ONE HORTON HEATH



# The Folds

## Transport Assessment

December 2025

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL | Investing in **our** community

# Transport Assessment

The Folds, One Horton Heath

December 2025

Prepared for:
Eastleigh Borough Council (One Horton Heath Team)

Prepared by:
Stantec UK Ltd

Project Number:
332612639

| Revision | Description | Author | Date | Quality Check | Date | Independent Review | Date |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| V0.1 | DRAFT | TH | Oct 2025 | JH | Oct 2025 | DM | Oct 2025 |
| V0.2 | Final | TH | Nov 2025 | JH | Nov 2025 | JH | Nov 2025 |
| V0.3 | Dwelling No. Adjustments | TH | Dec 2025 | JH | Dec 2025 | JH | Dec 2025 |

The conclusions in the Report titled **The Folds, One Horton Heath** are Stantec's professional opinion, as of the time of the Report, and concerning the scope described in the Report. The opinions in the document are based on conditions and information existing at the time the scope of work was conducted and do not take into account any subsequent changes. The Report relates solely to the specific project for which Stantec was retained and the stated purpose for which the Report was prepared. The Report is not to be used or relied on for any variation or extension of the project, or for any other project or purpose, and any unauthorized use or reliance is at the recipient's own risk.

Stantec has assumed all information received from Client (the "Client") and third parties in the preparation of the Report to be correct. While Stantec has exercised a customary level of judgment or due diligence in the use of such information, Stantec assumes no responsibility for the consequences of any error or omission contained therein.

This Report is intended solely for use by the Client in accordance with Stantec's contract with the Client. While the Report may be provided by the Client to applicable authorities having jurisdiction and to other third parties in connection with the project, Stantec disclaims any legal duty based upon warranty, reliance or any other theory to any third party, and will not be liable to such third party for any damages or losses of any kind that may result.

Prepared by: T. Harland
TH

Thea Harland

Reviewed by: J. House
JH

Joe House

Approved by: D. McDougall
DM

Doug McDougall

# Contents

**1 Introduction ..... 6**
1.1 Overview ..... 6
1.2 The Folds ..... 6
1.3 Parkside Character Area ..... 7
1.4 Scoping ..... 8
1.5 Policy Overview ..... 8
1.6 Travel Plan ..... 9
1.7 Report Structure ..... 9
**2 Planning Background ..... 10**
2.1 Introduction ..... 10
2.2 Extant Consents (O/14/75735 and O/16/79354) ..... 10
2.3 Outline Planning Permission (OPP) (O/20/89498) ..... 10
2.4 Lower Acre (F/20/89500) ..... 11
2.5 The Avenue (F/21/91185) ..... 11
2.6 Secondary Inner Distributor *"SID"* Road (F/23/96631) ..... 11
2.7 Overview ..... 13
**3 The Folds ..... 14**
3.1 Accommodation Schedule ..... 14
3.2 Car Parking Provision ..... 14
3.3 Cycle Parking ..... 16
**4 Internal Roads, Connectivity and Layout ..... 17**
4.1 Overview ..... 17
4.2 Wider OHH Access Connectivity ..... 17
4.3 Internal Junction Design ..... 17
4.4 Road Hierarchy ..... 19
4.5 Delivery, Servicing and Refuse Strategy ..... 20
4.6 Bus Strategy ..... 21
4.7 Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity and Crossing Point Design ..... 22
**5 Proposed Trip Generation ..... 26**
5.1 Introduction ..... 26
5.2 The Folds Residential Trip Generation ..... 26
5.3 Residential Trip Distribution ..... 27
5.4 Parkside Total Trip Generation ..... 29
**6 Background OHH Development Vehicle Trips ..... 30**
6.1 Introduction ..... 30
6.2 Wider OHH Development Vehicle Trips ..... 30
6.3 Local Centre Trip Generation ..... 31
6.4 School Trip Generation ..... 31
6.5 Fir Tree Lane Through Trips ..... 31
6.6 Total 'Other' Trip Generation ..... 32

6.7 Future Year (incl Development) Network ..... 32
**7 Highways Capacity Assessments ..... 34**
7.1 Introduction ..... 34
7.2 Scope of Junction Assessments ..... 34
7.3 Junction Capacity Assessment Results ..... 35
7.4 Sensitivity Test ..... 37
7.5 Summary ..... 37
**8 Summary and Conclusion ..... 38**

# Figures

Figure 1.1: Parkside Character Area ..... 7
Figure 2.1: The Avenue and The SID Road Plan ..... 12
Figure 4.1: Internal Vehicle Access Arrangements ..... 18
Figure 4.2: Road Hierarchy ..... 20
Figure 4.3: Bus Stop Radius ..... 22
Figure 4.4: Fir Tree Lane Concept Images ..... 23
Figure 4.5: Proposed Active Travel Infrastructure ..... 25
Figure 5.1: Residential Distribution via OHH Site Accesses ..... 28
Figure 6.1: SID Road / The Avenue Junction Predicated Trip Generation ..... 30
Figure 7.1: Assessed Junctions ..... 35

# Tables

Table 3.1: Accommodation Schedule ..... 14
Table 3.2: Proposed Parking Standards ..... 14
Table 3.3: Proposed Parking Provision ..... 15
Table 3.4: EBC Minimum Cycle Parking Requirements and Proposed Quantum ..... 16
Table 4.1: Road Hierarchy and Dimensions ..... 19
Table 5.1: Residential Trip Rates and Trip Generation, Rounded ..... 26
Table 5.2: Residential Trip Generation External and Internal Split, Rounded ..... 27
Table 5.3: RMA Trip Generation and Internal Trips ..... 29
Table 5.4: Parkside Trip Generation and Internal Trips, Rounded ..... 29
Table 6.1: Wider OHH Background Trip Generation on SID Road ..... 31
Table 6.2: Fir Tree Lane – Allington Lane Roundabout Through Trips Calculation ..... 32
Table 7.1: Junction 1 The SID Road / The Homestal Junction Assessment Outputs ..... 35
Table 7.2: Junction 2 The SID Road / The Folds Western Access Junction Assessment Outputs ..... 36
Table 7.3: Junction 3 The SID Road / The Folds Eastern Access Junction Assessment Outputs ..... 36
Table 7.4: Junction 4 The Folds Eastern Access / Fir Tree Lane Junction Assessment Outputs ..... 37

# Appendices

Appendix A The Folds Landscape Masterplan
Appendix B Visibility Splay Assessment Drawings
Appendix C Swept Path Analysis Drawings
Appendix D Network Diagrams
Appendix E Junctions 11 Outputs

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Overview

1.1.1 Stantec UK Ltd have been commissioned by Eastleigh Borough Council (One Horton Heath Team) to support the Reserved Matters Application (RMA) for The Folds at One Horton Heath, Land west of Burnetts Lane, Eastleigh, SO30 2HH.

1.1.2 One Horton Heath is a major mixed-use development, located within the administrative area of Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC), which was granted Outline Planning Permission (LPA ref no. O/20/89498) in October 2025 for up to 2,500 homes, a local centre, a primary school and commercial floorspace. This RMA Application will be submitted pursuant to Condition 4 of the Outline Planning Permission (OPP) which states that:

> *"4. The permission hereby granted is an outline permission and an application for the approval by the Local Planning Authority of the following reserved matters (for at least the first phase of residential development) shall be made no later than the expiration of 18 months beginning with the date of this permission:*
>
> *a) layout*
>
> *b) scale*
>
> *c) appearance*
>
> *d) landscaping of the site*
>
> *The development shall accord with the approved details."*

1.1.3 Within the OPP, all matters were reserved except the access arrangements. This RMA relates to the erection of 629 dwellings within Phases 17 (named The Folds) of the OPP.

1.1.4 This Transport Assessment (TA) details the following reserved transport and highways matters for The Folds:

- Accommodation schedule;
- Parking strategy;
- Road layout, design and hierarchy;
- Site connectivity and crossing point design;
- Refuse strategy; and
- Internal junction design and assessment.

## 1.2 The Folds

1.2.1 The Folds is situated in the north-easternmost part of the OPP site. The Site is comprised predominantly of open agricultural land, though a small collection of temporary and ancillary buildings project into the centre of the site from the south-eastern corner.

1.2.2 The site is bound by dense woodland of Quobleigh Woods to the north which visually and physically separates the Site from the built form of the new residential development to the north-west along Allington Lane. An established hedgerow runs along the entirety of the Site's western


boundary, separating The Folds from The Homestal, leading from Quobleigh Woods in the north to Fir Tree Lane to the south.

1.2.3 The eastern portion of The Folds is laid to grass, though the eastern boundary is similarly demarcated by dense soft landscaping separating the Site from the residential built form beyond.

## 1.3 Parkside Character Area

1.3.1 In line with the August 2025 Design Code, The Folds is a part of combined 'Parkside' character area of the wider OHH development. The Parkside consists of the area set out in **Figure 1.1** which comprises of three residential parcels: The Holme, The Homestal and The Folds. The Holme and Homestal are situated to the west and the south-west of The Folds, and a separate RMA is being prepared and submitted for these parcels.

Figure 1.1: Parkside Character Area



1.3.2 The secondary inner distributor (SID) road routes between The Avenue (within Quobleigh Breach) and the Lower Acre development to the south via through The Holme and past the Local Centre.

1.3.3 The Parkside has been designed to incorporate high quality pedestrian and cycle facilities, enabling sustainable accessibility within parcels, the wider OHH development and to the surrounding local area.

1.3.4 Due to their proximity and inter-connected infrastructure, the total traffic generated from the three parcels in the Parkside and the wider OHH development have been assessed together in line with the OPP, as set out in **Section 7**.

1.3.5 A masterplan of The Folds has been included in **Appendix A**.

## 1.4 Scoping

1.4.1 This TA has been prepared following pre-application discussions held with Hampshire County Council (HCC) officers on 31st July 2025. Stantec prepared a presentation which set out the key matters to be covered within the RMA TA for The Folds, in addition to the other parcels in the Parkside: The Holme and Homestal.

1.4.2 Parking has been a central point of discussion with EBC as it forms a key element of how the masterplan designs have evolved. A parking note was prepared by Stantec with the proposed bespoke car parking standards for the Parkside and submitted to EBC as the LPA who are generally comfortable with the principles proposed for this RMA. The proposed parking standards have been set out in **Section 3** of this TA.

## 1.5 Policy Overview

1.5.1 This TA has been prepared in accordance with and refers to the following policy documents and design guidance:

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**: This document sets out the governments planning policies for England and how they are to be applied. The NPPF was initially published in 2012 and was most recently updated in December 2024. Section 9 is titled Promoting Sustainable Transport consisting of paragraphs 109 to 118 which have been adhered to within this TA.

- **The National Planning Practice Guidance** (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2014): The NPPG is a web-based collection of guidance which provides more detailed specifications for travel plans, transport assessments, and statements. This TA has been prepared in line with the NPPG.

- **Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan (2016 – 2036)**: The EBC Local Plan was adopted in April 2022 and sets out the policies and plans to guide development to 2036. This has been reviewed and Policy MD13 which the use of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans in relation to general development criteria in regard to transport.

- **Eastleigh Borough Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2025)**: The EBC Parking Standards SPD were adopted in September 2025 and have been referenced throughout this TA in regard to car and cycle parking, EV charging and car clubs.

- **Manual for Streets (2007)**: MfS was published by the Department for Transport in 2007 and sets out national guidance for the design for residential streets.

- **UK Building Regulations**: The UK Building Regulations set out the legal standards for the design and construction of buildings to ensure safety, health, welfare, energy efficiency and accessibility requirements are met for new buildings.

## 1.6 Travel Plan

1.6.1 A Residential Travel Plan has been prepared for The Folds and should be read in tandem with this TA.

## 1.7 Report Structure

1.7.1 This TA consists of the following sections:

- **Section 2: Planning Background** – This section details the planning background associated with the wider OHH development which comprises of multiple applications. It also signposts information that has been used from other applications that have fed into the internal junction assessment in this TA.

- **Section 3: The Folds** – This section sets out the accommodation schedule for the parcel, in addition to the car and cycle parking strategy.

- **Section 4: Internal Roads, Connectivity and Layout** – The access arrangements for the parcel is detailed in this section consisting of the layout, design details, active travel infrastructure and road hierarchy. Furthermore, the delivery and servicing strategy is set out in this section.

- **Section 5: Proposed Trip Generation** – This section sets out the proposed trip generation for The Folds, in addition to the total trip generation for the Parkside.

- **Section 6: Background OHH Development Vehicle Trips**: This section sets out the background traffic which has been included in the highways capacity assessment.

- **Section 7: Highways Capacity Assessment** – Four internal junctions have been considered as a part of the junction assessment which are to be used by future residents and other site users. The outputs of Junctions 11 modelling are included in this section in addition to a sensitivity test.

- **Section 8: Summary and Conclusions**.

# 2 Planning Background

## 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The wider OHH development has extensive planning history which is set out in this section, including live applications and the sections of OHH that have been / are in the process of being constructed. It also signposts information which has been used to inform this TA.

## 2.2 Extant Consents (O/14/75735 and O/16/79354)

2.2.1 The land associated with the wider OHH development currently has two planning permissions which permit, inter alia, the construction of up to 1,400 residential dwellings across two sites and a new link road from Bubb Lane to Allington Lane. The main access roundabouts located at the north (Allington Lane) and south (Burnetts Lane / Bubb Lane) have been built out following the consent of this application.

## 2.3 Outline Planning Permission (OPP) (O/20/89498)

2.3.1 As aforementioned in **Section 1**, outline planning for the OHH development which was granted permission in October 2025 for the following:

*"Outline: Phased mixed-use development comprising severable and separate phases of development (as per the Phasing Plan) consisting:*

- *Up to 2,500 residential units in total (across The Lower Acre, Quobleigh Breach, The Upper Acre, Round Copse, The Holme, The Homestal, Chalcroft Farm and The Folds phases and partially within Chalcroft Outfarm Works phase);*
- *A Local Centre (and supporting secondary local centres) on land up to 3.1ha comprising mixed-use residential / retail / leisure / community / employment / day nursery / food establishment uses (Local Centre Phase);*
- *Further non-residential floorspace on land up to 5ha comprising of office, commercial and industrial uses and general industrial and storage & distribution uses (Chalcroft Outfarm works and Fir Tree Farm Hub phases and partially within the Chalcroft Farm Phases);*
- *A 3FE Primary School (Primary School Phase);*
- *Public open space including formal sports facilities and informal provisions (across Green Infrastructure Phases);*
- *Allotments, ecological, landscape and sustainable drainage works;*
- *Key infrastructure and utilities provision including new roads, footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths;*
- *Vehicular access from Allington Lane, Fir Tree Lane and Burnetts Lane with improvements to the existing road junction at Fir Tree Lane / Burnetts Lane; and*
- *Site preparation and demolition works."*

2.3.2 The OPP was all matters reserved except the access arrangements and set out the wider masterplan and locations of parcels and land uses within the site.

2.3.3 The TA submitted for the OPP was prepared by Paul Basham Associates Ltd. (Doc Ref: 039.0014/TA/2). This set out trip rates for each land use and assessed the impact of the

development on the surrounding highway network. This considered a comprehensive number of junctions in the local vicinity of the wider OHH development, and three main accesses.

2.3.4 The residential trip rates set out in the OPP TA have been used to calculate the residential trip generation for The Folds and the Parkside. Furthermore, the distribution of residential trips via the three main accesses have also been used. This is detailed in **Section 5** of this report.

