry and layout are reasonable to undertake as part of the project. Table 5 is a summary and a guide of the project types and the typical design criteria which could be used;

| Project Type | Changes to Existing Road | Typical Design Criteria |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| New Road or Duplication | A new road or duplication involving a new alignment or significant changes to existing geometry and intersections | NDD. EDD if context warrants. DE should be avoided. |
| Restoration (Major) | A project on an existing road involving major changes to the cross section, intersection layouts and significant changes to sections of targeted geometric improvements | NDD. EDD if context warrants. DE where it is prohibitively expensive to justify NDD criteria. |
| Restoration (Minor) | A project on an existing road involving minor changes to the cross section and intersection layouts while retaining the majority of existing geometry. | Retain existing design criteria and adopt flexible design criteria to upgrade existing design elements that contribute to poor current and/or future performance. |

Table 5: Project Type and Typical Design Criteria



| Project Type | Changes to Existing Road | Typical Design Criteria |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Maintenance & Improvement Works | A project involving maintenance and minor upgrades to seal width, barriers, intersection layout, signs and linemarking | Retain existing design criteria and adopt flexible design criteria to upgrade existing design elements that contribute to poor current and/or future performance. |

Note: Normal Design Domain (NDD), Extended Design Domain (EDD), Design Exception (DE)

For existing roads, the geometry and layout may not meet current design values (Normal Design Domain). However, this does not mean that all design elements that do not meet current standards have to be upgraded. The analysis of the existing geometry and layout should identify existing design elements that do not meet current standards and/or produce an acceptable level of performance (such as safety, or access and mobility). These design elements should be upgraded as they specifically relate to the project objectives.

It is quite likely that some projects may have a combination of project types for different sections of the project. Where this is the case, different design values may be used for different sections of the project. However, it is desirable to have a consistent road-user experience for a route. Therefore, the application of design criteria should be consistent for the project and route (network-wide design). Consistency of road-user experience is an important aspect of safety as it provides a self-explaining and predictable road environment.

During the early phases of a project (such as the concept design phase), design options may be developed using a main project type to help define the scope and objectives. For example, one option may be to realign the existing road to create a new carriageway. Another option may be to keep the existing carriageway with significant changes to horizontal and vertical alignment. Another option may be to keep the existing alignments and widen on the existing crossfall and superelevation. These options must be developed in line with the network-wide design objectives and the ultimate vision for the corridor (See Section V4.3.1) and documented in the Design Report (See Section 5.2).

V4.4.3.3 Acceptance of Design Criteria

Wherever design values adopted for the preferred design are below either the Normal Design Domain or an agreed standard, the designer is required to have the design criteria accepted by the DoT. Table 6 highlights some of the key design tasks and acceptance of key design elements typically associated with each design phase.

A project team (including the client) should establish gates or hold points throughout the development of the project where the project team and client agree on the design criteria that will be adopted as the project moves forward.

Design values for key design elements (such as horizontal and vertical alignment, typical cross sections, intersection layout and accesses) should be accepted early in the project development phase. When the preferred design includes Design Exceptions, it is important the design be assessed and accepted by the appropriate delegated officers, technical specialists and subject matter experts.

As the project develops it can be extremely difficult (if required) to adopt more conservative design values than those agreed for a previous phase, as this may result in increased project cost and impact on constraints.

For example, a project at the Concept Design phase may have adopted Design Exception values for the horizonal and vertical alignment. Values which were used may not be appropriate for the project or route (network-wide design). At the Preliminary Design phase of the project it may be very difficult to adopt more conservative design criteria than that which was used for the Concept Design as it may increase construction cost, increase impacts on constraints and result in significant changes to the construction timeline and footprint. This scenario may result in requests for decision-makers to make compromised or less than desirable decisions. These types of scenarios can be avoided, or minimised, by involving the right decision-makers and technical experts (with the appropriate delegation and experience) at the appropriate gates or hold points during project development.

For acceptance of the use of Design Exceptions (including EDD), where this criteria has not previously been agreed, the designer is required to document the design in a *Design Exception Report (DER)*. See Section 5.2.1 for more information.



| Design Phase | Typical tasks or Objectives | Criteria to be accepted |
|--|--|--|
| Strategic Network & Transport Options | Understand the project in the context of the Transportation Network Determine the modes of transport that will be prioritised along a route Understand the ultimate design vision for the route and determine the scope of the project with respect to the ultimate network-wide design Undertake a M&P assessment of the existing infrastructure and strategic options to determine mode priorities and objectives for the project | State assumptions and values of key design criteria that have been used to determine the feasibility of strategic options. |
| Concept Design & Route Selection | Determine the design criteria based on the project objectives Analysis of existing geometry and layout against current standards noting areas of poor performance Engage relevant road-user groups, stakeholders and community to understand their requirements for the project Map project constraints with available information and undertake specialist studies (environmental, geotechnical, heritage, property, hydrology, utilities) Explore 'Flexible Design Solutions' based on the project type (New Construction or Duplication, Major Reconstruction, Minor Construction, Maintenance and Improvement works) and major constraints (environment, property boundaries, utilities, structures) Select the preferred concept design option | Design Speed Horizontal Geometry Vertical Geometry Typical Cross Sections for major and significant minor roads (for example; lane widths, shoulder widths, median widths, offsets to barriers, hazards and roadside furniture) Intersection and Accesses type and layout including design and check vehicle swept paths, sight distance criteria Concepts for major structures such as bridges, retaining walls and culverts Concepts for major hydrology structures such as detention basins |
| Preliminary Design | Develop the preferred concept design based on additional information such as detailed 3D survey, results of specialist studies Develop using combinations of design criteria and evaluate variations to the design where decisions are required that affect road-user requirements and impact constraints Assess design variations based on the anticipated performance and determine the level of risk for each option Finalise the preliminary design | Detailed development and assessment of sight distance for intersections and accesses Reduced design criteria at locations where constraints (such as property boundaries, environment, heritage, utilities, drainage and structures) require trade-offs to be made |
| Detailed Design or Design for Construction | Develop design details of the preliminary design to prepare the design for construction Develop minor variations to the preferred option using a combination of design criteria to determine the best outcomes for road-users, stakeholders and impacts on constraints | Reductions to agreed design criteria where required based on additional details and requirements |

Table 6: Design Phase and Typical tasks and Design Criteria to be accepted

4.5 Design Exception Process

4.5.1 Design Exceptions

Additional Information

Design Exceptions are values which are below those published in the body of Austroads Guidelines and additional Department of Transport design guidance (including supplements and RDN's).

DoT's M&P Framework can also be applied to provide context and justification for the application of Design Exceptions.

The use of design values which are Design Exceptions should be done in accordance with *RDN 01-02 Design Exception Reports (DER)* and be documented in a Design Exception Report (DER).

Design Exceptions will require the acceptance of the client and ultimate asset owner.

4.5.2 Innovative and Emerging Treatments

Additional Information

The content of AGRD Part 7 relates to new and emerging treatments. These treatments are considered to be outside of EDD (i.e. Design Exceptions) and will require acceptance through the relevant governance processes before being adopted as a solution.

While several of these treatments have been trailed in Victoria, these solutions in this part are considered Design Exceptions unless DoT has published specific guidelines or publications stating saying otherwise.

4.5.3 Application of Guidelines

No additional information

4.6 Design and Legal Liability

4.6.1 Legal liability

No additional information

4.7 Coordination of Disciplines

Additional Information

Planning Factors

Refer to https://mapshare.vic.gov.au/vicplan/ for planning and zoning reports, including right of way boundaries.

Associated Designs

Refer to https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/pavementsgeotechnical-and-materials for pavement, geotechnical and material information for applications in Victoria.

Operational Factors

There is an increasing need from enforcement officers to ensure there are adequate areas to safely undertake enforcement activities such as inspecting large vehicles. Access to the roadside is also required to enable maintenance activities to be carried out. These needs must especially be considered where there are long lengths of road with safety barriers installed adjacent to shoulders. Guidance in balancing hazard protection and provision of space to facilitate maintenance and operational tasks is provided in Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 6: Roadside Design Safety and Barriers and the DoT Supplement.

Heavy vehicles

In the heavy vehicle industry, combinations of heavy vehicles prescribed in Austroads Design Vehicles and Turning Path Templates Guide are commonly used on the road network.



The Performance Based Standards (PBS) Scheme was developed to allow complying combinations of these heavy vehicles to operate safely and productively on networks that are designed for their level of performance. This scheme is based on the length of the vehicle, the trailer combination and the turning performance of the vehicle. Design guidance is provided in *RDN 04-01* which provides further information such as intersection design, check vehicles, swept path widths and movement and place framework limitations.

Table 7: PBS Level and equivalent Austroads Design Vehicles (for the purpose of swept path assessment)

| PBS Road Class | Austroads Vehicle |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| PBS Level 1 | 19m prime mover and semitrailer |
| PBS Level 2 | 26m B-double |
| PBS Level 3 | 35.4m B-Triple |
| PBS Level 4 | 53.5m Type 2 road train |

(Source: RDN 04-01, July 2019)

4.8 Delivery Considerations

No additional comments

4.8.1 Mechanism to Deliver Projects

No additional comments

4.8.2 Workplace Health and Safety/Safe Design

The Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004 ("OH&S Act") outlines the standards in health and safety in the workplace to help protect employees. It also aims to protect the health and safety of the public by work activities.

Specifically, designers and consultants must take careful consideration of Section 28 of the OH&S Act:

A person who designs a building or structure or part of a building or structure who knows, or ought reasonably to know, that the building or structure or the part of the building or structure is to be used as a workplace must ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that it is designed to be safe and without risks to the health of persons using it as a workplace for a purpose for which it was designed. ("Structures" shall be taken to include bridges, tunnels, culverts, roads, footpaths and landscaping).

Designers and consultants have a duty to meet the obligations outlined in the OH&S Act throughout the design development phase. They must take into account hazards associated with construction, inspections, repair, maintenance and demolition of the completed design. This includes, but not limited to, the following:

- Eliminate the need for traffic management and mechanical devices to maintain assets
- Eliminate risks of falls from heights
- Eliminate or minimise risks of tripping or slipping
- Eliminate risks of overturning plant due to uneven/unstable ground
- Provide safe access to carry out maintenance activities
- Minimise the risk of collisions by traffic; and
- Provide safe access for inspection of structures or any other asset

Designers may be required to engage with constructors and maintainers to ensure that the preferred design can be safely constructed, inspected, operated, maintained and decommissioned. For some projects, this will involve a formal "Safety in Design" workshop and report. However, irrespective of whether a formal "Safety in Design" assessment has been done for the design, it remains the responsibility of the designer to incorporate best practice into a design (and to seek out advice where necessary) to ensure that it is a 'safe design'.



Where OH&S requirements and design principles cannot be met, designers and consultants must provide the following to DoT:

- A report that includes an assessment carried out by the designer explaining the reasons as to why the above requirements cannot be met
- A risk assessment of hazards for the preferred design option including a risk rating and mitigation measures (where appropriate)
- A proposed alternative including how to mitigate any hazards caused by not meeting the above requirements; and
- The whole of life cost where it can be determined (including specific information in relation to the cost of maintenance) resulting from not meeting the above requirements. The cost to be costed on an annual basis for the design life of the asset.