## 2.4 Lower Acre (F/20/89500)

2.4.1 Planning permission was granted in December 2022 for the residential parcel named *'Lower Acre'* located to the south of the OHH development. This application was submitted as a standalone application and complies with the OPP. The construction of this parcel is underway and will comprise of a mix of houses and flats with a total of 381 dwellings. The first homes are anticipated to be occupied early 2026.

2.4.2 The transport and highways documents associated with this application have been reviewed in the preparation of this TA.

## 2.5 The Avenue (F/21/91185)

2.5.1 Planning permission was granted in October 2022 for the construction of the main spine road, 'The Avenue' which routes between Allington Lane (to the north of the OHH site) and Burnetts Lane (to the south of the site) with associated footway, cycle paths, water crossings, drainage and landscaping.

2.5.2 The Avenue forms a key link road through the centre of the development and will carry construction traffic to the site, avoiding the village of Horton Heath. The road consists of a dual carriageway with a 30-mph speed restriction, and three junctions to provide access to future residential and commercial parcels. The Avenue opened in September 2025.

2.5.3 The 2021 TA prepared for this application was authored by Paul Basham Associated Ltd (Doc Ref: 131.0008/TA/1). The report set out an impact assessment which included internal junction modelling of access roads off The Avenue, including the access from The Avenue to the Parkside. The trips associated with this junction have been used for this TA, as detailed in **Section 6**.


## 2.6 Secondary Inner Distributor *"SID"* Road (F/23/96631)

2.6.1 An application has been submitted for the construction of the SID road; a secondary link road which connects the northern part of the Lower Acre parcel at its southern end to The Avenue via The Holme residential parcel. The SID Road will also connect to Fir Tree Lane at the join of The Holme and The Folds. This is a key application for The Folds as it forms the main access points to each parcel. At the time of writing this report, this application is awaiting planning permission.

2.6.2 A Transport Statement (TS) was prepared by Campbell Reith Consulting Engineers in December 2023. This included an impact assessment which considered the SID road junction with The Avenue (the same junction referenced in **Paragraph 2.5.3** above) and the school access which is to be located between the Local Centre and Upper Acre. The flows in this impact assessment have been used as a part of this TA and will be detailed further in **Section 6** of this report.

2.6.3 **Figure 2.1** illustrates the location of The Avenue and the SID road in relation to wider OHH development land uses. The Avenue is highlighted in orange routing in the north – south direction through the OHH site. The SID Road is in dashed purple which routes around the solar farm at the centre of OHH.

Figure 2.1: The Avenue and The SID Road Plan



## 2.7 Overview

2.7.1 This section has set out the relevant planning applications to this RMA TA, and are summarised below:

- There are two extant consents in place at the wider OHH development under applications O/14/75735 and O/16/79354 for up to 1,400 residential dwellings across two sites and a new link road;

- Outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access was granted in October 2025 for up to 2,500 residential dwellings, a local centre, commercial units, a primary school, public open space, sports facilities, allotments, landscaping, and key infrastructure under reference (O/20/89498);

- Phase 1 of OHH consists of Lower Acre residential parcel with 381 residential dwellings under application F/20/89500. This was granted permission in 2022 and, at the time of writing this report, is currently under construction;

- An application was approved in 2022 for the spine road named 'The Avenue' which routes between the two main site access points at Allington Lane to the north and Burnetts Lane to the south (F/21/91185). The Avenue opened in September 2025; and

- An application for the secondary inner distributor road is awaiting planning consent (F/23/96631). This road routes from The Avenue via The Holme and Local Centre to the northern portion of Lower Acre via the School. This is a key application for this RMA as the road would provide access to The Folds.

# 3 The Folds

## 3.1 Accommodation Schedule

3.1.1 In line with the parcel masterplan included in **Appendix A**, the development proposals consist of the construction of up to 629 residential dwellings within The Folds. The accommodation schedule for parcel is set out below in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1: Accommodation Schedule

| Unit Type | Size | The Folds |
|---|---|---|
| Houses | 2 Bed | 105 |
| | 3 Bed | 122 |
| | 4 Bed | 30 |
| Older Person Flats | 1 Bed | 10 |
| | 2 Bed | 25 |
| Flat / Apartment | 1 Bed | 153 |
| | 2 Bed | 184 |
| Total | | 629 |

## 3.2 Car Parking Provision

3.2.1 The development proposals have carefully considered the future parking needs of the parcel, taking into account the Site's location, its future relationship to the forthcoming highways infrastructure, and the planned development of a new local centre and primary school. It is proposed that a bespoke parking provision is applied to the development parcel which is a reduction to the EBC Parking Standards (Adopted September 2025). This approach has been discussed with the LPA during the pre-application process.

3.2.2 **Table 3.2** sets out the proposed parking standards that have been applied.

Table 3.2: Proposed Parking Standards

| Unit Type | Size | Allocated Space (per dwelling) | Visitor / Unallocated Space (per dwelling) | Total Formal Spaces |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Houses / Flats | 1-2 Bed | 1 | 0.2 | 1.2 |
| | 3-4 Bed | 2 | 0.4 | 2.4 |
| Older Person Housing | 1-2 Bed | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.8 |

3.2.3 The proposed parking standards applied to the development schedule set out in **Table 3.1** results in the parking provision set out in **Table 3.3**.

Table 3.3: Proposed Parking Provision

| Unit Type | Size | The Folds | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Allocated On Plot | Allocated Off Plot | Visitor | Total |
| Houses | 1B2P | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2B4P | 0 | 105 | 21 | 126 |
| | 3B6P | 46 | 198 | 49 | 293 |
| | 4B7P & 4B8P | 54 | 6 | 12 | 72 |
| Older Person Housing | 1B2P | 0 | 6 | 5 | 26* |
| | 2B4P | 0 | 15 | | |
| Flats | 1B2P | 0 | 153 | 30 | 183 |
| | 2B4P | 0 | 184 | 37 | 221 |
| Total | | 100 | 667 | 154 | 921 |

**The parking provision for the older persons apartment block is 2 visitor spaces below the required number, however, should demand require these additional spaces there is scope to convert adjacent landscaping areas.*

3.2.4 Parking will be delivered through a range of methods, including on-plot spaces, on-street provision, and courtyard parking. The strategy ensures all dwellings have access to at least one allocated space, which are to be supplemented by a higher than required level of formal unallocated / visitor spaces.

3.2.5 A total of 154 visitor / unallocated spaces is to be provided as formal parking spaces spread throughout the development parcel. The masterplan in **Appendix A** displays the parking arrangements.

3.2.6 Application for the full parking requirement set out in the EBC Parking Standards SPD would generate a need for 1,023 spaces. The Folds will collectively deliver 921 formally laid our car parking spaces, representing a ratio of 1.46 spaces per dwelling. The proposed parking to support the RMA would be 10% lower than EBCs parking standards.

3.2.7 It is considered that the proposed parking strategy for the development parcel and the wider masterplan provides a balance between meeting residential parking needs and promoting long term sustainable travel objectives. By prioritising walking and cycling infrastructure, ensuring convenient access to public transport and the local centre, and incorporating car clubs, the strategy aims to reduce reliance on private vehicles and encourage more sustainable modes of travel. These elements are explored further in other sections of this report.

## Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

3.2.8 As a part of the bespoke parking strategy, there is a specific proposed electric vehicle charging provision. Of the allocated spaces provided per house or apartment, one active electric vehicle charging space will be provided.

## Car Club Strategy

3.2.9 EBC Parking Standards SPD recommends that new residential developments have the provision for a car club to be implemented on site. Car club spaces are to be situated in readily accessible locations within the development and clearly marked up and provided with EV charging points.

3.2.10 A minimum requirement for car club vehicles is 1 car per 100 dwellings. This equates to 7 spaces across The Folds in addition to the 921 set out above. The masterplan included in **Appendix A** highlights the location of these car club spaces. This provision will enable future

car club operators to come forward to implement this service at the site. EBC expect future car club providers to be CoMo accredited in line with the Parking Standards SPD.

## 3.3 Cycle Parking

3.3.1 The proposed cycle parking will be provided in line with EBC minimum requirements for long term cycle storage for Houses (*Table 3 of SPD*) and Apartments (*Table 4 of SPD*). **Table 3.4** sets out the minimum cycle parking requirements and the proposed quantum for The Folds.

Table 3.4: EBC Minimum Cycle Parking Requirements and Proposed Quantum

| **Dwelling Type** | **Minimum Requirement** (spaces per dwelling) | **Proposed Provision** |
|---|---|---|
| | Long Term (Resident Parking) | The Folds |
| 1 Bed House | 1 | 0 |
| 2 to 3 Bed House | 2 | 454 |
| 4+ Bed House | 3 | 90 |
| 1 & 2 Bed Flats | 1 | 556 |
| Total | - | 1,100 |

3.3.2 For houses, space to store cycles will be provided in the gardens of dwellings. Secure and accessible cycle parking will be located within communal stores within the apartment blocks. Additional short term visitor cycle parking will be accommodated for within private gardens and sheds.

# 4 Internal Roads, Connectivity and Layout

## 4.1 Overview

4.1.1 The internal layout and access arrangements have been informed by the framework parameter plans approved as part of the OPP for the wider OHH development and Design Code. As aforementioned, the application for the SID Road (Ref: F/23/96631) is yet to be determined, but for the purposes of assessing this RMA it has been assumed that the SID Road will be approved and constructed.

4.1.2 The layout has evolved through the process of the planning application to respond not only to highway matters but also those relating to planning, urban design, landscape and ecology.

## 4.2 Wider OHH Access Connectivity

4.2.1 Vehicular access to The Folds from the external roads will be via the three main access points that will serve the wider OHH development:

- The Avenue / Allington Lane Roundabout (north),
- The Avenue / Burnetts Lane / Roundabouts (south), and
- Fir Tree Lane (east).

4.2.2 The SID Road is subject to a separate planning application and does not for part of this RM application. To the north The Avenue provides access to the Quobleigh Breach junction with the minor arm being the new SID Road which heads east, then south, broadly parallel to The Avenue, and passes the School Access. Eventually the SID Road rejoins The Avenue further south via Lower Acre.

4.2.3 The SID Road bypasses through The Holme in an east – west direction. The SID Road is 6.5m wide and is subject to a 30mph speed limit. As aforementioned, planning application ref F/23/96631 provides the detail of the SID Road including the junction of The Avenue / SID Road located to the west of The Holme.

4.2.4 For the SID Road, the proposed use of conditions is extensive covering off the locations of bus stops and how bus services will serve the local centre. The use of conditions allowing for future changes to the side road junctions, detailed junction layouts and the positioning of crossings has also been agreed.

## 4.3 Internal Junction Design

4.3.1 Within the adjacent development parcel, The Holme, the SID Road runs centrally through the site and provides three main vehicular junctions serving the Parkside development parcels, including The Folds. These junction arrangements with the SID Road have been considered as part of the TA prepared for The Holme and Homestal RMA.

4.3.2 Access to The Folds will be provided via two roads extending north from the SID Road. The western access road will initially serve homes within The Holme before crossing Fir Tree Lane and continuing into The Folds. The eastern access road, extending up to its junction with Fir Tree Lane, forms part of the SID Road application and provides the second point of access to The Folds. At this location, a priority junction will connect to Fir Tree Lane to the east.

4.3.3 The proposed access roads and key junctions serving this RM development parcel, and the wider Parkside area, are illustrated in **Figure 4.1** and numbered as follows:

- Junction 1: The SID Road / The Homestal access;
- Junction 2: The SID Road / The Folds (western access);
- Junction 3: The SID Road / The Folds (eastern access); and
- Junction 4: The Folds (eastern access) / Fir Tree Lane. This junction also has an access only entrance to an existing residential dwelling located on the western side of the junction.

Figure 4.1: Internal Vehicle Access Arrangements




4.3.4 The junction design principals of the SID Road application, that were subject to extensive engagement with HCC Highways, have been retained for the four proposed junctions in question and have been designed as simple priority-controlled junctions with a 6.5m wide major arm (the SID Road and eastern access to The Folds).

4.3.5 The western and eastern access roads into The Folds are 6.0 and 6.5m wide respectively. Once within the development parcel and north of Fir Tree Lane, the internal road will have a narrower width of 5.5m.

4.3.6 For The Folds / Fir Tree Lane junction (Junction 4), Fir Tree Lane will have a future carriageway width of 5.5m which is representative of the widening improvement proposed to the lane to the east towards Burnetts Lane.

**Visibility Splays**

4.3.7 At all internal residential accesses that provide access to the mews streets and parking courts within the development parcel, they are designed with a 15-20mph design speed in mind. As a minimum, unobstructed visibility splays of 2.0m x 17.0m have been provided and more generally visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m are provided for.

4.3.8 Where a shared-use footway/cycle track crosses a minor arm or access road, cycle path visibility splays have been provided to the nearest edge of the shared use path which in accordance with LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design require splays of 2.4m x 17m for cycle design speed of 20kmh.

4.3.9 Within The Folds, there are instances within the parking courts and tertiary streets where the internal road alignments have tight bends with a reduced forward visibility splay. In such locations the character of the area and the road alignment will support lower vehicle speeds on the approach and therefore provide a forward visibility that accords with a design speed of 10mph.

4.3.10 A series of drawings (**332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5009** to **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5012**) showing the visibility splays assessment across The Folds have been included within **Appendix B**.

## 4.4 Road Hierarchy

4.4.1 All internal roads, including the SID Road, are to be unadopted. Aside from the SID Road, the internal roads within the parcel have been designed to a 20mph or less standard. A road hierarchy has been developed with the Architecture team to provide '*Primary'*, '*Secondary'* and *'Mews / Parking Courtyards'* or '*Tertiary'* streets.

4.4.2 The following table sets out the street geometries of each of the internal road types have been designed in accordance with Manual for Streets (MfS) and Hampshire County Council Technical Guidance Note TG1 – Highways Cross Section.


Table 4.1: Road Hierarchy and Dimensions

| Road Type | Design Feature |
|---|---|
| Primary | Road width of 6.0 – 6.5m |
| | Designed to 20 mph speed limit standards |
| | No on street parking will be provided along Primary Streets |
| Secondary | Road width of 5.5m and increased to effective width of 6.0m when there is on-street parking |
| | On-Street perpendicular parking with integrated between landscaping |
| | Designed to 20 mph speed limit standards |
| Tertiary / Mews / Parking Courtyards | Road width of 5.0m (short sections reduced to 4.2m) |
| | These streets will be accessed to / from Secondary streets. |
| | Shared use of these areas for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. |
| | Designed to 15 mph speed limit standards. |

4.4.3 The two vehicle accesses into The Folds will be primary streets. The western access changes from a primary street to a secondary street just north of Fir Tree Lane. Secondary roads form the central loop within the parcel from which tertiary roads branch off leading to parking courts around the parcel. Along the secondary street there will be traffic calming measures implemented to allow pedestrian and cycle priority at key crossing points. This is detailed further in **Section 4.7**.

4.4.4 **Figure 4.2** illustrates the road hierarchy for The Folds.

Figure 4.2: Road Hierarchy




## 4.5 Delivery, Servicing and Refuse Strategy

4.5.1 The Folds masterplan has been undertaken in accordance with the principles of MfS by not allowing the requirements of occasional vehicles to dominate the geometric layout of roads and junction.

4.5.2 The appropriate provisions have been made to ensure that residents will not have to carry their bins for a distance of over 30m to a bin store, collection area or kerbside. Furthermore, a refuse vehicle will be able to get within 25m of each property or a collection point / bin store. This is in line with MfS and Building Regulation Guidance.

4.5.3 For the proposed apartment blocks with communal bin stores, access has been provided so that a waste collection vehicle can get to within 10m of the storage point in line with MfS.

4.5.4 The internal road layout has been designed to accommodate a 11.22m refuse vehicle which is able to manoeuvre and egress each area in the forward gear. Where a refuse vehicle is required to access a parking courtyard and tertiary streets, appropriate turning areas will be provided to allow refuse vehicles to adequately manoeuvre. This has been demonstrated using Swept Path Analysis shown in **Drawings 32612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5001** to **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5004** which are included in **Appendix C**.

4.5.5 The drawing highlights the anticipated route for refuse vehicles to travel through The Folds. This route is via the secondary streets in the parcel and enter each parking court where the bin store and the dedicated collection points will be located.

4.5.6 Other servicing and delivery vehicle trips are anticipated to occur on an ad hoc basis mainly consisting of food and retail shopping deliveries for residents. Deliveries of this nature will be undertaken using the proposed internal roads which have been designed to accommodate larger vehicles. Primarily, tertiary streets and parking courts will be used by delivery drivers, though in some cases the north-south secondary roads may be utilised.

4.5.7 Fire tender vehicle tracking has been tracked using Swept Path Analysis which show that emergency access to each property is appropriate and within the required maximum distance of 45m in line with Building Regulations Guidance. The emergency services will be consulted to ensure they find the proposals acceptable.

4.5.8 The swept path analysis assessment for a fire tender vehicle has been shown in **Drawings 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5005** to **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5008** which are included in **Appendix C**.

## 4.6 Bus Strategy

4.6.1 Local bus routes currently run along Fair Oak Road to the north, and through Horton Heath to the east offer connections to Eastleigh, Hedge End, and Southampton.

4.6.2 A future bus service is proposed to route along the proposed SID Road through The Holme and linking to the future school and local centre. The future bus route will not enter the individual development parcels and will remain on the SID Road.


4.6.3 One set of bus stops will be provided within the Parkside, within The Holme, on the SID Road. Additional bus stops on the SID Road will come forward with the development of the local centre which is subject to its individual RMA.

4.6.4 HCC generally require a walking distance of 400m for residents to access a bus stop. The northern areas of The Folds fall outside of a 400m radius from the proposed bus stop, however HCC acknowledge that greater distances are acceptable if there were high quality active travel links connecting the parcel to the bus stops, as per the pre-application meeting.

4.6.5 This has fed into the design of The Folds masterplan with higher-density housing (apartments) maximised in the southern and central parts of the parcel. This positions residents closer to the local centre, active travel routes, and where possible within 400m of the future bus stop proposed along the SID Road.

4.6.6 A total of 499 dwellings are located within 400m of the SID Road which equates to 79% of the dwellings in the parcel. A further 14% of dwellings are included between 400-500m of the SID Road, amounting to a total of 93% (589 dwellings) located within a 500m radius. This is shown below in **Figure 4.3**.

Figure 4.3: Bus Stop Radius




## 4.7 Pedestrian and Cycle Connectivity and Crossing Point Design

**SID Road**

4.7.1 Along the SID Road through The Holme development parcel, there will be a shared footway / cycleway provided along the northern side of the road providing continuous active travel access from The Avenue to the west and the proposed local centre located to the south of The Folds. The proposed road that connects the SID to Fir Tree Lane will also have cycle provisions with a shared 3.0m path on the western side of the carriageway.

**Internal Paths**

4.7.2 Pedestrian and cycle provisions have been integrated throughout the design of the masterplan. On the western side of the eastern access road, the 3.0m shared path will be continued north joining with the proposed east-west greenway.

4.7.3 Along the n-s secondary streets, 2.0m footways will be provided along both sides, whilst in the mews street and parking court areas will provide shared areas.

4.7.4 At key crossing points within The Folds, namely at Fir Tree Lane and the proposed Greenway, pedestrians and cyclists will generally have priority over vehicles. These have been described in more detail below.

**Fir Tree Lane (Bridleway)**

4.7.5 As part of the OPP, the western section of Fir Tree Lane is to be downgraded to a bridleway to create a walking and cycle connection. The downgrading of Fir Tree Lane will form an attractive active travel link that runs through the Parkside with The Folds and The Homestal to the north, and The Holme to the south. This active travel link will continue west into the Quobleigh Breach parcel and form a link with The Avenue.

4.7.6 The western vehicle access into The Folds crosses the proposed Fir Tree Lane bridleway. Pedestrians and cyclists travelling east-west will have priority at these crossing points where raised tables are provided for a continual level for active travel. The raised crossing points and vehicle give way markings will provide traffic calming benefits, slowing vehicle speeds entering the respective residential developments plots.

4.7.7 The layout for these crossing points have been set out in the masterplan drawings in **Appendix A**. **Figure 4.4** includes concept sketches of the improvements along Fir Tree Lane.

Figure 4.4: Fir Tree Lane Concept Images



4.7.8 The associated visibility splays for the layout of these crossings require a vehicle visibility splay from the give way line looking east - west along Fir Tree Lane on both sides. As per the visibilities set out in Section 4.3 visibility splays of 2.4m x 17m are required and have been allowed for in the layout and landscape design.

**Fir Tree Lane (Road)**

4.7.9 For the section of Fir Tree Lane retained for vehicle access towards Burnetts Lane, the OPP included a package of off-site highway improvements. These works proposed widening the lane to 5.5 metres (where possible) and introducing a new 2.0-metre footpath on the southern side, extending from Burnetts Lane to the Public Right of Way (PRoW) at the edge of the OHH site.

4.7.10 As part of this RMA, the principle of these upgrades has been allowed for in the building and landscape design. For the section of Fir Tree Lane within the boundary of The Holme parcel, the road is similarly proposed to be widened to 5.5 metres and provided with a 2.0-metre footpath. At the proposed junction with The Folds (Junction 4), an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing is proposed to the south of the junction to facilitate east–west pedestrian movements along Fir Tree Lane.

4.7.11 For the section of Fir Tree Lane which lies adjacent to the future Local Centre development parcel, a comparable approach will be taken to ensure the lane is widened to the desirable 5.5m, where achievable, and a continuous footway is provided. The detailed design of these highway improvements will be submitted as part of a future RMA.

**The Greenway**

4.7.12 The greenway routes across The Folds in the east – west direction, connecting the south-eastern perimeter of the parcel to The Homestal and Quobleigh Breach to the west. At its eastern end, the greenway connects to the existing PRoW which routes around the northern edge of The Folds. This will form an attractive active travel connection through the centre of these parcels. The greenway will consist of a 3.0m shared foot/cycleway and a separate 2.0m footway segregated by greenery and landscaping corridor.

4.7.13 Pedestrian and cycle movements along the greenway will have priority over vehicles where the greenway crosses the internal roads. There are two greenway crossings within The Folds. On the approach to crossing points the vehicles will slow and give way.

4.7.14 At each vehicle approach to the Greenway crossings, there is a required visibility splay of 2.4m x 17.0m for vehicles approaching. The crossing area will comprise of a raised table to provide a continuous level of the priority pedestrian / cycle movements, and to reduce vehicle speeds travel through the masterplan.

**PRoWs**


4.7.15 The wider OHH masterplan benefits from a series of PRoWs that extend across area which are to be upgraded. There is an existing PRoW along the north of The Folds (ref: *085/11/1*) which continues to the west into The Homestal and is to be retained. Four car parking spaces will be positioned at the northern edge of the parcel, further providing access to the PRoW.

4.7.16 Along the eastern edge of The Folds is another PRoW *(*ref: *085/10/*4) which is proposed to be diverted to be around the edge of the developed area and provide a perimeter route around the parcel. This route will be accessible by future residents, and the general public.

**Overview**

4.7.17 **Figure 4.5** illustrates the proposed active travel connections throughout The Folds, and with wider connections within the Parkside and adjacent areas.

Figure 4.5: Proposed Active Travel Infrastructure



# 5 Proposed Trip Generation

## 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section of the Transport Assessment provides an overview of the predicted vehicle trip demand associated with the proposed RMA residential development. The overall trip generation of the wider OHH site was approved at outline. This assessment has been undertaken to allow the LPA to understand the trip generation of the RMA parcel. The approach of this assessment is considered robust and appropriate, drawing upon the agreed OPP assessment parameters.

5.1.2 The number of dwellings cited in this section, and within the capacity assessment are slightly greater level than the proposed dwelling mix. The proposed quantum for The Folds is 629 dwellings, and the assessment has tested as 634 dwellings. For the total Parkside, an additional 18 dwellings have been assessed. As this is a minor difference, the assessments set out are deemed to be reflective of the proposed development, and in any case considered robust as a greater quantum has been tested. This approach is consistent within the subsequent sections of this report.

## 5.2 The Folds Residential Trip Generation

5.2.1 Residential and retirement living / care home trip rates were agreed as part of the OPP and have been utilised to calculate the trip generation for the parcel. This has been shown in **Table 5.1** below.

Table 5.1: Residential Trip Rates and Trip Generation, Rounded

| **Quantum** | | **AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900)** | | | **PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800)** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Arrive | Depart | Total | Arrive | Depart | Total |
| OPP Residential Vehicle Trip Rate | | 0.149 | 0.392 | 0.541 | 0.377 | 0.224 | 0.601 |
| OPP Retirement / Care Home Vehicle Trip Rate | | 0.075 | 0.085 | 0.160 | 0.059 | 0.052 | 0.111 |
| Parcel | Dwelling Type | Trip Generation | | | | | |
| The Folds | 599 Residential Dwellings | 89 | 234 | 324 | 255 | 134 | 359 |
| | 35 Older Person Flats | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | 634 Dwellings | 92 | 237 | 329 | 228 | 136 | 363 |

5.2.2 A total of 329 and 363 two-way vehicle trips is anticipated to be generated in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The nature of the OHH site will mean there will be a level of internalised vehicle trips.

5.2.3 In line with the OPP, 7.5% of residential and retirement / care home trips are internal trips, travelling between each parcel to / from the local centre and the school.

5.2.4 The remaining 92.5% of residential trips will be 'external trips' which travel to and from OHH from the local highway network. This split of external and internal residential trips has been shown below in **Table 5.2**.

Table 5.2: Residential Trip Generation External and Internal Split, Rounded

| Parcel | Internal / External Split (%) | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Arrive | Depart | Total | Arrive | Depart | Total |
| The Folds | External 92.5% | 85 | 220 | 304 | 210 | 126 | 336 |
| | Internal 7.5% | 7 | 18 | 25 | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| | Total | 92 | 327 | 329 | 228 | 136 | 363 |

5.2.5 From the combined 634 dwellings proposed, internalisation trips will equate to 25 and 27 two-way internal vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.


## 5.3 Residential Trip Distribution

5.3.1 To understand how the forecast residential trips will travel through the local roads within the OHH development, the external trips have been distributed from OHH out to the local highway network by following proportions in line with the distributions set out in the OPP:

- 45.3% of trips via the northern access roundabout at The Avenue / Allington Lane;
- 18.7% of trips via Fir Tree Lane; and
- 36.0% of trips via the southern access roundabout at The Avenue / Burnetts Lane.

5.3.2 This has been illustrated in **Figure 5.1**.

Figure 5.1: Residential Distribution via OHH Site Accesses




5.3.3 The above distribution has been applied to 92.5% of the residential trip generation for The Folds. The remaining 7.5% of the trips consist of internal trips which have been distributed within the Site to all route to and from the residential parcel and the local centre / school in both the AM and PM peak hours. It is unlikely that all of these internal trips will do this movement in both peak hours, however this is what has been considered for a robust assessment.

5.3.4 A summary of The Folds residential trips routing via the three OHH development accesses, and internal trips have been set out in **Table 5.3** below.

Table 5.3: RMA Trip Generation and Internal Trips

| Residential Trip Proportions | | | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Arrive | Depart | Total | Arrive | Depart | Total |
| 92.5% of Residential Trips distributed via north and south access roundabouts, and Fir Tree Lane | Allington Lane Access Roundabout | 45.3% | 38 | 99 | 138 | 95 | 57 | 152 |
| | Burnetts Lane Roundabout Access | 36% | 31 | 79 | 110 | 76 | 45 | 121 |
| | Fir Tree Lane | 18.7% | 16 | 41 | 57 | 39 | 23 | 63 |
| | Total | | 85 | 220 | 304 | 210 | 126 | 336 |
| 7.5% of Residential Trips Internally distributed to and from the local centre and school | | | 7 | 18 | 25 | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| Total Resi Trips | | | 92 | 237 | 329 | 228 | 136 | 363 |

## 5.4 Parkside Total Trip Generation

5.4.1 Reserved Matters applications for the Holme and the Homestal residential parcels are being submitted at a similar time to the Folds and, given the interconnected access arrangements, an assessment for the combined RMA (referred to collectively as 'Parkside') has been set out in **Table 5.4** below.

Table 5.4: Parkside Trip Generation and Internal Trips, Rounded

| Parkside Residential Trip Proportions | | | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Arrive | Depart | Total | Arrive | Depart | Total |
| 92.5% of Residential Trips distributed via north and south access roundabouts, and Fir Tree Lane | Allington Lane Access Roundabout | 45.3% | 60 | 156 | 216 | 149 | 89 | 238 |
| | Burnetts Lane Roundabout Access | 36% | 48 | 124 | 172 | 118 | 71 | 189 |
| | Fir Tree Lane | 18.7% | 25 | 64 | 89 | 61 | 37 | 98 |
| | Total | | 133 | 343 | 477 | 329 | 196 | 525 |
| 7.5% of Residential Trips Internally distributed to and from the local centre and school | | | 11 | 28 | 39 | 27 | 16 | 43 |
| Total Resi Trips | | | 144 | 371 | 515 | 355 | 212 | 568 |

5.4.2 The estimated trip generation for all three parcels is 515 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak hour, and 568 two-way vehicles in the PM peak hour. These trips are a proportion of the residential trip generated for the wider OHH site that has been assessed and approved as part of the OPP and are therefore not new or additional trips.

5.4.3 Taking account of the external and internal proportions, the network diagrams showing the distribution of residential vehicle trips for The Folds, The Home and Homestal have been included in Figure D.1 in **Appendix D**.

# 6 Background OHH Development Vehicle Trips

## 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 To assess the impacts of the proposed development at the access junctions with the SID, there is a need to understand the volume of 'other' traffic using the future SID road and Fir Tree Lane for wider OHH site access.

6.1.2 Once the OHH Site is fully built out, the section of the SID road which accommodates the proposed RMA parcel accesses will be used by other vehicles that are generated by the wider development parcels to access areas such as the local centre and the school.


6.1.3 Therefore, the forecast trip generation for the wider OHH Site that would be assigned along the SID Road has been considered using information set out in other planning applications associated with OHH.

## 6.2 Wider OHH Development Vehicle Trips

6.2.1 As part of the link road application (F/21/91185), the northern section of the SID road was assessed with a level of development consisting of 1,050 dwellings and 3,200 sqm of office space as a part of the 'Baseline 2036 + Committed Development + OPA' scenario (included in Appendix B of The Avenue TA (Report Ref 131.0008/TA/1). This level of development was also tested within the SID Road TS (Application F/23/96631).