Further information regarding the OH&S Act can be found at

https://www.worksafe.vic.gov.au/resources/summary-occupational-health-and-safety-act-2004-handbook-workplaces

https://www.worksafe.vic.gov.au/resources/designing-safer-buildings-and-structures

4.8.3 Constructability and Maintainability

Designs shall deliver a solution that meet DoT's requirements regarding maintenance:

- Reduce the need for ongoing maintenance by designing maintenance solutions that minimise interventions to maintain serviceability
- Reduce the costs of undertaking maintenance where maintenance is needed
- Eliminate disruption to traffic resulting from inspections and maintenance activities; and
- Innovate to design solutions with longer life and greater availability

Designers must be cognisant of current maintenance practices/procedures and the use of existing type approved products to determine whether they are the best or optimal for the design solution. The designers must consider maintainability within the "function" of the road during development of designs so that the maintainers are able to operate safely and the road user faces minimal disruption.

For each project, the delivery agency shall provide DoT with a maintainability report for each asset being constructed signed by a suitably qualified independent reviewer.

5 The Road Design Process

5.1 General

The Department of Transport's Policy and Programs Network Planning Division generally takes a lead role in the establishment and management of road network strategies and planning processes and should be consulted prior to commencement of studies.

5.2 Design Reports

Design Reports shall be prepared for all projects, irrespective of their size and scope. Documenting the design development process, including the components of CSD related decision making, must be included in the Design Report.

The success of a project depends on the design documentation being accurate and complete. Without these qualities, difficulties are more likely to arise both during the project tendering/procurement process or during construction. *Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 8: Process and Documentation* details the need for design documentation and provides guidance on preparing and developing designs..

To encompass the design development process, a 'Design Report' must be completed in order to:

- Demonstrate that the design has met all relevant requirements, and clearly describes the basis for judgement used during the design process
- Document how Safe System principles have been considered and applied in the design process
- Demonstrate that the design is context-sensitive through describing the application of the components of Context Sensitive Design (See Section 4.3)
- Document all Design Exception design elements, including a risk assessment and any mitigation measures
- Document the options which were explored and their reasons for not being adopted in the preferred design option
- Document any special features of the design that must not be varied in construction
- Document particular features of the design that require specific or "non-standard" maintenance procedures to be adopted
- Document the design criteria used and assumptions made during the design; and
- Record the various reports and other inputs used in completing the design.

A Design Report ensures that all key factors and design decisions are transferred to the next stage of the project and ultimately the operator of the asset. If necessary, decisions can be retraced by other stakeholders at a future date should there be a need to review (for example) project scoping decisions. While the Design Report may include progress updates on the design or construction of a project, this is not the only purpose of the report.

Appendix A – Process and Documentation

NOTE: This Appendix is largely unchanged in this edition and will be updated in the next edition of this Part.

This section has been moved from the now superseded VicRoads Supplement to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 8 – Process and Documentation.

Those engaged to undertake design works for DoT shall be accredited through DoT Prequalification Scheme. Accreditation through the scheme requires consultants to have an operational quality management system. Refer to the website for further details regarding these requirements.

A.1 Preparation for Design

A.1.1 Overview

No additional information

A.1.2 Design control process - the Relationship to ISO 9001

No additional information

A.1.3 Use of Design Control Aids

This Supplement includes a range of design control aids which may be used to assist in the preparation of a road design. These control aids are included in Appendix D.

A.1.4 Client and Designer Interaction

Additional Information

Project Leader's Responsibilities

The Project Leader should determine the degree of checking and review required for a project based on the assessment of:

- (a) the type of project
- (b) project complexity
- (c) knowledge and skills of the designer(s) involved and
- (d) technology being utilised, taking into account the clients requirements.

The Project Leader shall ensure that the control activities are adequately resourced, and sufficient time has been allocated. The verification activities shall be included in the project design program.

Where a verification activity identifies a conflict between the client's requirements and good design standards, principles, road safety, constructability and/or cost the Project Leader shall resolve the conflict with the client.

A.1.5 Scope of the Design

No additional information

A.1.6 Design Development Inputs

Road Safety Audits

Additional Information

DoT maintains a policy to undertake road safety audits throughout the planning, design and construction stages of road and bridge projects. Refer Section 2.2.3.1 – Road Safety Audits

A.1.7 Design Development Output

No additional information

A.2 Design Development

A.2.1 Overview

No additional information

A.2.2 Producing the Road Design

Designer's Responsibilities

Additional Information

A designer shall progressively check his/her own work during development of the design, recording clearly and concisely any design data used, calculations, analysis, considerations and assumption adopted. The design outputs should be in accordance with the project requirements and presentation standards.

A designer on reaching a checking hold point or completion of the design task shall:

- Compile all design data, design outputs and other relevant details
- Sign and date the above design documentation
- Advise the Project Leader that a checking hold point has been reached, or that the design task has been completed.

Where a design discrepancy has been identified either through self checking or by another checker, the designer shall review the implications of an amendment on associated design components.

A.2.3 Matters Specific to Each Design Phase

No additional information

A.2.4 Design Control

No additional information

A.2.5 Design Self Checks

No additional information

A.2.6 Design Interfaces

No additional information

A.2.7 Workplace Health and Safety/Safe Design

DoT, along with all agencies, consultants and contractors involved in the procurement and maintenance of assets, is required to consider the designer duties under Section 28 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004. Refer Section 4.8.2 - Workplace Health and Safety/Safe Design

A.2.8 Constructability and Maintainability

No additional information

A.2.9 Quantities

No additional information



A.3 Design Review, Verification and Validation

A.3.1 Overview

No additional information

A.3.2 Independence in the Process

No additional information

A.3.3 Design Review

No additional information

A.3.4 Additional Aspects to the Review Process

No additional information

A.3.5 Design Interface Review

No additional information

A.3.6 Incorporating the Review Response

No additional information

A.3.7 Dealing with Design Non-conformance/Departures

No additional information

Design Departures/Exceptions

Additional Information

Should a design exception be identified during the development of a road design, it is incumbent upon the designer to notify the client of this non-conformance within the design report. The client shall accept the design exception where they have the delegated authority to do so.

Refer Section 4.5 – Design Exception Process.