6.2.2 **Figure 6.1** illustrates the predicted OHH development flows, as set out in The Avenue application, entering and exiting at the SID Road / The Avenue junction which will be located to the west of The Holme.

Figure 6.1: SID Road / The Avenue Junction Predicated Trip Generation




*Data Source: Link Road Application Transport Assessment (Report Ref 131.0008/TA/1, EBC Planning Reference: F/21/91185)*

6.2.3 To avoid double counting, the predicted vehicle trips generated by the Parkside RMA parcels (**Table 5.4**) which enter/exit from this junction have been removed. The residual flows have then been considered as the other OHH development trips which will route along the SID road past the RMA parcel accesses. This has been set out below in **Table 6.1**.

Table 6.1: Wider OHH Background Trip Generation on SID Road

| Quantum / Scenario | | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Eastbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Westbound |
| 1 | The Avenue TA Traffic Generation | 177 | 325 | 310 | 231 |
| 2 | Parkside RMA Residential Trip Generation | 60 | 156 | 149 | 89 |
| 3 | Residual OHH Through Trips | 117 | 169 | 161 | 142 |

6.2.4 The traffic flows set out in the third row are considered to be the background traffic along the SID Road generated by the wider OHH Site.

## 6.3 Local Centre Trip Generation

6.3.1 The trips associated with the local centre are considered to be accommodated for within the SID Road through trips considered above and the internal residential trips made by those living in The Folds, The Holme and Homestal (**Table 5.4**).

## 6.4 School Trip Generation

6.4.1 The Transport Statement prepared for the SID road considered the trip generation associated with the school by students and staff. As it is a primary school, it has been assumed that the students will be attending the school from within the wider OHH development. The internalised vehicle trips associated with the OHH residential development accounts for vehicle trips associated with students being driven to and from the school from residential parcels.

6.4.2 Due to the above, no additional vehicle trips have been added to this junction assessment for students as the trips already included are considered to robustly include this group.

6.4.3 A total of 30 staff were assessed arriving during the AM peak hour and departing in the PM peak hour. The flows tested in the SID Road TS suggest that 15 staff are travelling to and from the school from the south, and 15 to and from the north.

6.4.4 For this RMA, the 15 staff travelling to/from the north, 50% will come into the OHH development via the Allington Lane roundabout and 50% via the Fir Tree Lane access.

## 6.5 Fir Tree Lane Through Trips

6.5.1 The Transport Statement that supported the SID road application made allowances for existing Fir Tree Lane through trips that would persist after the OHH site is built out. These flows would route between Fir Tree Lane and the Allington Lane roundabout bypassing along the SID Road through The Holme and therefore through all four junctions included in this junction assessment.

6.5.2 An uplift factor of 1.5 was applied to the SID Road / The Avenue junction flows that were submitted within the Transport Assessment for the Phase 3 Road application. The resulting difference has therefore been assumed as the Fir Tree Lane through trips. **Table 6.2** below sets out the traffic flows assessed on the SID road for the different planning applications.

Table 6.2: Fir Tree Lane – Allington Lane Roundabout Through Trips Calculation

| Quantum / Scenario | | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Eastbound | Westbound | Eastbound | Westbound |
| 1 | Phase 3 The Avenue TA | 177 | 325 | 310 | 231 |
| 2 | SID Road TS | 193 | 402 | 387 | 266 |
| 3 | Resulting Through Trips between Fir Tree Lane and Allington Road | 16 | 77 | 77 | 35 |

6.5.3 This shows that a total of 93 and 112 two-way trips that are considered as through trips and would, in turn, route through all four junctions that are being assessed as a part of this junction assessment.

## 6.6 Total 'Other' Trip Generation

6.6.1 The combination of the Wider OHH Development, School, and Fir Tree Lane vehicle trips generates the background traffic volumes which are estimated to be on the SID Road and Fir Tree Lane. The resulting traffic network peak flows are illustrated in Figure D.2 contained within **Appendix D**.

## 6.7 Future Year (incl Development) Network

### Summary of Trip Generation Assessment Inputs

6.7.1 The information utilised to determine the flows to be tested for the junction assessments has been included to ensure a robust assessment has been undertaken. This information has been summarised below:

- **Parkside Residential trip generation**: The trip rates from the OPP have been used to calculate the trip generation of The Folds, The Holme and Homestal to obtain a total resident trip generation for each parcel. 7.5% of these trips are internal trips, in line with the OPP, which have been diverted to and from each parcel to the local centre and school. The remaining 92.5% of trips have been distributed via the main access points of the development, in line with the residential distribution set out in the OPP TA;

- **Wider Development Trip Generation**: The applications for The Avenue and the SID Road included highways impact assessments which considered the OPP level of development routing along the SID Road. These flows have been used to determine the background traffic generated by the wider development. These have been manipulated to ensure that Parkside RMA parcel residential trips have been removed, as they have been re-calculated and added in to account for movement in / out of individual parcels, instead of just routing along the SID Road;

- **Local Centre**: The local centre trip generation is accounted for within the wider development trip generation; therefore, no additional flows have been added to the junction assessment;

- **School Trip Generation**: Staff trips have been considered which will all route to and from the school from outside of the OHH development; and

- **Fir Tree Lane Through Trips**: In line with the SID Road TS, through trips using the SID road routing between Fir Tree Lane and the Allington Lane roundabout access to the OHH development have been included in this junction assessment.

6.7.2 These are considered to provide a robust assessment for the reasons stated above, in addition to the fact that the mode shift associated with The Folds, which will be set out in the Travel Plan, has not been accounted for.

6.7.3 Using the calculated Background Traffic Scenario and adding the proposed development flows associated with the 1,004 new homes, Figure D.3 contained in **Appendix D** present the peak hour traffic flows for the future year development scenario.

# 7 Highways Capacity Assessments

## 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 Although the highway impacts of the wider OHH development were assessed as part of the OPP, this RMA includes the local level assessments of the proposed site accesses to demonstrate they can accommodate the forecast vehicle trips.

7.1.2 This section sets out the junction assessment of three internal junctions of relevance to this RMA to demonstrate that they operate within capacity with the anticipated level of development the parcels are likely to generate.

7.1.3 For consistency with the traffic impacts assessment undertaken for The Holme and Homestal RMA, the SID road junction to the western of the site which provides access into The Homestal parcel has been included.

7.1.4 In addition to the residential impact of the parcels, the trips associated with development for the wider Site have been considered to ensure a robust junction assessment has been undertaken.

## 7.2 Scope of Junction Assessments


7.2.1 The OPP set out a comprehensive impact assessment to demonstrate the impact of the Site on the access points to the external road network and the surrounding highway network. Furthermore, the junction of the SID Road / spine road has been assessed in the spine road (F/21/91185) and SID Road (F/23/96631) planning applications and therefore has not been re-assessed as a part of this TA.

7.2.2 A total of four junctions have been included in the junction capacity assessments to support this RMA which consist of the main proposed access junctions along the SID Road within The Holme and where The Folds access roads join. The assessment of these junctions, shown in **Figure 7.1**, was agreed with HCC at the pre-application meeting held on 31 July 2025:

- The Avenue and SID Road have been fully built out providing access throughout the Site.
- The Site access from Fir Tree Lane is assumed to be open and operational for two-way traffic which benefits from the improvements to the Fir Tre Lane / Burnetts Lane (in line with those set out in the OPP) that are also assumed to be implemented.
- The school and local centre have been assumed to be built out and fully operational.
- The Holme and Homestal residential parcels have been assessed alongside The Folds due to their proximity and integrated infrastructure. These parcels are also anticipated to come forward at a similar time to The Folds.

7.2.3 It should be noted that all trips associated with The Holme have been assigned into the network model from a single point between ‘Junctions 1’ (the SID road / The Homestal) and ‘Junction 2’ (the SID road / The Folds western access) for a robust assessment. As The Holme has multiple minor accesses, the trip generation for this parcel enter the network across Junctions 1, 2, and 3, however loading it to a single point is considered to be a more simplistic and robust approach.

Figure 7.1: Assessed Junctions




## 7.3 Junction Capacity Assessment Results

7.3.1 All of the internal junctions included in this junction assessment are priority-controlled junction and are therefore being assessed using the industry standard TRL Junctions 11 software package. Standard peak hours for assessment have been used for the morning (08:00 – 09:00) and afternoon (17:00 – 18:00) peak hour assessments.

7.3.2 When reviewing Junctions 11 outputs, it is important to note that it is generally accepted that a junction is approaching capacity and will begin to display characteristics indicating delay when the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) of one or more of the arms exceeds 0.85. The maximum queue is displayed in total vehicles and is rounded up from the Junctions 11 output to the nearest one vehicle.

7.3.3 The full Junction 11 outputs for these junction assessments have been included in **Appendix E**.

### Junction 1: The SID Road / The Homestal

7.3.4 The junction for the SID Road with The Homestal access road will consist of a three-arm priority-controlled junction located in the western side of The Holme. The Junctions 11 outputs have been summarised within **Table 7.1** which sets out the RFC, queue length and delay.

Table 7.1: Junction 1 The SID Road / The Homestal Junction Assessment Outputs

| | **AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900)** | | | **PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800)** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC |
| The Homestal Access | 0.2 | 7.84 | 0.14 | 0.1 | 8.10 | 0.09 |
| The SID Road | 0.1 | 5.22 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 6.13 | 0.10 |

7.3.5 The results show that this junction operates well within capacity along both the minor and major roads in the junction. Along the Homestal Access there is minimal queueing in both the AM and PM peak hours. The greatest level of delay is within The Homestal with 8.10 s/veh in the PM

peak hour which is an acceptable level of delay. The SID Road operates well at this junction with minimal queuing, delay and RFC.

## Junction 2: The SID Road / The Folds (Western Access)

7.3.6 The junction on the SID Road with The Folds western access road will consist of a three-arm priority-controlled junction located in the middle section of The Holme. The Junctions 11 outputs have been summarised within **Table 7.2** which sets out the RFC, queue length and delay.

Table 7.2: Junction 2 The SID Road / The Folds Western Access Junction Assessment Outputs

| | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC |
| The Folds Western Access | 0.3 | 9.19 | 0.20 | 0.2 | 8.92 | 0.12 |
| The SID Road | 0.1 | 5.30 | 0.04 | 0.2 | 5.83 | 0.11 |

7.3.7 The results show that this junction operates well within capacity with low levels of queueing, delay and RFC for all arms of the junction. The greatest level of RFC across the junction is on The Folds western access with 0.20 which is an acceptable RFC level. There is slightly more delay along The Folds western access compared to The Homestal (Junction 1, **Table 7.1**) likely due to The Folds having a higher number of residential dwellings using that access.

## Junction 3: The SID Road / The Folds Eastern Access

7.3.8 The junction on the SID Road with The SID Road Northbound access road which leads to Junction 4 will consist of a three-arm priority-controlled junction located in the eastern section of The Holme. The Junctions 11 outputs have been summarised within **Table 7.3** which sets out the RFC, queue length and delay.

Table 7.3: Junction 3 The SID Road / The Folds Eastern Access Junction Assessment Outputs

| | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC |
| The Folds Eastern Access | 0.6 | 10.07 | 0.35 | 0.3 | 8.97 | 0.22 |
| The SID Road | 0.1 | 5.77 | 0.04 | 0.3 | 6.10 | 0.13 |

7.3.9 The results show that overall, this junction operates within capacity. Along The Folds eastern access road, there is an RFC of 0.35 and 0.22 in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. This is paired with a slightly greater level of delay (in the AM peak hour) than at Junctions 1 and 2 which is due to the traffic routing along this road from The Folds and from Fir Tree Lane. However, even with these additional flows from the north, this junction operates well.

## Junction 4: The Folds Eastern Access / Fir Tree Lane

7.3.10 The junction on the SID Road with The Folds eastern access and Fir Tree Lane will consist of a three-arm priority-controlled junction located in the north-east section of The Holme, just south of The Folds. The Junctions 11 outputs have been summarised within **Table 7.4** which sets out the RFC, queue length and delay.

Table 7.4: Junction 4 The Folds Eastern Access / Fir Tree Lane Junction Assessment Outputs

| | AM Peak Hour (0800 – 0900) | | | PM Peak Hour (1700 – 1800) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s/Veh) | RFC |
| Fir Tree Lane | 0.3 | 8.45 | 0.21 | 0.3 | 9.18 | 0.20 |
| The Folds Eastern Access / The SID Road | 0.1 | 7.05 | 0.08 | 0.3 | 7.38 | 0.19 |

7.3.11 The results show that the RFC along Fir Tree Lane is 0.21 in the AM and 0.20 in the PM peak hours. Along The Folds Access / The SID Road the RFC is slightly lower, all of which is an acceptable level. There are also minor levels of queuing and delay at this junction.

## 7.4 Sensitivity Test

7.4.1 There are many parcels of the Site which are yet to come forward as reserved matters applications meaning the level of development traffic that will route through the junctions is challenging to accurately determine. The assessment set previously in **Sections 5 and 6** is robust, however a sensitivity test has been undertaken to provide comfort that these junctions will operate well even with inflated background traffic travelling along the SID Road.

7.4.2 The sensitivity test includes the following flows change to the core assessments:

- Residential Trip Generation for The Holme, The Homestal and The Folds as per **Table 5.3**;
- Wider Development Trip Generation inflated by a factor of 1.5;
- Fir Tree Lane Through Trips inflated by a factor of 1.5; and
- School Staff Trips inflated by a factor of 1.5.

7.4.3 In summary this equates to approximately a further 200 two-way vehicle trips along the SID Road in each assessment peak hours, and a further 50 to 60 two-way trips through Fir Tree Lane.

7.4.4 The results of the sensitivity test show that all four junctions perform well within capacity when accounting for an increased volume of through traffic. The junction 11 outputs have been included in **Appendix E**.

## 7.5 Summary

7.5.1 The junction assessment set out in this section has considered four internal junctions within the Site which are of relevance to The Holme and The Homestal. The Junctions 11 outputs showed that all four junctions operated well within capacity, demonstrating low levels of queuing, delay and RFC for all arms at each junction.

7.5.2 A sensitivity test was also conducted which inflated all traffic, except the residential trip generation for the RMA applications, by a factor of 1.5. Factored traffic routing along the SID road has been undertaken to accommodate for a robust level of flows. The outputs of the sensitivity test illustrate that the junctions would still operate well within capacity, even then internal flows are inflated. This should provide comfort that these internal junctions will work with the level of development proposed as part of the RMA applications, and for the wider OHH Site.

# 8 Summary and Conclusion

8.1.1 Stantec UK Ltd have been commissioned by Eastleigh Borough Council (One Horton Heath Team) to support the Reserved Matters Application for The Folds at One Horton Heath, Land west of Burnetts Lane, Eastleigh, SO30 2HH.

8.1.2 One Horton Heath is a major mixed-use development for which outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access was granted in October 2025 (LPA ref no. O/20/89498) for up to 2,500 homes, a local centre, a primary school and commercial floorspace. This RMA Application will be submitted pursuant to Condition 4 of the Outline Planning Permission.

8.1.3 Phase 17 of the Outline Planning Permission relates to the erection of 629 dwellings within The Folds located in the north-eastern corner of the One Horton Heath Development named 'Parkside'. The Parkside comprises of three residential parcels: The Folds, The Holme and Homestal. The Holme and Homestal are situated to the south and west of The Folds, and a separate RMA is associated with these parcels.

8.1.4 The wider One Horton Heath development has extensive planning history including live applications and the sections of the Site that have been / are in the process of being constructed. These applications have been used to inform the junction assessment in this report.

8.1.5 This report has detailed the internal roads within The Folds which have been designed in line with required standards and guidance. Swept Path Analysis has been undertaken for refuse and emergency vehicles to demonstrate the internal road network, and junctions have been designed to accommodate these vehicles.

8.1.6 The pedestrian and cycle connectivity within The Folds have been detailed in this report with particular detail surrounding the design of the crossing points of active travel routes and internal road network. Along key internal active travel routes such as along Fir Tree Lane and the greenway will prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles which will also provide traffic calming within the parcel.

8.1.7 The overall trip generation and junction assessments associated with the wider One Horton Heath development was approved with the Outline Planning Permission. This TA has set out the trip generation for The Folds for the LPA to understand the portion of trips associated with this parcel. These trips are not additional to the OHH wider development, but account for a portion of the total residential trip generation.

8.1.8 The junction assessment set out in this section has considered four internal junctions within the Site which are of relevance to The Folds. The Junctions 11 outputs showed that all four junctions operated well within capacity, demonstrating low levels of queuing, delay and RFC for all arms at each junction.

8.1.9 A sensitivity test was also conducted which factored all traffic, except the residential trip generation for the RMA applications, by a factor of 1.5. Factoring traffic routing along the SID road has been undertaken to accommodate for a robust level of flows. The outputs of the sensitivity test illustrate that the junctions would still operate well within capacity, even then internal flows are factored. This should provide comfort that these internal junctions will work with the level of development proposed as part of the RMA applications, and for the wider One Horton Heath Site.

8.1.10 Overall, this RMA TA for The Folds has been prepared in line with the Outline Planning Permission for One Horton Heath and demonstrated that the parcel and background development are accommodated within the design of the junctions. Accessibility to active travel infrastructure is a key focus on this RMA TA highlighted by the prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists within the parcel.

# Appendix A The Folds Landscape Masterplan

this drawing is the copyright of Re-Format LLP and may not be copied, altered or reproduced in any way or passed to a third party without written authority. All dimensions subject to site survey and site verification. Do not scale for construction ©

| rev. | date | changes description | Status | issued by |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| P12 | 01/12/2025 | Minor revisions to increase offset in NW of site. | S1 | SM |
| P11 | 27/11/2025 | Revisions in response to expanded ecological offsets in NW of site. | S1 | SM |
| P10 | 14/11/2025 | Minor amendments to apartment blocks following development of layouts for planning application; Block C amendments to ground floor layout; block D handed, bin store attached | S1 | JKR |
| P09 | 15/10/2025 | Doorways grouped, balcony locations updated. | S1 | SM |
| P08 | 14/10/2025 | Minor amendments following LA comments on overlooking and garden sizes., House type standardised., Landscaping amendments to increase depth of central planting area. | S1 | SM |

## KEY

### UNIT TYPES

- 1-Bed Apartment
- 2-Bed Apartment
- 1-Bed Maisonette (Ground floor)
  2-Bed Maisonette duplex (First & second flo
- 2-Bed F.O.G.
- 2-Bed House
- 3-Bed House
- 4-Bed House
- Shed in private garden comprising of general/cycle storage

### PARKING

- 2.5 x 5.0m space (standard)
- 2.7 x 5.2m space (main avenues)
- 2.5 x 6.0m space (parallel bays)
- Allocated Residential Space (houses)
- Allocated Residential Space (apartments)
- Allocated Disabled Space (apartments)
- Unallocated Space (visitors/residents)
- SANG Parking Space
- Car Club Space

RE–FORM AT

www.re-format.co.uk mail@re-format.co.uk +44 (0)1730 778778

project title
One Horton Heath

document title
Proposed Masterplan_CAD

| date created | drawn by | checked by | approved by |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jul 2025 | DM / SM | MS | MS |

scale at A1
1:1000


0 10 20 40 50m

N

| originator | parcel | block/zone | type | role | number |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RFT - | 17 - | ZZ - | DR - | A - | 0130 |

| status | suitability description | revision |
|---|---|---|
| S1 | For Co-ordination | P12 |

# Appendix B Visibility Splay Assessment Drawings




Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |

Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |


Title

VISIBILITY SPLAY ANALYSIS

PLAN 1 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |
| **Revision** | **Drawing No.** |
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5009** |

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:38:12 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5009-5012 - the folds visibility splays




Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:39:24 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 P:\332612639 - one horton heath\S500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\vwp\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5009-5012 - the folds visibility splays

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |
| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |
| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

Title

# VISIBILITY SPLAY ANALYSIS

## PLAN 2 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |
| **Revision** | **Drawing No.** |
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5010** |




Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:40:34 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 P:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5009-5012 - the folds visibility splays

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 YYYY.MM.DD |

| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL (ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH


HORTON HEATH, UK

Title

# VISIBILITY SPLAY ANALYSIS

## PLAN 3 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |
| **Revision** | **Drawing No.** |
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5011** |




FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5010

FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5011

Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |
| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |
| | Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |

Title

VISIBILITY SPLAY ANALYSIS

PLAN 4 OF 4

Project No.
332612639

A2 Scale
1:500

Revision
**P01**

Drawing No.
**332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5012**


Plotted: 11.12.2025 12:11 11:41:51 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5009-5012 - the folds visibility splays

# Appendix C Swept Path Analysis Drawings

FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5002

FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5003

N




Phoenix 2 Duo (P2-15W with Elite 6x4 chassis)

| | |
|---|---|
| Overall Length | 11.200m |
| Overall Width | 2.530m |
| Overall Body Height | 3.751m |
| Min Body Ground Clearance | 0.304m |
| Track Width | 2.500m |
| Lock to lock time | 4.00s |
| Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius | 9.500m |

0 10 20 30 40 50m

SCALE 1:500

Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |

Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| | Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |

Title

SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
REFUSE VEHICLE

PLAN 1 OF 4


Project No. 332612639

A2 Scale 1:500

Revision **P01**

Drawing No. **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5001**

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:22:00 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5001-5004 - the folds swept path analysis (refuse)




Stantec
Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |
| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |
| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL (ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK


Title

# SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS REFUSE VEHICLE

## PLAN 2 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |
| **Revision** | **Drawing No.** |
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5002** |

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:22:42 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 P:\332612639 - one horton heath\5000 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\vwp\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5001-5004 - the folds swept path analysis (refuse)




Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |
| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

Title


# SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
# REFUSE VEHICLE

PLAN 3 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |

| Revision | Drawing No. |
|---|---|
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5003** |

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:23:25 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5000 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5001-5004 - the folds swept path analysis (refuse)







Phoenix 2 Duo (P2–15W with Elite 6x4 chassis)

| | |
|---|---|
| Overall Length | 11.200m |
| Overall Width | 2.530m |
| Overall Body Height | 3.751m |
| Min Body Ground Clearance | 0.304m |
| Track Width | 2.500m |
| Lock to lock time | 4.00s |
| Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius | 9.500m |

Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |

Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| | Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |

Title

SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
REFUSE VEHICLE

PLAN 4 OF 4

Project No.
332612639

A2 Scale
1:500


Revision
**P01**

Drawing No.
**332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5004**

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:24:50 AM By: Eardle, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\c.cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5001-5004 - the folds swept path analysis (refuse)

FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5006

FOR CONTINUATION SEE DRAWING 332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5007







| Pumping Appliance | |
|---|---|
| Overall Length | 7.900m |
| Overall Width | 2.500m |
| Overall Body Height | 3.300m |
| Min Body Ground Clearance | 0.140m |
| Track Width | 2.500m |
| Lock to lock time | 4.00s |
| Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius | 7.750m |

## Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |

## Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |

Title

SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
FIRE TENDER

PLAN 1 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |

| Revision | Drawing No. |
|---|---|
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5005** |

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:28:10 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5005-5008 - the folds swept path analysis (fire tender)




Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:28:59 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5000 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5005-5008 - the folds swept path analysis (fire tender)

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |
| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |
| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

Title

# SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
# FIRE TENDER

## PLAN 2 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |
| **Revision** | **Drawing No.** |
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-ZZ-XX-DR-T-5006** |




Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

## Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing.
Any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec.
Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorised by Stantec is forbidden.

## Notes

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 YYYY.MM.DD |

| | Dwn. | Dsgn. | Chkd. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 YYYY.MM.DD |

Issue Status

**S2 - FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Client/Project Logo

Client/Project

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

Title

# SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
# FIRE TENDER

## PLAN 3 OF 4

| Project No. | A2 Scale |
|---|---|
| 332612639 | 1:500 |

| Revision | Drawing No. |
|---|---|
| **P01** | **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5007** |

Plotted: 11.12.2025 2025.12.11 11:29:47 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5000 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5005-5008 - the folds swept path analysis (fire tender)




Notes:

UTILITIES NOTE: The position of any existing public or private sewers, utility services, plant or apparatus shown on this drawing is believed to be correct, but no warranty to this is expressed or implied. Other such plant or apparatus may also be present but not shown. The Contractor is therefore advised to undertake their own investigation where the presence of any existing sewers, services, plant or apparatus may affect their operations.

| Issued/Revision | By | Appd | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| P01 FIRST ISSUE | CE | JH | 2025.12.11 |

Issue Status

**S2 FOR INFORMATION**

This document is suitable only for the purpose noted above.
Use of this document for any other purpose is not permitted.

Stantec

Stantec UK Limited
Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place
Reading
RG1 8DN
Tel. +44 1189 500 761
www.stantec.com/uk

Copyright Reserved

The Contractor shall verify and be responsible for all dimensions. DO NOT scale the drawing - any errors or omissions shall be reported to Stantec without delay.
The Copyrights to all designs and drawings are the property of Stantec. Reproduction or use for any purpose other than that authorized by Stantec is forbidden.

Client/Project:

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL
(ONE HORTON HEATH TEAM)

THE FOLDS, ONE HORTON HEATH

HORTON HEATH, UK

| Dwn | Dsgn. | Chkd. | YYYY.MM.DD |
|---|---|---|---|
| CE | - | JH | 2025.12.10 |

Title

SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS
FIRE TENDER

PLAN 4 OF 4

Project No. 332612639

A2 Scale 1:500


Revision **P01**

Drawing No. **332612639-STA-17-XX-DR-T-5008**


Plotted: 11.12.2025 12:11 11:30:41 AM By: Eadie, Charlie
ORIGINAL SHEET - ISO A2 J:\332612639 - one horton heath\5500 - transport\02 - drawings\cad\wip\332612639-sta-17-xx-dr-t-5005-5008 - the folds swept path analysis (fire tender)

# Appendix D Network Diagrams


**Appendix D, Figure D.1: Network Diagram: Total Proposed Development Trips for The Holme, The Homestal and The Folds (Total of 1,004 dwellings)**




**Appendix D, Figure D.2: Network Diagram: Background Flows [2036 Flows, Fir Tree Lane Through Trips, School Staff Trips]**



**Appendix D, Figure D.3: Network Diagram: Development Trips + Background Flows [2036 Flows, Fir Tree Lane Through Trips, School Staff Trips]**



**Appendix D, Figure D.4: Network Diagram: Sensitivity Test Development Trips + Background Flows [2036 Flows, Fir Tree Lane Through Trips, School Staff Trips x Factor of 1.5]**



# Appendix E Junctions 11 Outputs

# Junctions 11

## PICADY 11 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 11.0.0.2177
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2024

For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk trlsoftware.com

**The users of this computer program for the solution of an engineering problem are in no way relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the solution**

**Filename:** J1 The SID_The Homestall Access.j11
**Path:** J:\332612639 - One Horton Heath\5500 - Transport\06 - Modelling\Local Modelling
**Report generation date:** 22/10/2025 09:58:53

---

**»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM**
**»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM**
**»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM**
**»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM**

### Summary of junction performance

| | AM | | | | | PM | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
| | 2036 - Development + Wider Development and Background | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.2 | 7.84 | 0.14 | A | D2 | 0.1 | 8.10 | 0.09 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 5.22 | 0.04 | A | | 0.2 | 6.13 | 0.10 | A |
| | 2036 - Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.2 | 8.48 | 0.15 | A | D4 | 0.1 | 9.04 | 0.10 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 4.90 | 0.05 | A | | 0.3 | 5.91 | 0.12 | A |

*There are warnings associated with one or more model runs - see the 'Data Errors and Warnings' tables for each Analysis or Demand Set.*

*Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.*

### File summary

#### File Description

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | |
| **Location** | |
| **Site number** | |
| **Date** | 19/08/2025 |
| **Version** | |
| **Status** | (new file) |
| **Identifier** | |
| **Client** | |
| **Jobnumber** | |
| **Enumerator** | CORP\tharland |
| **Description** | |

### Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units | Rate of delay units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| m | kph | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Analysis Options

| Calculate Queue Percentiles | Calculate residual capacity | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold (s) | Queue threshold (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Network flow scaling factor (%) |
|---|---|
| A1 | 100.000 |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.10 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.10 | A |

## Arms

### Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | The SID WB | | Major |
| B | The Homestall | | Minor |
| C | The SID EB | | Major |

### Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right-turn storage | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 6.50 | | | 90.0 | ✓ | 0.00 |

*Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.*

### Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | One lane | 3.00 | 58 | 230 |

### Slope / Intercept / Capacity

#### Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept (PCU/hr) | Slope for A-B | Slope for A-C | Slope for C-A | Slope for C-B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-A | 611 | 0.109 | 0.275 | 0.173 | 0.393 |
| B-C | 769 | 0.115 | 0.291 | - | - |
| C-B | 626 | 0.237 | 0.237 | - | - |

*The slopes and intercepts shown above include custom intercept adjustments only.*

*Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.*

*Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.*

# Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 201 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 74 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 387 | 100.000 |

# Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 12 | 189 |
| | B | 31 | 0 | 43 |
| | C | 371 | 16 | 0 |

# Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.14 | 7.84 | 0.2 | 0.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 5.22 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 56 | 0.00 | 622 | 0.090 | 55 | 0.1 | 6.989 | A |
| C-AB | 19 | 0.00 | 778 | 0.024 | 19 | 0.0 | 5.216 | A |
| C-A | 273 | 0.00 | | | 273 | | | |
| A-B | 9 | 0.00 | | | 9 | | | |
| A-C | 142 | 0.00 | | | 142 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 67 | 0.00 | 607 | 0.110 | 66 | 0.1 | 7.322 | A |
| C-AB | 25 | 0.00 | 809 | 0.030 | 24 | 0.0 | 5.049 | A |
| C-A | 323 | 0.00 | | | 323 | | | |
| A-B | 11 | 0.00 | | | 11 | | | |
| A-C | 170 | 0.00 | | | 170 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 81 | 0.00 | 587 | 0.139 | 81 | 0.2 | 7.834 | A |
| C-AB | 34 | 0.00 | 852 | 0.040 | 34 | 0.1 | 4.840 | A |
| C-A | 392 | 0.00 | | | 392 | | | |
| A-B | 13 | 0.00 | | | 13 | | | |
| A-C | 208 | 0.00 | | | 208 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 81 | 0.00 | 587 | 0.139 | 81 | 0.2 | 7.839 | A |
| C-AB | 34 | 0.00 | 852 | 0.040 | 34 | 0.1 | 4.843 | A |
| C-A | 392 | 0.00 | | | 392 | | | |
| A-B | 13 | 0.00 | | | 13 | | | |
| A-C | 208 | 0.00 | | | 208 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 67 | 0.00 | 607 | 0.110 | 67 | 0.1 | 7.330 | A |
| C-AB | 25 | 0.00 | 809 | 0.030 | 25 | 0.0 | 5.052 | A |
| C-A | 323 | 0.00 | | | 323 | | | |
| A-B | 11 | 0.00 | | | 11 | | | |
| A-C | 170 | 0.00 | | | 170 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 56 | 0.00 | 622 | 0.090 | 56 | 0.1 | 7.000 | A |
| C-AB | 19 | 0.00 | 778 | 0.024 | 19 | 0.0 | 5.217 | A |
| C-A | 273 | 0.00 | | | 273 | | | |
| A-B | 9 | 0.00 | | | 9 | | | |
| A-C | 142 | 0.00 | | | 142 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.00 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.00 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 387 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 42 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 297 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 30 | 357 |
| | B | 18 | 0 | 24 |
| | C | 256 | 41 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.09 | 8.10 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 6.13 | 0.2 | 1.2 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 32 | 0.00 | 586 | 0.054 | 31 | 0.1 | 7.137 | A |
| C-AB | 43 | 0.00 | 690 | 0.062 | 42 | 0.1 | 6.113 | A |
| C-A | 181 | 0.00 | | | 181 | | | |
| A-B | 23 | 0.00 | | | 23 | | | |
| A-C | 269 | 0.00 | | | 269 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 38 | 0.00 | 565 | 0.067 | 38 | 0.1 | 7.514 | A |
| C-AB | 55 | 0.00 | 704 | 0.078 | 55 | 0.1 | 6.101 | A |
| C-A | 212 | 0.00 | | | 212 | | | |
| A-B | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-C | 321 | 0.00 | | | 321 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 46 | 0.00 | 535 | 0.086 | 46 | 0.1 | 8.098 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 0.00 | 725 | 0.102 | 74 | 0.2 | 6.089 | A |
| C-A | 253 | 0.00 | | | 253 | | | |
| A-B | 33 | 0.00 | | | 33 | | | |
| A-C | 393 | 0.00 | | | 393 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 46 | 0.00 | 535 | 0.086 | 46 | 0.1 | 8.102 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 0.00 | 725 | 0.102 | 74 | 0.2 | 6.094 | A |
| C-A | 253 | 0.00 | | | 253 | | | |
| A-B | 33 | 0.00 | | | 33 | | | |
| A-C | 393 | 0.00 | | | 393 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 38 | 0.00 | 565 | 0.067 | 38 | 0.1 | 7.521 | A |
| C-AB | 55 | 0.00 | 704 | 0.078 | 55 | 0.2 | 6.108 | A |
| C-A | 212 | 0.00 | | | 212 | | | |
| A-B | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-C | 321 | 0.00 | | | 321 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 32 | 0.00 | 586 | 0.054 | 32 | 0.1 | 7.146 | A |
| C-AB | 43 | 0.00 | 690 | 0.062 | 43 | 0.1 | 6.126 | A |
| C-A | 181 | 0.00 | | | 181 | | | |
| A-B | 23 | 0.00 | | | 23 | | | |
| A-C | 269 | 0.00 | | | 269 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.53 | 0.92 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.53 | 1.20 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 0.93 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 0.93 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 271 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 74 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 510 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 12 | 259 |
| | B | 31 | 0 | 43 |
| | C | 494 | 16 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.15 | 8.48 | 0.2 | 0.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 4.90 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 56 | 0.00 | 596 | 0.093 | 55 | 0.1 | 7.312 | A |
| C-AB | 22 | 0.00 | 830 | 0.026 | 22 | 0.0 | 4.898 | A |
| C-A | 362 | 0.00 | | | 362 | | | |
| A-B | 9 | 0.00 | | | 9 | | | |
| A-C | 195 | 0.00 | | | 195 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 67 | 0.00 | 577 | 0.115 | 66 | 0.1 | 7.761 | A |
| C-AB | 29 | 0.00 | 872 | 0.034 | 29 | 0.0 | 4.698 | A |
| C-A | 429 | 0.00 | | | 429 | | | |
| A-B | 11 | 0.00 | | | 11 | | | |
| A-C | 233 | 0.00 | | | 233 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 81 | 0.00 | 548 | 0.149 | 81 | 0.2 | 8.473 | A |
| C-AB | 42 | 0.00 | 931 | 0.046 | 42 | 0.1 | 4.454 | A |
| C-A | 519 | 0.00 | | | 519 | | | |
| A-B | 13 | 0.00 | | | 13 | | | |
| A-C | 285 | 0.00 | | | 285 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 81 | 0.00 | 548 | 0.149 | 81 | 0.2 | 8.479 | A |
| C-AB | 43 | 0.00 | 932 | 0.046 | 43 | 0.1 | 4.454 | A |
| C-A | 519 | 0.00 | | | 519 | | | |
| A-B | 13 | 0.00 | | | 13 | | | |
| A-C | 285 | 0.00 | | | 285 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 67 | 0.00 | 576 | 0.115 | 67 | 0.1 | 7.772 | A |
| C-AB | 29 | 0.00 | 872 | 0.034 | 30 | 0.1 | 4.699 | A |
| C-A | 429 | 0.00 | | | 429 | | | |
| A-B | 11 | 0.00 | | | 11 | | | |
| A-C | 233 | 0.00 | | | 233 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 56 | 0.00 | 596 | 0.093 | 56 | 0.1 | 7.330 | A |
| C-AB | 22 | 0.00 | 830 | 0.026 | 22 | 0.0 | 4.899 | A |
| C-A | 362 | 0.00 | | | 362 | | | |
| A-B | 9 | 0.00 | | | 9 | | | |
| A-C | 195 | 0.00 | | | 195 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 0.87 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 0.87 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 506 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 42 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 389 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 30 | 476 |
| | B | 18 | 0 | 24 |
| | C | 348 | 41 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.10 | 9.04 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 5.91 | 0.3 | 1.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 32 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.057 | 31 | 0.1 | 7.597 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 0.00 | 720 | 0.067 | 48 | 0.1 | 5.894 | A |
| C-A | 244 | 0.00 | | | 244 | | | |
| A-B | 23 | 0.00 | | | 23 | | | |
| A-C | 358 | 0.00 | | | 358 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 38 | 0.00 | 524 | 0.072 | 38 | 0.1 | 8.139 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 0.00 | 741 | 0.086 | 64 | 0.2 | 5.849 | A |
| C-A | 286 | 0.00 | | | 286 | | | |
| A-B | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-C | 428 | 0.00 | | | 428 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 46 | 0.00 | 484 | 0.095 | 46 | 0.1 | 9.031 | A |
| C-AB | 90 | 0.00 | 772 | 0.117 | 90 | 0.3 | 5.809 | A |
| C-A | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |
| A-B | 33 | 0.00 | | | 33 | | | |
| A-C | 524 | 0.00 | | | 524 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 46 | 0.00 | 484 | 0.095 | 46 | 0.1 | 9.036 | A |
| C-AB | 90 | 0.00 | 772 | 0.117 | 90 | 0.3 | 5.814 | A |
| C-A | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |
| A-B | 33 | 0.00 | | | 33 | | | |
| A-C | 524 | 0.00 | | | 524 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 38 | 0.00 | 524 | 0.072 | 38 | 0.1 | 8.148 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 0.00 | 741 | 0.087 | 65 | 0.2 | 5.862 | A |
| C-A | 285 | 0.00 | | | 285 | | | |
| A-B | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-C | 428 | 0.00 | | | 428 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 32 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.057 | 32 | 0.1 | 7.607 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 0.00 | 720 | 0.068 | 49 | 0.1 | 5.907 | A |
| C-A | 244 | 0.00 | | | 244 | | | |
| A-B | 23 | 0.00 | | | 23 | | | |
| A-C | 358 | 0.00 | | | 358 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.18 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.54 | 1.51 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | | | N/A | N/A |

# Junctions 11

## PICADY 11 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 11.0.0.2177
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2024

For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk trlsoftware.com

**The users of this computer program for the solution of an engineering problem are in no way relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the solution**

**Filename:** J2 The SID_The Folds Western Access.j11
**Path:** J:\332612639 - One Horton Heath\5500 - Transport\06 - Modelling\Local Modelling
**Report generation date:** 22/10/2025 10:00:35

---

»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM
»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | AM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | PM

### Summary of junction performance

| | AM | | | | | PM | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
| | 2036 - Development + Wider Development and Background | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.3 | 9.19 | 0.20 | A | D2 | 0.2 | 8.92 | 0.12 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 5.30 | 0.04 | A | | 0.2 | 5.83 | 0.11 | A |
| | 2036 - Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.3 | 10.09 | 0.22 | B | D4 | 0.2 | 10.06 | 0.14 | B |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 4.98 | 0.05 | A | | 0.3 | 5.65 | 0.13 | A |

*There are warnings associated with one or more model runs - see the 'Data Errors and Warnings' tables for each Analysis or Demand Set.*

*Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.*

### File summary

#### File Description

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | |
| **Location** | |
| **Site number** | |
| **Date** | 19/08/2025 |
| **Version** | |
| **Status** | (new file) |
| **Identifier** | |
| **Client** | |
| **Jobnumber** | |
| **Enumerator** | CORP\tharland |
| **Description** | |

### Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units | Rate of delay units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| m | kph | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Analysis Options

| Calculate Queue Percentiles | Calculate residual capacity | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold (s) | Queue threshold (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Network flow scaling factor (%) |
|---|---|
| A1 | 100.000 |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.52 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.52 | A |

## Arms

### Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | The SID WB | | Major |
| B | The Folds Western Access | | Minor |
| C | The SID EB | | Major |

### Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right-turn storage | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 6.50 | | | 137.0 | ✓ | 0.00 |

*Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.*

### Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | One lane | 3.62 | 104 | 107 |

### Slope / Intercept / Capacity

#### Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept (PCU/hr) | Slope for A-B | Slope for A-C | Slope for C-A | Slope for C-B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-A | 601 | 0.107 | 0.271 | 0.170 | 0.387 |
| B-C | 734 | 0.110 | 0.278 | - | - |
| C-B | 653 | 0.248 | 0.248 | - | - |

*The slopes and intercepts shown above include custom intercept adjustments only.*

*Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.*

*Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.*

# Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 256 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 98 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 346 | 100.000 |

# Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 19 | 237 |
| | B | 50 | 0 | 48 |
| | C | 327 | 19 | 0 |

# Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 9.19 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 5.30 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 74 | 0.00 | 578 | 0.128 | 73 | 0.2 | 7.837 | A |
| C-AB | 21 | 0.00 | 769 | 0.027 | 21 | 0.0 | 5.294 | A |
| C-A | 239 | 0.00 | | | 239 | | | |
| A-B | 14 | 0.00 | | | 14 | | | |
| A-C | 178 | 0.00 | | | 178 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 88 | 0.00 | 562 | 0.157 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.358 | A |
| C-AB | 27 | 0.00 | 793 | 0.034 | 27 | 0.1 | 5.171 | A |
| C-A | 284 | 0.00 | | | 284 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 213 | 0.00 | | | 213 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 108 | 0.00 | 539 | 0.200 | 108 | 0.3 | 9.178 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 827 | 0.045 | 37 | 0.1 | 5.013 | A |
| C-A | 344 | 0.00 | | | 344 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 261 | 0.00 | | | 261 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 108 | 0.00 | 539 | 0.200 | 108 | 0.3 | 9.189 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 827 | 0.045 | 37 | 0.1 | 5.014 | A |
| C-A | 344 | 0.00 | | | 344 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 261 | 0.00 | | | 261 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 88 | 0.00 | 562 | 0.157 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.375 | A |
| C-AB | 27 | 0.00 | 793 | 0.034 | 27 | 0.1 | 5.174 | A |
| C-A | 284 | 0.00 | | | 284 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 213 | 0.00 | | | 213 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 74 | 0.00 | 578 | 0.128 | 74 | 0.2 | 7.863 | A |
| C-AB | 21 | 0.00 | 769 | 0.027 | 21 | 0.0 | 5.295 | A |
| C-A | 239 | 0.00 | | | 239 | | | |
| A-B | 14 | 0.00 | | | 14 | | | |
| A-C | 178 | 0.00 | | | 178 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 0.91 | 1.30 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.20 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.20 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 378 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 56 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 333 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 48 | 330 |
| | B | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| | C | 287 | 46 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.12 | 8.92 | 0.2 | 0.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 5.83 | 0.2 | 1.2 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 42 | 0.00 | 556 | 0.076 | 42 | 0.1 | 7.698 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 0.00 | 729 | 0.068 | 49 | 0.1 | 5.820 | A |
| C-A | 201 | 0.00 | | | 201 | | | |
| A-B | 36 | 0.00 | | | 36 | | | |
| A-C | 248 | 0.00 | | | 248 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 50 | 0.00 | 535 | 0.094 | 50 | 0.1 | 8.170 | A |
| C-AB | 63 | 0.00 | 746 | 0.085 | 63 | 0.2 | 5.807 | A |
| C-A | 236 | 0.00 | | | 236 | | | |
| A-B | 43 | 0.00 | | | 43 | | | |
| A-C | 297 | 0.00 | | | 297 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 62 | 0.00 | 505 | 0.122 | 62 | 0.2 | 8.918 | A |
| C-AB | 86 | 0.00 | 770 | 0.112 | 86 | 0.2 | 5.794 | A |
| C-A | 280 | 0.00 | | | 280 | | | |
| A-B | 53 | 0.00 | | | 53 | | | |
| A-C | 363 | 0.00 | | | 363 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 62 | 0.00 | 505 | 0.122 | 62 | 0.2 | 8.924 | A |
| C-AB | 86 | 0.00 | 770 | 0.112 | 86 | 0.2 | 5.798 | A |
| C-A | 280 | 0.00 | | | 280 | | | |
| A-B | 53 | 0.00 | | | 53 | | | |
| A-C | 363 | 0.00 | | | 363 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 50 | 0.00 | 535 | 0.094 | 50 | 0.1 | 8.182 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 0.00 | 746 | 0.085 | 64 | 0.2 | 5.812 | A |
| C-A | 236 | 0.00 | | | 236 | | | |
| A-B | 43 | 0.00 | | | 43 | | | |
| A-C | 297 | 0.00 | | | 297 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 42 | 0.00 | 556 | 0.076 | 42 | 0.1 | 7.714 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 0.00 | 729 | 0.068 | 50 | 0.1 | 5.833 | A |
| C-A | 201 | 0.00 | | | 201 | | | |
| A-B | 36 | 0.00 | | | 36 | | | |
| A-C | 248 | 0.00 | | | 248 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.53 | 1.23 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.15 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.24 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.32 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.32 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 326 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 98 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 469 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 19 | 307 |
| | B | 50 | 0 | 48 |
| | C | 450 | 19 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 10.09 | 0.3 | 1.4 | B |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 4.98 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 74 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.134 | 73 | 0.2 | 8.252 | A |
| C-AB | 24 | 0.00 | 820 | 0.030 | 24 | 0.0 | 4.978 | A |
| C-A | 329 | 0.00 | | | 329 | | | |
| A-B | 14 | 0.00 | | | 14 | | | |
| A-C | 231 | 0.00 | | | 231 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 88 | 0.00 | 531 | 0.166 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.939 | A |
| C-AB | 33 | 0.00 | 855 | 0.038 | 32 | 0.1 | 4.815 | A |
| C-A | 389 | 0.00 | | | 389 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 276 | 0.00 | | | 276 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 108 | 0.00 | 500 | 0.216 | 108 | 0.3 | 10.074 | B |
| C-AB | 46 | 0.00 | 905 | 0.051 | 46 | 0.1 | 4.613 | A |
| C-A | 470 | 0.00 | | | 470 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 108 | 0.00 | 500 | 0.216 | 108 | 0.3 | 10.091 | B |
| C-AB | 46 | 0.00 | 905 | 0.051 | 46 | 0.1 | 4.616 | A |
| C-A | 470 | 0.00 | | | 470 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 88 | 0.00 | 531 | 0.166 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.960 | A |
| C-AB | 33 | 0.00 | 855 | 0.038 | 33 | 0.1 | 4.819 | A |
| C-A | 389 | 0.00 | | | 389 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 276 | 0.00 | | | 276 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 74 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.134 | 74 | 0.2 | 8.284 | A |
| C-AB | 24 | 0.00 | 820 | 0.030 | 25 | 0.0 | 4.981 | A |
| C-A | 329 | 0.00 | | | 329 | | | |
| A-B | 14 | 0.00 | | | 14 | | | |
| A-C | 231 | 0.00 | | | 231 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 1.06 | 1.41 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.07 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.07 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Backgound 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 497 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 56 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 426 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 48 | 449 |
| | B | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| | C | 380 | 46 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.14 | 10.06 | 0.2 | 0.5 | B |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 5.65 | 0.3 | 1.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 42 | 0.00 | 522 | 0.081 | 42 | 0.1 | 8.225 | A |
| C-AB | 56 | 0.00 | 758 | 0.073 | 55 | 0.1 | 5.636 | A |
| C-A | 265 | 0.00 | | | 265 | | | |
| A-B | 36 | 0.00 | | | 36 | | | |
| A-C | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 50 | 0.00 | 495 | 0.102 | 50 | 0.1 | 8.911 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 0.00 | 781 | 0.094 | 73 | 0.2 | 5.596 | A |
| C-A | 309 | 0.00 | | | 309 | | | |
| A-B | 43 | 0.00 | | | 43 | | | |
| A-C | 404 | 0.00 | | | 404 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 62 | 0.00 | 455 | 0.135 | 61 | 0.2 | 10.053 | B |
| C-AB | 104 | 0.00 | 816 | 0.128 | 104 | 0.3 | 5.569 | A |
| C-A | 365 | 0.00 | | | 365 | | | |
| A-B | 53 | 0.00 | | | 53 | | | |
| A-C | 494 | 0.00 | | | 494 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 62 | 0.00 | 455 | 0.135 | 62 | 0.2 | 10.062 | B |
| C-AB | 105 | 0.00 | 816 | 0.128 | 105 | 0.3 | 5.573 | A |
| C-A | 364 | 0.00 | | | 364 | | | |
| A-B | 53 | 0.00 | | | 53 | | | |
| A-C | 494 | 0.00 | | | 494 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 50 | 0.00 | 494 | 0.102 | 51 | 0.1 | 8.924 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 0.00 | 782 | 0.095 | 74 | 0.2 | 5.607 | A |
| C-A | 309 | 0.00 | | | 309 | | | |
| A-B | 43 | 0.00 | | | 43 | | | |
| A-C | 404 | 0.00 | | | 404 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 42 | 0.00 | 522 | 0.081 | 42 | 0.1 | 8.252 | A |
| C-AB | 56 | 0.00 | 758 | 0.074 | 56 | 0.1 | 5.651 | A |
| C-A | 265 | 0.00 | | | 265 | | | |
| A-B | 36 | 0.00 | | | 36 | | | |
| A-C | 338 | 0.00 | | | 338 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.14 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.12 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.54 | 1.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | | | N/A | N/A |