A.3.8 Dealing with Variations

No additional information

A.3.9 Design Development Verification

No additional information

A.3.10 Design Development Validation

No additional information

A.4 Design Audit Process

A.4.1 Overview

Documentation

Additional Information

The completed audit checklists provide a summary of the depth of design process review. Supportive evidence of the satisfactory completion and compliance with the control process needs to be maintained and would generally include:

• Minutes of meetings and discussions,



- Record of design variations,
- Record of design discrepancies,
- Correspondence (including e-mail and faxes) seeking clarification or requests for information.
- Program of works
- Checking documentation
- Design files, including package files.
- Corrective Action Requests.

A.4.2 Design Process Audit

No additional information

A.4.3 Design Product Audit

No additional information

A.5 Presentation of Outputs

A.5.1 Overview

DoT presentation requirements are available in DOT Final Drawing Presentation Guidelines, available on the website.

Checking Aids

Additional Information

The checking aids provided in Appendix VD are in two parts, (a) Designer Aids and (b) Co-ordination Review.

Designer Aids: provide a series of items that may assist a designer in questioning, identifying and tracking design issues that need to be considered. The use of these design prompts sheets is optional.

Co-ordination Review Aids: represents a generic design checklist that must be reviewed for appropriateness for each work package prior to adoption. Where more design check items are necessary they shall be added for completeness. The checklist should be used progressively throughout the development of the design by the designer and checker, rather than at the completion of the design in order to prevent significant redesign work due to errors.

A.5.2 Typical Sheets Contents

No additional information

A.5.3 Organisation of CADD Data

No additional information

A.5.4 Preparation of CADD Drawings

No additional information

A.5.5 Phase 2 – Design Composition

No additional information

A.5.6 Phase 3 – Design Composition

No additional information

A.5.7 Standard Feature labels for Data Groups

No additional information



A.5.8 Standard Symbols

No additional information

A.5.9 Supplementary Design Elements and Criteria

No additional information



Appendix B – Geotechnical Investigations and Design

Additional Information

Refer to https://www.vicroads.vic.gov.au/business-and-industry/technical-publications/pavementsgeotechnical-and-materials for test methods, codes of practice and technical documents to be applied in Victoria.

Appendix C – Contract Review Checklist

NOTE: These checklists are unchanged in this edition and will be updated in the next edition of this Part

These checklists have been moved from the now superseded VicRoads Supplement to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 8 – Process and Documentation.



Contract Review Checklist - Client Relationship

| Project Name: | | |
|------------------|------------|---------------------|
| Project Section: | Cha fro | chainage: rom to |
| Drawing No: | | |
| Reviewer: | Che | hecker: |

| REFERENCE | CHECK ITEMS | CHECK DATE | COMMENTS |
|-----------|--|---------------|----------|
| | Scope and extent of work | | |
| | Availability of the following information: | | |
| | Project concept report | | |
| | Environmental Effect Statement | | |
| | Materials investigation reports | | |
| | Design (concept) status report | | |
| | Traffic engineering reports | | |
| | Safety review report | | |
| | Availability of design data files: | | |
| | Survey files | | |
| | Design files | | |
| | Drawing files | | |
| | Utility services (existing & proposed) | | |
| | Design (concept) criteria specification: | | |
| | Listings of design guides | | |
| | Reference materials | | |
| | Standards adopted | | |
| | Environmental studies: | | |
| | Cultural Heritage site surveys | | |
| | Flora & fauna surveys | | |
| | Noise studies/surveys | | |
| | Community issues | | |
| | Community consultation involvement | | |
| | Time to be allowed | | |
| | Municipal and Planning Authority reqts: | | |
| | Environmental controls | | |
| | Conservation areas | | |
| | Historical buildings | | |
| | Planning permits | | |
| | Planning scheme classification | | |
| | ROW concerns/controls | | |



| REFERENCE | CHECK ITEMS | CHECK DATE | COMMENTS |
|-----------|--|---------------|----------|
| | Access controls | | |
| | Project staging requirements | | |
| | Project control requirements: | | |
| | Hold points | | |
| | Design reviews | | |
| | Road safety review | | |
| | Proof engineering | | |
| | Responsibility for Service Information: | | |
| | Contacting authorities | | |
| | Obtaining agreements/approvals | | |
| | Responsibility for decision making: | | |
| | Who is involved | | |
| | Who makes decisions | | |
| | List of project contact/liaison officers | | |
| | Project superintendent | | |
| | Project Quality Representative | | |
| | Process for design variations approval and variations | | |
| | Can the design concept be varied or alternative proposed | | |
| | What type of after service will be provided | | |
| | Type of documentation required: | | |
| | Hardcopy – Number of | | |
| | Electronic – Format | | |
| | Presentation of design: | | |
| | Colour photocopying | | |
| | Drawing size A3 | | |
| | Other | | |
| | Project time frame | | |
| | Budgetary / constraints | | |
| | Type of contract: | | |
| | Limiting fee | | |
| | Lump sum | | |
| | Fees for additional work | | |
| | Progressive payment | | |
| | Contract Conditions: | | |
| | Security deposit | | |
| | Retention money | | |
| | Liquidated damages | | |
| | Insurance policies | | |



Contract Review Checklist - Technical Relationship

| Project Name: | | |
|------------------|---|----------------------|
| Project Section: | C | Chainage: from to |
| Drawing No: | | |
| Reviewer: | c | Checker: |

| REFERENCE | CHECK ITEMS | CHECK DATE | COMMENTS |
|-----------|---|---------------|----------|
| | Concept and Functional Layout Review; | | |
| | Have the following design issues been considered: | | |
| | Road side features, e.g. landscape, environmental aspects | | |
| | Rest area and service centre locations | | |
| | Traffic volumes and turning movements | | |
| | Traffic composition | | |
| | Traffic lane widths | | |
| | Public transport lanes | | |
| | Emergency lanes | | |
| | Land acquisition | | |
| | Cross section elements | | |
| | ROW boundary constraints | | |
| | Vertical clearances along the project | | |
| | The operating speed along the project is consistent with: | | |
| | Topography | | |
| | Adjacent development | | |
| | Road function | | |
| | Cross section | | |
| | Road classification | | |
| | Road users expectation | | |
| | Functional Layout Review | | |
| | Alignment approaches to structures adequate with respect to: | | |
| | Horizontal & vertical curves | | |
| | Superelevation development | | |
| | Sight distance | | |
| | Horizontal and vertical alignments consistent with visibility requirements: | | |
| | Along the road and at junctions | | |
| | Access points | | |



| REFERENCE | CHECK ITEMS | CHECK DATE | COMMENTS |
|-----------|---|---------------|----------|
| | Pedestrian and cyclist crossings | | |
| | Is the frequency of crossing either too high or too low in relation to: | | |
| | Safety access | | |
| | Impact on surrounding/adjacent or superseded lengths of road | | |
| | Disruption to traffic movements | | |
| | Access of emergency vehicles & public transport | | |
| | Are all road users, including pedestrians and non motorised users provided for | | |
| | Do the proposed connections to the existing road occur at hazardous locations | | |
| | Future Development: | | |
| | Will the approved concept provide consistent design standards in relation to adjacent road standards | | |
| | Will future upgrading of the approved concept be possible without compromising safety and practices | | |
| | Has stage construction been addressed: | | |
| | Traffic operation | | |
| | Construction safety | | |
| | Side track connections | | |
| | Drainage | | |
| | What regulatory and statutory requirements affect or need to be addressed as part of the design | | |
| | Critical design control identified & information on cost of replacement, location adequately verified | | |
| | Design Data | | |
| | Site visit details verity design inputs and design controls | | |
| | Design input data adequacy: | | |
| | Environmental effect statement/EIS | | |
| | Materials investigation reports | | |
| | Design (concept) status reports | | |
| | Traffic engineering reports | | |
| | Safety review report | | |
| | Environmental studies | | |
| | Structure details | | |
| | Survey files | | |
| | Design files | | |
| | Drawing files | | |

| REFERENCE | CHECK ITEMS | CHECK DATE | COMMENTS |
|-----------|--|---------------|----------|
| | Utility services (existing & proposed) | | |
| | Listings of design guides | | |
| | Reference materials | | |
| | Standards adopted | | |
| | Other Details | | |



Appendix D – Design Checklist and Aids

NOTE: These checklists are unchanged in this edition and will be updated in the next edition of this Part

These checklists have been moved from the now superseded VicRoads Supplement to Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 8 – Process and Documentation.

The checklists have been structured into several columns covering:

- a) Reference: to provide a list of design references, or documentation that can be used to locate applicable standards and/or policy.
- b) Checklist Item: to provide a list of prompts that can be used as a reference during development of the design and independent checking.
- c) Designer Date: to assist in the tracking of the design checks by the designer and to record the depth of the checking. The column must be initialled and dated to verify that the check was completed.
- d) Check Date: to assist in the tracking of the design output checks and recording the depth of the review. The column must be initialled and dated to verify that the check was completed. (Note: This column has not been providing on the design prompt sheets).
- e) Comments: to provide for recording the outcomes of checks or responses that require further follow up. Supervisor agreements must be recorded or cross referenced in this column.

Legend:

- AGRD Austroads Guide to Road Design
- AGTM Austroads Guide to Traffic Management
- GTEP Austroads Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice (superseded)
- RDG VicRoads Road Design Guideline Part 7: Drainage (all other RDGs are superseded)
- RDN VicRoads Road Design Note (available on VicRoads website)
- Task Brief Design Specification
- TEM VicRoads Traffic Engineering Manual
- VRS VicRoads Supplement to AGRD (available through VicRoads website at its online bookshop)



| AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief | The selected horizontal alignment addresses: | | | |
| Contract Review | | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-3, 3-5, 3-8 | Operating speed | | | |
| | Existing terrain | | | |
| | Approach to bridge structures | | | |
| | Acquisition of land | | | |
| | Minimises conflict with services | | | |
| | Clearances to row boundaries | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Cross Section fits within the Right of Way and is consistent with: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-5, 3-6 | Operating speed | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-5 | Traffic composition | | | |
| These RDNs no longer exist | Services constraints | | | |
| Task brief | Selection of curves and spiral transitions | | | |
| Contract Review | address: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 3.8 | Radii and required lane width | | | |
| | Lateral friction factors | | | |
| | Distance between tangent points is adequate for superelevation development | | | |
| | Spiral lengths requirements | | | |
| | Isolated curves of small radius have been avoided | | | |
| | Effect of road curvature on stopping sight distance | | | |
| | Consistency of radii adopted along the alignment | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 3.6, 3-7.7 | Superelevation development length | | | |
| | Appropriate for the design speed and curve | | | |
| | Adequate for the development within straight or spiral | | | |
| | Been correctly located | | | |
| | Clear of bridge abutments | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-5, 3-7 | Sight distance requirements have been addressed: | | | |
| | Lateral sight distance | | | |
| | Entering sight distance | | | |
| | Approach sight distance | | | |
| | Safe intersection sight distance | | | |

Horizontal Alignment Checklist

| AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief | Noise wall locations | | | |
| Contract Review | | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 6B | | | | |
| RDN 06-01 | | | | |
| AGRD & VRS to AGRD Part 6-4.2, Part 3.5 RDN 06-02 | Location of safety barriers: | | | |
| | Terminal locations | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Objects being protected | | | |
| | Clear zones | | | |
| | Run-out areas | | | |
| Task brief | Landscape requirements | | | |
| Contract Review | | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 6B & Part 3-6.3 | | | | |
| | Batters slope | | | |
| | Land forming requirements | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-6 | Co-ordination of horizontal and vertical geometry | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-6 | Other horizontal criteria | | | |