# Junctions 11

## PICADY 11 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 11.0.0.2177
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2024

For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk trlsoftware.com

**The users of this computer program for the solution of an engineering problem are in no way relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the solution**

**Filename:** J3 The SID_The Folds Eastern Access.j11
**Path:** J:\332612639 - One Horton Heath\5500 - Transport\06 - Modelling\Local Modelling
**Report generation date:** 22/10/2025 10:04:07

---

»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM
»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM

### Summary of junction performance

| | AM | | | | | PM | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
| | 2036 - Development + Wider Development and Background | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.6 | 10.07 | 0.35 | B | D2 | 0.3 | 8.97 | 0.22 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 5.77 | 0.04 | A | | 0.3 | 6.10 | 0.13 | A |
| | 2036 - Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.9 | 13.05 | 0.46 | B | D4 | 0.4 | 10.79 | 0.28 | B |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 5.54 | 0.05 | A | | 0.3 | 6.04 | 0.15 | A |

*Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.*

### File summary

#### File Description

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Folds Eastern Access/SID |
| **Location** | |
| **Site number** | |
| **Date** | 19/08/2025 |
| **Version** | |
| **Status** | (new file) |
| **Identifier** | |
| **Client** | EBC |
| **Jobnumber** | 332612639 |
| **Enumerator** | CORP\ceadle |
| **Description** | |

### Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units | Rate of delay units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| m | kph | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Analysis Options

| Vehicle length (m) | Calculate Queue Percentiles | Calculate detailed queueing delay | Show lane queues in feet / metres | Show all PICADY stream intercepts | Calculate residual capacity | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold (s) | Queue threshold (PCU) | Use simulation for HCM roundabouts | Use iterations for HCM roundabouts |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.75 | | | | | | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 | | |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Run automatically |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 | ✓ |
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 | ✓ |
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 | ✓ |
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 | ✓ |

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Include in report | Network flow scaling factor (%) | Network capacity scaling factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| A1 | ✓ | 100.000 | 100.000 |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

*No errors or warnings*

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 2.95 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 2.95 | A |

## Arms

### Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | The SID WB | | Major |
| B | The Folds Eastern Access | | Minor |
| C | The SID EB | | Major |

### Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right-turn storage | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 6.50 | | | 136.0 | ✓ | 0.00 |

*Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.*

### Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | One lane | 3.68 | 216 | 215 |

### Slope / Intercept / Capacity

#### Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept (PCU/hr) | Slope for A-B | Slope for A-C | Slope for C-A | Slope for C-B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-A | 710 | 0.126 | 0.320 | 0.201 | 0.457 |
| B-C | 811 | 0.122 | 0.307 | - | - |
| C-B | 653 | 0.247 | 0.247 | - | - |

*The slopes and intercepts shown above include custom intercept adjustments only.*

*Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.*

*Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.*

# Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Run automatically |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 | ✓ |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 285 | 100.000 |
| B | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 192 | 100.000 |
| C | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 229 | 100.000 |

# Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 58 | 227 |
| | B | 136 | 0 | 56 |
| | C | 210 | 19 | 0 |

# Vehicle Mix

| HV data entry mode | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
|---|---|
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Total Junction Arrivals (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.35 | 10.07 | 0.6 | B | 176 | 264 |
| C-AB | 0.04 | 5.77 | 0.1 | A | 24 | 36 |
| C-A | | | | | 186 | 279 |
| A-B | | | | | 53 | 80 |
| A-C | | | | | 208 | 312 |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 145 | 36 | 0.00 | 647 | 0.224 | 143 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 7.846 | A |
| C-AB | 18 | 5 | 0.00 | 705 | 0.026 | 18 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.766 | A |
| C-A | 154 | 38 | 0.00 | | | 154 | | | | |
| A-B | 44 | 11 | 0.00 | | | 44 | | | | |
| A-C | 171 | 43 | 0.00 | | | 171 | | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 173 | 43 | 0.00 | 629 | 0.274 | 172 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.660 | A |
| C-AB | 23 | 6 | 0.00 | 716 | 0.032 | 23 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.712 | A |
| C-A | 183 | 46 | 0.00 | | | 183 | | | | |
| A-B | 52 | 13 | 0.00 | | | 52 | | | | |
| A-C | 204 | 51 | 0.00 | | | 204 | | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 211 | 53 | 0.00 | 605 | 0.350 | 211 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 10.034 | B |
| C-AB | 31 | 8 | 0.00 | 732 | 0.042 | 31 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 5.641 | A |
| C-A | 221 | 55 | 0.00 | | | 221 | | | | |
| A-B | 64 | 16 | 0.00 | | | 64 | | | | |
| A-C | 250 | 62 | 0.00 | | | 250 | | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 211 | 53 | 0.00 | 605 | 0.350 | 211 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 10.070 | B |
| C-AB | 31 | 8 | 0.00 | 732 | 0.042 | 31 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.645 | A |
| C-A | 221 | 55 | 0.00 | | | 221 | | | | |
| A-B | 64 | 16 | 0.00 | | | 64 | | | | |
| A-C | 250 | 62 | 0.00 | | | 250 | | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 173 | 43 | 0.00 | 629 | 0.274 | 173 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 8.700 | A |
| C-AB | 23 | 6 | 0.00 | 716 | 0.032 | 23 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 5.714 | A |
| C-A | 183 | 46 | 0.00 | | | 183 | | | | |
| A-B | 52 | 13 | 0.00 | | | 52 | | | | |
| A-C | 204 | 51 | 0.00 | | | 204 | | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 145 | 36 | 0.00 | 647 | 0.224 | 145 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.900 | A |
| C-AB | 18 | 5 | 0.00 | 705 | 0.026 | 19 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.770 | A |
| C-A | 154 | 38 | 0.00 | | | 154 | | | | |
| A-B | 44 | 11 | 0.00 | | | 44 | | | | |
| A-C | 171 | 43 | 0.00 | | | 171 | | | | |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

*No errors or warnings*

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 1.95 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 1.95 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Run automatically |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 | ✓ |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 358 | 100.000 |
| B | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 114 | 100.000 |
| C | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 302 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 138 | 220 |
| | B | 86 | 0 | 28 |
| | C | 248 | 54 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

| HV data entry mode | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
|---|---|
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Total Junction Arrivals (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 8.97 | 0.3 | A | 105 | 157 |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 6.10 | 0.3 | A | 73 | 110 |
| C-A | | | | | 204 | 306 |
| A-B | | | | | 127 | 190 |
| A-C | | | | | 202 | 303 |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 21 | 0.00 | 620 | 0.138 | 85 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 7.393 | A |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 0.00 | 712 | 0.077 | 55 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.023 | A |
| C-A | 172 | 43 | 0.00 | | | 172 | | | | |
| A-B | 104 | 26 | 0.00 | | | 104 | | | | |
| A-C | 166 | 41 | 0.00 | | | 166 | | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 102 | 26 | 0.00 | 598 | 0.171 | 102 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.987 | A |
| C-AB | 70 | 18 | 0.00 | 725 | 0.097 | 70 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 6.047 | A |
| C-A | 201 | 50 | 0.00 | | | 201 | | | | |
| A-B | 124 | 31 | 0.00 | | | 124 | | | | |
| A-C | 198 | 49 | 0.00 | | | 198 | | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 126 | 31 | 0.00 | 567 | 0.221 | 125 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.956 | A |
| C-AB | 94 | 24 | 0.00 | 744 | 0.127 | 94 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 6.092 | A |
| C-A | 238 | 60 | 0.00 | | | 238 | | | | |
| A-B | 152 | 38 | 0.00 | | | 152 | | | | |
| A-C | 242 | 61 | 0.00 | | | 242 | | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 126 | 31 | 0.00 | 567 | 0.221 | 126 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.970 | A |
| C-AB | 94 | 24 | 0.00 | 744 | 0.127 | 94 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.100 | A |
| C-A | 238 | 60 | 0.00 | | | 238 | | | | |
| A-B | 152 | 38 | 0.00 | | | 152 | | | | |
| A-C | 242 | 61 | 0.00 | | | 242 | | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 102 | 26 | 0.00 | 598 | 0.171 | 103 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 8.006 | A |
| C-AB | 70 | 18 | 0.00 | 725 | 0.097 | 71 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 6.057 | A |
| C-A | 201 | 50 | 0.00 | | | 201 | | | | |
| A-B | 124 | 31 | 0.00 | | | 124 | | | | |
| A-C | 198 | 49 | 0.00 | | | 198 | | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 21 | 0.00 | 620 | 0.138 | 86 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.420 | A |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 0.00 | 712 | 0.078 | 55 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 6.034 | A |
| C-A | 172 | 43 | 0.00 | | | 172 | | | | |
| A-B | 104 | 26 | 0.00 | | | 104 | | | | |
| A-C | 166 | 41 | 0.00 | | | 166 | | | | |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

*No errors or warnings*

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 3.57 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 3.57 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Run automatically |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 | ✓ |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 355 | 100.000 |
| B | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 234 | 100.000 |
| C | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 313 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 66 | 289 |
| | B | 174 | 0 | 60 |
| | C | 294 | 19 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

| HV data entry mode | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
|---|---|
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Total Junction Arrivals (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.46 | 13.05 | 0.9 | B | 215 | 322 |
| C-AB | 0.05 | 5.54 | 0.1 | A | 28 | 41 |
| C-A | | | | | 260 | 389 |
| A-B | | | | | 61 | 91 |
| A-C | | | | | 265 | 398 |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 176 | 44 | 0.00 | 616 | 0.286 | 174 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 8.933 | A |
| C-AB | 20 | 5 | 0.00 | 736 | 0.028 | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.535 | A |
| C-A | 215 | 54 | 0.00 | | | 215 | | | | |
| A-B | 50 | 12 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | | |
| A-C | 218 | 54 | 0.00 | | | 218 | | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 210 | 53 | 0.00 | 593 | 0.355 | 210 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 10.315 | B |
| C-AB | 26 | 7 | 0.00 | 754 | 0.035 | 26 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 5.442 | A |
| C-A | 255 | 64 | 0.00 | | | 255 | | | | |
| A-B | 59 | 15 | 0.00 | | | 59 | | | | |
| A-C | 260 | 65 | 0.00 | | | 260 | | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 258 | 64 | 0.00 | 561 | 0.459 | 256 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 12.948 | B |
| C-AB | 36 | 9 | 0.00 | 780 | 0.046 | 36 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.322 | A |
| C-A | 309 | 77 | 0.00 | | | 309 | | | | |
| A-B | 73 | 18 | 0.00 | | | 73 | | | | |
| A-C | 318 | 80 | 0.00 | | | 318 | | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 258 | 64 | 0.00 | 561 | 0.459 | 258 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 13.052 | B |
| C-AB | 36 | 9 | 0.00 | 780 | 0.046 | 36 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.323 | A |
| C-A | 309 | 77 | 0.00 | | | 309 | | | | |
| A-B | 73 | 18 | 0.00 | | | 73 | | | | |
| A-C | 318 | 80 | 0.00 | | | 318 | | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 210 | 53 | 0.00 | 593 | 0.355 | 212 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 10.418 | B |
| C-AB | 26 | 7 | 0.00 | 754 | 0.035 | 26 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.444 | A |
| C-A | 255 | 64 | 0.00 | | | 255 | | | | |
| A-B | 59 | 15 | 0.00 | | | 59 | | | | |
| A-C | 260 | 65 | 0.00 | | | 260 | | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 176 | 44 | 0.00 | 616 | 0.286 | 177 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 9.033 | A |
| C-AB | 21 | 5 | 0.00 | 736 | 0.028 | 21 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 5.536 | A |
| C-A | 215 | 54 | 0.00 | | | 215 | | | | |
| A-B | 50 | 12 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | | |
| A-C | 218 | 54 | 0.00 | | | 218 | | | | |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