Vertical Alignment

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8.5 | Maximum and minimum grades | | | |
| | Minimum | | | |
| | Maximum | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 7.7, 3-8, 3-8.5 | Location of horizontal curves and superelevation development | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8.2, 3-7, 3-8 | Vertical curves meet the design standards and requirements for: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8.6, | Sag curves | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8.6 | Crest curves | | | |
| | Provide appropriate vertical sight distance | | | |
| | Level of driver comfort | | | |
| | Use of straights and curves to provide a smooth gradeline without hidden dips | | | |
| | Co-ordination of horizontal and vertical curves | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | The vertical grading addresses: | | | |
| | Flood levels | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 7.7, 3-8 | Existing pavement levels | | | |
| | Superelevation requirements: | | | |
| | Rotation of pavement | | | |
| | Future overlay levels | | | |
| | Future overlay structures | | | |
| | Matching to bridge levels | | | |
| | Pavement depth on bridge structure been considered | | | |
| | Driver safety, comfort and vertical alignment appearance is satisfactory | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8 | Clearance to services and structures overhead | | | |
| | Underground | | | |
| | Lateral clearance | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Resheet / overlay controls | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3- 5 | Depth of cuts/fills: | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Batter slopes can be constructed taking into consideration the soil type/condition | | | |
| | Height of the batters not excessive | | | |
| | Batter slopes driveable | | | |
| | Benching required | | | |
| | Protection requirements | | | |
| | Erosion controls measures needed e.g. Beaching, catch drains | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Parts 4, 4A, & 4B AGTM/VRS Part 6 | Grades through intersections adequate for: | | | |
| | Sight distance | | | |
| | Stopping | | | |
| | Merge and diverge areas visible and of adequate length | | | |
| | Turning movements are not affected by adverse crossfall | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8 AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3, 7-4 | Adequate drainage provided at: | | | |
| | Vertical sag curves in cut | | | |
| | Large vertical crest curves in cut | | | |
| | Superelevation level points | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3- 9 | Adequacy of overtaking provisions | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8.7 | Earthwork quantities in balance | | | |
| | Other vertical grading criteria | | | |

Coordination of Horizontal and Vertical Geometry

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Horizontal control criteria | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-8, 3-6.3 | Minimum lateral clearance to non relocatable | | | |
| | Structures | | | |
| | Services | | | |
| | Features (monuments etc) | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Minimum clearance to row boundaries | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-3 | Operating speed | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7 | Horizontal curve criteria | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7.7, 3-7.3 | Superelevation requirements | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9 | Overtaking provisions | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Cross Section requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Location and type of grade separation interchange | | | |
| | Overpass | | | |
| | Underpass | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 4 & 4A AGTM & VRS Part 6 | Median, outer separator and emergency opening locations | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Public transport requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Stage construction requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Part 6A | Pedestrian and bicycle requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Other horizontal controls | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Vertical control constraints | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Structure clearance controls | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Structural depth | | | |
| | Bridge deck levels | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Clearances to services | | | |
| | Underground | | | |
| | Overhead | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Control levels | | | |
| | Building lines | | | |
| | Access level | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-1, 7-3, 7-4, 7-7 RDN 05-01 RDN 05-02 | Drainage controls | | | |
| | Flood levels | | | |
| | Culvert controls | | | |
| | Sub surface controls | | | |
| | Location of low points | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Crossfalls | | | |
| | Medians | | | |
| | Footpaths | | | |
| | Pavements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Resheet/overlay controls | | | |
| | Other vertical controls | | | |
| | Coordination of horizontal and vertical geometry | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8, 3-6 | Does the geometry conform with the terrain | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7 | Grade changes minimised | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8, 3-9 | Use of compound curves been avoided, if not are the curves of suitable radii | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Have adequate lengths of straight been provided | | | |
| | Between curves | | | |
| | For passing opportunities | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7, 3-8 | Horizontal and vertical geometry in phase: | | | |
| | Alignment appearance has no kinks or hidden dips | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Does the alignment provide a consistent standard free from sudden changes | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9 | Have sufficient passing opportunities been provided in accordance with all route requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | High vehicle detour been provided where there is conflict with vertical clearance | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7 | Location of adverse superelevation and curve radii | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8.7, 3-10 | Alignment approaches to structures are adequate with respect to: | | | |
| | Cut and fill | | | |
| | Bridge location clear of horizontal and vertical curves | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-3 | Operating speed for: | | | |
| | Main carriageways | | | |
| | Entry ramp | | | |
| | Exit ramp | | | |
| | Side roads | | | |
| | Access roads | | | |
| | Is the operation speed consistent for the alignment | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7, 3-5, 3-6 | Effect of horizontal and vertical geometry on sight distance taking into account: | | | |
| | Stopping sight correction factors | | | |
| | Horizontal and vertical approaches to curves | | | |
| | Design vehicles | | | |
| | Intersection | | | |
| | Property access | | | |
| | Structures | | | |
| | Pedestrians | | | |
| | Cyclists | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Part 4 AGRD & VRS Part 6A | Geometric design of the side road approaches have adequate sight distance to: | | | |
| | Intersection e.g. Traffic islands, linemarking & signage | | | |
| | Pedestrians | | | |
| | Cyclists | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7 | Superelevation rotation location with respect to: | | | |
| | Structures | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Intersections | | | |
| | Lengths of spirals | | | |
| | Sag and crest curves | | | |
| | Grading of outer edges of carriageways, kerb and channel, table drain | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-10.3 | The reduction in effective crossfall due to sleep down grades at horizontal curves | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-7, 3-8, 3-10 | Application of superelevation for each curve: | | | |
| | Super development | | | |
| | Relative grades | | | |
| | Longitudinal grades | | | |
| | Water flow depths | | | |
| | Location of flat spots | | | |
| | Crowing details | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-4 | Design levels controls have been addressed: | | | |
| | Building lines | | | |
| | Low points | | | |
| | Crossfall | | | |
| | Access points | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-4, 3-6 | Clearances horizontal and vertical boundaries address: | | | |
| | Services location and address | | | |
| | Batter location | | | |
| | Footpath | | | |
| | Bicycle path | | | |
| | Noise attenuation requirements | | | |
| | Landscape requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-4.1 | Construction staging controls have been addressed: | | | |
| | Operating speed for the departure and approach to the proposed design | | | |
| | Driver visibility to the change in road environment | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Other geometry coordination considerations: | | | |

| Intersection | Functional | Layouts |
|--------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Design criteria | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Traffic details | | | |
| | Volumes | | | |
| | Composition | | | |
| | Peak hour volumes | | | |
| | Traffic direction | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Pedestrian volumes and movements | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Design requirements | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 6A | Bicycle volumes and movements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 4-5 AGRD & VRS Part 6A | Design requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Traffic turning movements | | | |
| | Left turns | | | |
| | Right turns | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Design vehicles | | | |
| | Semi trailer | | | |
| | Restrictive access vehicles | | | |
| | Buses | | | |
| | Other | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Public transport requirements: | | | |
| | Bus stop locations | | | |
| | Mid block | | | |
| | Departure side of intersection | | | |
| | Approach side of intersection | | | |
| | Property access requirements and location | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Horizontal clearances to: | | | |
| | Row boundaries | | | |
| | Services | | | |
| | Structures | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3-5 | Operating speed on approach legs to intersection | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Intersection Cross Section: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 | Through lane widths | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-4 | Number of lanes | | | |
| | Auxiliary lane width | | | |
| | Median widths | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Right turn lane treatment: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4A | Lane width | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4A-3 | Right turn lane storage length | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9.9 AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Taper lengths | | | |
| | Deceleration length | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Left turn lane treatment | | | |
| | Free flow | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-4.3 AGRD & VRS Part 4-4.5 AGRD & VRS Part 4A-4.6, 4A-4.5, 4A- 8.3 | High angle | | | |
| | Lane width | | | |
| | Left turn lane storage length | | | |
| | Deceleration length | | | |
| | Acceleration length | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9.9 AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Taper length | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Pavement taper lengths | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4A-6 | Merge | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9 | Diverge | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Median treatment details: | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| AGRD & VRS Part 4-7 | Median widths | | | |
| | Island length | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Parking requirements: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Number of bays | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-4 | Parking | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8 | Vertical grades through intersection | | | |
| | Major road | | | |
| | Minor roads | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8, 3-Table 8.1 | Vertical clearances to: | | | |
| | Structures | | | |
| | Services | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-4 | Vertical grading controls | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4-10 | | | | |
| | Existing pavement levels | | | |
| | Pavement resheet depths | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Other design criteria | | | |
| | Intersection design checks | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-5 AGRD & VRS Part | Approach alignment to the intersection | | | |
| 4A | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Lane configuration not confusing | | | |
| | Safety roads clearly visible | | | |
| | Driver decisions kept to a minimum | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Alignment through the intersection not confusing to the driver | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Part 4 | Intersection departure alignment not confusing to driver | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4 & 4A | Intersection area clearly defined | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Intersection sight distance requirement been met on all approaches: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4 & 4A | Safe intersection sight distance | | | |
| | Entering sight distance | | | |
| | Approach sight distance | | | |



| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Lateral sight distance | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Driver sight cone satisfactory | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 AGRD & VRS Part 4A | Check truck stopping distance | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3 | Truck clearance time for crossing the intersection | | | |
| | Visibility of: | | | |
| | Islands (constructed and painted) | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-9 | Auxiliary lane treatments | | | |
| | Lane diverge treatments | | | |
| | Lane merge treatments | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8 | Clearances to services above ground and underground: | | | |
| | Gas mains | | | |
| | Electricity lines | | | |
| | Telephone lines, pits | | | |
| | Water mains | | | |
| | Sewage mains | | | |
| | Drainage pipes, pits | | | |
| | Oil pipelines | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 3-8.2, 3-10 | Clearance to structures | | | |
| | Bridge abutments | | | |
| | Building verandas | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4 & 4A | Island details and layout: | | | |
| | Meets minimum size | | | |
| | Size appropriate for storage of pedestrian signals and signs, pits | | | |
| | Approach nose radii | | | |
| | Departure nose radii | | | |
| | Island provides appropriate driver direction | | | |
| | Shape discourages way movement | | | |
| | Traffic lane offset clearances | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 4A-4 | Auxiliary lane treatments: | | | |
| | Approach to treatment vehicle to driver | | | |
| | Island nose shape appropriate for design vehicle turns | | | |
| | Turning templates for turns been checked | | | |
| Austroads Turning Templates | Turning movement for design vehicles provide for clearances: | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Pedestrian standing areas | | | |
| | Sign locations | | | |
| | Traffic signal locations | | | |
| | Other intersection geometry checks | | | |



Drainage

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Drainage control checks | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Drainage strategy | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Legal considerations | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Drainage authority requirements | | | |
| | Council | | | |
| | Melbourne water | | | |
| | Planning authorities | | | |
| | Developers | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-2 | Plans cover the entire catchment area and surface features relevant to drainage | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Drainage reserves | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Adjacent property use | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-2, 7-4, 7- 7 | Overland flow paths | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Environmental sensitive areas such as: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-6 | Erosion controls | | | |
| | Vegetation area | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Geological report | | | |
| | Ground water table level | | | |
| | Stratum layers | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Service location, size and depth of: | | | |
| | Electricity, water, sewage, gas, telephone | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 3- 8 | Clearance to services | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Location of outfalls and responsible authority | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-1, 7-4 | Area affected by floods and flood levels | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Details on the existing drainage system: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 | Design discharge | | | |
| | Pipe sizes | | | |
| | Time of concentration | | | |
| | Average recurrence interval | | | |
| | Minimum pipe grading | | | |
| | Drainage site inspection constraints/controls | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Design criteria | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3, 7-4 | Average recurrence interval for the design and hydraulic gradeline check | | | |
| | Coefficient of runoff for design and hydraulic gradeline check | | | |
| | Flow width | | | |
| | Freeboard requirements | | | |
| | Minimum and maximum | | | |
| | Pipe sizes | | | |
| | Pipe grading | | | |
| | Water velocities | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 6A | Cyclist and pedestrian requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Bridge design responsibilities | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3 | Construction staging | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Other drainage controls | | | |
| | General drainage checks | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | The grading of the road with respect to: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3, 7-4, 7- 7 | Flood levels | | | |
| | Ground water levels | | 1 | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | The flow across superelevation development | | | |
| | Acceptable flow width | | | |
| | Acceptable flow velocity | | | |
| | Outlet conditions | | | |
| | Subsurface drainage requirements | | | |
| | Landlocked sags | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Drainage diversions such as: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-6 | Table drains | | | |
| | Catch drains | | | |
| | Noise attenuation mounds | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-1, 7-4 | Strategic assessment of the contributing catchment and construction requirements | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Does the strategic location address: | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-1, 7-4 | Maintenance and construction Requirements | | | |
| | Network drainage checks | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-4, 7-6, 7- 7 | Appropriate pits types are provided at all low points in the: | | | |
| | Roadway | | | |
| | Median | | | |
| | Catch drains | | | |
| | Table drains | | | |
| | On the low side of superelevation in accordance with guidelines | | | |
| | Pit locations are not in conflict with: | | | |
| | Driveways | | | |
| | Pram crossings | | | |
| | Services | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-7 | Pavement surface flow widths are in accordance with the design criteria guidelines | | | |
| | Selection of the pipe network adopted is: | | | |
| | Visually cost efficient | | | |
| | Constructible | | | |
| | Road crossings are minimum | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-4 | Check pipe calculation components: | | | |
| | Area calculations including partial area affect | | | |
| | Discharge calculation | | | |
| | Grading | | | |
| | Size | | | |
| | Water velocity | | | |
| | Cover/clearances, e.g. Road, services | | | |
| | Settlement criteria | | | |
| | Ground water table level | | | |
| | SSDs outlet levels | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-4.9 | Check data used in hydraulic gradelines calculations | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-4.9 | Check hydraulic gradeline on drainage longitudinal plot | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 | For each segment of pipe: | | | |
| RDG Part 7-3, 7-4.7 | Calculation for: | | | |
| | 50 year Q | | | |
| | Pipe roughness | | | |
| | Reynolds No. | | | |
| | Selection of appropriate case A, B, C, or D | | | |
| | Estimation of pipe fiction losses | | | |
| | Fiction factor "f" from moody diagram | | | |
| | For each segment of pipe: | | | |
| | Level of the hydraulic gradeline in the downstream end of pipe | | | |
| | Water level in the upstream pit | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-4.1.3 | Provision for major storms | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-6 | Outfall protection treatment: | | | |
| | Beaching | | | |
| | Grading | | | |
| | Litter and debris traps | | | |
| | Detention storage | | | |
| | Culvert design checks | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3 | Culvert shape suits natural waterways | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-3 | Check culvert calculation components | | | |
| | Area calculations including partial area affect | 1 | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|---|----------------|---------------|----------|
| | Ground water table level | | | |
| | Discharge calculation | | | |
| | Grading | | | |
| | Size | | | |
| | Determination of | | | |
| | Allowable headwater | | | |
| | Tailwater | | | |
| | Critical depth flow | | | |
| | Outlet velocity | | | |
| | Drawdown affect | | | |
| | Application of inlet and outlet control nomography | | | |
| | Cover/clearances, e.g. Road, services | | | |
| | Settlement criteria | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Beaching requirements | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-6 | Energy dissipater requirements | | | |
| | Catch and table drain checks | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-6 | Catch drain and table drain checks: | | | |
| | Level of the water compared to the top of bank | | | |
| | Level of water compared to the subgrade level of the road | | | |
| | Flow velocity values to prevent scouring | | | |
| | Level of water compared to the ssdp outlets | | | |
| | Debris control measures | | | |
| | Sub surface drainage checks | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5 | Pavement depth compared to ssdp drain depth | | | |
| | Formation drain depth compared to ssdp drain depth | | | |
| | Cut and fill transition locations | | | |
| | Ground water levels | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5.2 | The relative permeability of the pavement materials and the surrounding materials | | | |

| New AGRD/VRS Reference | Checklist Item | Design Date | Check Date | Comments |
|--|--|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5.2 | Use of impervious collector pipes from subsurface drains | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5.2 | Sub surface pipe grading | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5 | SSDs provide for: | | | |
| | Flat pavement | | | |
| | Cut/fill lines | | | |
| | Pavement widening trenches | | | |
| | End of structures | | | |
| AGRD & VRS Part 5 RDG Part 7-5 | Sub surface inlet and outlet | | | |
| | Spacing | | | |
| | Preliminary levels | | | |
| | Drainage pit levels | | | |
| | Table drain levels | | | |
| | Location | | | |
| | Quality extraction | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Quantity and costs: | | | |
| | Pits | | | |
| | Special pits | | | |
| | Pipe length | | | |
| Task brief Contract Review | Other drainage checks | | | |
| | | | | |

Commentary 7

Additional Information

An EDD value can only be used on DoT projects with explicit approval by DoT. Applications for approval shall be supported by a documented risk assessment that justifies the use of the value and a proposal for the use of appropriate mitigation measures/devices. Refer to Section 4.5.1 of this Supplement for guidance.

Department of Transport 2020

Except for any logos, emblems, trademarks, artwork and photography this document is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia license. Please contact Department of Transport for an accessible version.