*No errors or warnings*

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 2.03 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 2.03 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Run automatically |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 | ✓ |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 477 | 100.000 |
| B | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 131 | 100.000 |
| C | | ONE HOUR | ✓ | 381 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 176 | 301 |
| | B | 103 | 0 | 28 |
| | C | 323 | 58 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

| HV data entry mode | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
|---|---|
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

### Heavy Vehicle %

| From | To | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Total Junction Arrivals (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.28 | 10.79 | 0.4 | B | 120 | 180 |
| C-AB | 0.15 | 6.04 | 0.3 | A | 90 | 135 |
| C-A | | | | | 260 | 390 |
| A-B | | | | | 162 | 242 |
| A-C | | | | | 276 | 414 |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 99 | 25 | 0.00 | 581 | 0.170 | 98 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 8.173 | A |
| C-AB | 65 | 16 | 0.00 | 731 | 0.090 | 65 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 5.943 | A |
| C-A | 221 | 55 | 0.00 | | | 221 | | | | |
| A-B | 133 | 33 | 0.00 | | | 133 | | | | |
| A-C | 227 | 57 | 0.00 | | | 227 | | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 118 | 29 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.213 | 117 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 9.108 | A |
| C-AB | 85 | 21 | 0.00 | 749 | 0.114 | 85 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 5.969 | A |
| C-A | 257 | 64 | 0.00 | | | 257 | | | | |
| A-B | 158 | 40 | 0.00 | | | 158 | | | | |
| A-C | 271 | 68 | 0.00 | | | 271 | | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 144 | 36 | 0.00 | 511 | 0.282 | 144 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 10.758 | B |
| C-AB | 118 | 30 | 0.00 | 775 | 0.153 | 118 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.029 | A |
| C-A | 301 | 75 | 0.00 | | | 301 | | | | |
| A-B | 194 | 48 | 0.00 | | | 194 | | | | |
| A-C | 331 | 83 | 0.00 | | | 331 | | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 144 | 36 | 0.00 | 511 | 0.282 | 144 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 10.791 | B |
| C-AB | 119 | 30 | 0.00 | 776 | 0.153 | 119 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 6.037 | A |
| C-A | 301 | 75 | 0.00 | | | 301 | | | | |
| A-B | 194 | 48 | 0.00 | | | 194 | | | | |
| A-C | 331 | 83 | 0.00 | | | 331 | | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 118 | 29 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.213 | 118 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 9.146 | A |
| C-AB | 86 | 21 | 0.00 | 749 | 0.114 | 86 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 5.983 | A |
| C-A | 257 | 64 | 0.00 | | | 257 | | | | |
| A-B | 158 | 40 | 0.00 | | | 158 | | | | |
| A-C | 271 | 68 | 0.00 | | | 271 | | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Junction Arrivals (PCU) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | Start queue (PCU) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 99 | 25 | 0.00 | 581 | 0.170 | 99 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 8.219 | A |
| C-AB | 66 | 16 | 0.00 | 731 | 0.090 | 66 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 5.959 | A |
| C-A | 221 | 55 | 0.00 | | | 221 | | | | |
| A-B | 133 | 33 | 0.00 | | | 133 | | | | |
| A-C | 227 | 57 | 0.00 | | | 227 | | | | |

# Junctions 11

## PICADY 11 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 11.0.0.2177
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2024

For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk trlsoftware.com

**The users of this computer program for the solution of an engineering problem are in no way relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the solution**

**Filename:** J4 The Folds Eastern Access_Fir Tree Lane.j11
**Path:** J:\332612639 - One Horton Heath\5500 - Transport\06 - Modelling\Local Modelling
**Report generation date:** 22/10/2025 10:11:23

---

»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM
»2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM
»2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM

### Summary of junction performance

| | AM | | | | | PM | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Set ID | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
| | 2036 - Development + Wider Development and Background | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.3 | 8.45 | 0.21 | A | D2 | 0.3 | 9.18 | 0.20 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 7.05 | 0.08 | A | | 0.3 | 7.38 | 0.19 | A |
| | 2036 - Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | | | | | | | | | |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.4 | 9.21 | 0.28 | A | D4 | 0.3 | 9.51 | 0.23 | A |
| Stream C-AB | | 0.1 | 7.17 | 0.09 | A | | 0.5 | 8.22 | 0.28 | A |

*There are warnings associated with one or more model runs - see the 'Data Errors and Warnings' tables for each Analysis or Demand Set.*

*Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.*

### File summary

#### File Description

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | |
| **Location** | |
| **Site number** | |
| **Date** | 20/08/2025 |
| **Version** | |
| **Status** | (new file) |
| **Identifier** | |
| **Client** | |
| **Jobnumber** | |
| **Enumerator** | CORP\tharland |
| **Description** | |

### Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units | Rate of delay units |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| m | kph | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Analysis Options

| Calculate Queue Percentiles | Calculate residual capacity | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold (s) | Queue threshold (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ✓ | | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Network flow scaling factor (%) |
|---|---|
| A1 | 100.000 |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 3.75 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 3.75 | A |

## Arms

### Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | The Folds | | Major |
| B | Fir Tree Lane | | Minor |
| C | The SID | | Major |

### Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right-turn storage | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 6.50 | | | 72.0 | ✓ | 0.00 |

*Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.*

### Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B | One lane | 3.21 | 22 | 22 |

### Slope / Intercept / Capacity

#### Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept (PCU/hr) | Slope for A-B | Slope for A-C | Slope for C-A | Slope for C-B |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-A | 506 | 0.090 | 0.228 | 0.143 | 0.326 |
| B-C | 651 | 0.098 | 0.247 | - | - |
| C-B | 616 | 0.233 | 0.233 | - | - |

*The slopes and intercepts shown above include custom intercept adjustments only.*

*Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.*

*Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.*

# Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D1 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 139 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 110 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 77 | 100.000 |

# Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 41 | 98 |
| | B | 16 | 0 | 94 |
| | C | 38 | 39 | 0 |

# Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.21 | 8.45 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A |
| C-AB | 0.08 | 7.05 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 83 | 0.00 | 601 | 0.138 | 82 | 0.2 | 7.624 | A |
| C-AB | 31 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.050 | 31 | 0.1 | 6.824 | A |
| C-A | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-B | 31 | 0.00 | | | 31 | | | |
| A-C | 74 | 0.00 | | | 74 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 99 | 0.00 | 596 | 0.166 | 99 | 0.2 | 7.958 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.061 | 37 | 0.1 | 6.917 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 0.00 | | | 32 | | | |
| A-B | 37 | 0.00 | | | 37 | | | |
| A-C | 88 | 0.00 | | | 88 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 121 | 0.00 | 590 | 0.205 | 121 | 0.3 | 8.443 | A |
| C-AB | 46 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.076 | 46 | 0.1 | 7.043 | A |
| C-A | 39 | 0.00 | | | 39 | | | |
| A-B | 45 | 0.00 | | | 45 | | | |
| A-C | 108 | 0.00 | | | 108 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 121 | 0.00 | 590 | 0.205 | 121 | 0.3 | 8.452 | A |
| C-AB | 46 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.076 | 46 | 0.1 | 7.046 | A |
| C-A | 39 | 0.00 | | | 39 | | | |
| A-B | 45 | 0.00 | | | 45 | | | |
| A-C | 108 | 0.00 | | | 108 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 99 | 0.00 | 596 | 0.166 | 99 | 0.2 | 7.971 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.061 | 37 | 0.1 | 6.922 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 0.00 | | | 32 | | | |
| A-B | 37 | 0.00 | | | 37 | | | |
| A-C | 88 | 0.00 | | | 88 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 83 | 0.00 | 601 | 0.138 | 83 | 0.2 | 7.650 | A |
| C-AB | 31 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.050 | 31 | 0.1 | 6.832 | A |
| C-A | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-B | 31 | 0.00 | | | 31 | | | |
| A-C | 74 | 0.00 | | | 74 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.08 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.52 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.98 | 1.35 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 4.68 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 4.68 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D2 | 2036 | Development + Wider Development and Background | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 79 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 96 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 192 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 23 | 56 |
| | B | 39 | 0 | 57 |
| | C | 94 | 98 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 9.18 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A |
| C-AB | 0.19 | 7.38 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 72 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.131 | 72 | 0.2 | 8.229 | A |
| C-AB | 83 | 0.00 | 649 | 0.128 | 82 | 0.2 | 6.980 | A |
| C-A | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 42 | 0.00 | | | 42 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 0.00 | 546 | 0.158 | 86 | 0.2 | 8.610 | A |
| C-AB | 101 | 0.00 | 656 | 0.154 | 101 | 0.2 | 7.143 | A |
| C-A | 71 | 0.00 | | | 71 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 50 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 106 | 0.00 | 537 | 0.197 | 105 | 0.3 | 9.165 | A |
| C-AB | 128 | 0.00 | 665 | 0.192 | 128 | 0.3 | 7.373 | A |
| C-A | 83 | 0.00 | | | 83 | | | |
| A-B | 25 | 0.00 | | | 25 | | | |
| A-C | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 106 | 0.00 | 537 | 0.197 | 106 | 0.3 | 9.178 | A |
| C-AB | 128 | 0.00 | 665 | 0.193 | 128 | 0.3 | 7.383 | A |
| C-A | 83 | 0.00 | | | 83 | | | |
| A-B | 25 | 0.00 | | | 25 | | | |
| A-C | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 0.00 | 546 | 0.158 | 87 | 0.2 | 8.628 | A |
| C-AB | 101 | 0.00 | 656 | 0.155 | 102 | 0.2 | 7.153 | A |
| C-A | 71 | 0.00 | | | 71 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 50 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 72 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.131 | 72 | 0.2 | 8.260 | A |
| C-AB | 83 | 0.00 | 649 | 0.128 | 83 | 0.2 | 7.004 | A |
| C-A | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 42 | 0.00 | | | 42 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.23 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 0.89 | 1.29 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.30 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 0.93 | 1.30 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.23 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 4.68 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 4.68 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D3 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 139 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 152 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 85 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 41 | 98 |
| | B | 16 | 0 | 136 |
| | C | 38 | 47 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.28 | 9.21 | 0.4 | 1.7 | A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 7.17 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 114 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.188 | 113 | 0.3 | 7.986 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.061 | 37 | 0.1 | 6.900 | A |
| C-A | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-B | 31 | 0.00 | | | 31 | | | |
| A-C | 74 | 0.00 | | | 74 | | | |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 137 | 0.00 | 604 | 0.226 | 136 | 0.3 | 8.471 | A |
| C-AB | 45 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.073 | 45 | 0.1 | 7.010 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 0.00 | | | 32 | | | |
| A-B | 37 | 0.00 | | | 37 | | | |
| A-C | 88 | 0.00 | | | 88 | | | |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 167 | 0.00 | 597 | 0.280 | 167 | 0.4 | 9.193 | A |
| C-AB | 56 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.091 | 55 | 0.1 | 7.163 | A |
| C-A | 38 | 0.00 | | | 38 | | | |
| A-B | 45 | 0.00 | | | 45 | | | |
| A-C | 108 | 0.00 | | | 108 | | | |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 167 | 0.00 | 597 | 0.280 | 167 | 0.4 | 9.211 | A |
| C-AB | 56 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.091 | 56 | 0.1 | 7.167 | A |
| C-A | 38 | 0.00 | | | 38 | | | |
| A-B | 45 | 0.00 | | | 45 | | | |
| A-C | 108 | 0.00 | | | 108 | | | |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 137 | 0.00 | 604 | 0.226 | 137 | 0.3 | 8.495 | A |
| C-AB | 45 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.073 | 45 | 0.1 | 7.016 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 0.00 | | | 32 | | | |
| A-B | 37 | 0.00 | | | 37 | | | |
| A-C | 88 | 0.00 | | | 88 | | | |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 114 | 0.00 | 608 | 0.188 | 115 | 0.3 | 8.026 | A |
| C-AB | 37 | 0.00 | 610 | 0.061 | 37 | 0.1 | 6.908 | A |
| C-A | 27 | 0.00 | | | 27 | | | |
| A-B | 31 | 0.00 | | | 31 | | | |
| A-C | 74 | 0.00 | | | 74 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 07:45 - 08:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:00 - 08:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:15 - 08:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.52 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:30 - 08:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.43 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 1.39 | 1.73 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.52 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 08:45 - 09:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 09:00 - 09:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.26 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.08 | | | N/A | N/A |

# 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM

### Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | Queue variations | Analysis Options | Queue percentiles may be unreliable if the mean queue in any time segment is very low or very high. |

## Junction Network

### Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way | | 5.66 | A |

### Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Left | Normal/unknown | 5.66 | A |

## Traffic Demand

### Demand Set Details

| ID | Year | Scenario | Time period | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D4 | 2036 | Sensitivity Test (Development + Wider Development and Background 1.5) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

### Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (PCU/hr) | Scaling Factor (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | | ✓ | 79 | 100.000 |
| B | | ✓ | 114 | 100.000 |
| C | | ✓ | 234 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

### Demand (PCU/hr)

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 23 | 56 |
| | B | 39 | 0 | 75 |
| | C | 94 | 140 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

### Heavy Vehicle %

| | | To | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C |
| From | A | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| | B | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| | C | 10 | 10 | 0 |

# Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max 95th percentile Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.23 | 9.51 | 0.3 | 1.5 | A |
| C-AB | 0.28 | 8.22 | 0.5 | 1.8 | A |
| C-A | | | | | |
| A-B | | | | | |
| A-C | | | | | |

## Main Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 0.00 | 559 | 0.154 | 85 | 0.2 | 8.342 | A |
| C-AB | 118 | 0.00 | 649 | 0.182 | 117 | 0.3 | 7.436 | A |
| C-A | 58 | 0.00 | | | 58 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 42 | 0.00 | | | 42 | | | |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 102 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.186 | 102 | 0.2 | 8.804 | A |
| C-AB | 145 | 0.00 | 656 | 0.221 | 144 | 0.3 | 7.745 | A |
| C-A | 66 | 0.00 | | | 66 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 50 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 126 | 0.00 | 542 | 0.232 | 125 | 0.3 | 9.499 | A |
| C-AB | 183 | 0.00 | 665 | 0.275 | 182 | 0.5 | 8.209 | A |
| C-A | 75 | 0.00 | | | 75 | | | |
| A-B | 25 | 0.00 | | | 25 | | | |
| A-C | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 126 | 0.00 | 542 | 0.232 | 126 | 0.3 | 9.508 | A |
| C-AB | 183 | 0.00 | 665 | 0.275 | 183 | 0.5 | 8.224 | A |
| C-A | 75 | 0.00 | | | 75 | | | |
| A-B | 25 | 0.00 | | | 25 | | | |
| A-C | 62 | 0.00 | | | 62 | | | |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 102 | 0.00 | 552 | 0.186 | 103 | 0.3 | 8.825 | A |
| C-AB | 145 | 0.00 | 656 | 0.221 | 145 | 0.4 | 7.770 | A |
| C-A | 66 | 0.00 | | | 66 | | | |
| A-B | 21 | 0.00 | | | 21 | | | |
| A-C | 50 | 0.00 | | | 50 | | | |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | Throughput (PCU/hr) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 86 | 0.00 | 559 | 0.154 | 86 | 0.2 | 8.380 | A |
| C-AB | 118 | 0.00 | 649 | 0.183 | 119 | 0.3 | 7.474 | A |
| C-A | 58 | 0.00 | | | 58 | | | |
| A-B | 17 | 0.00 | | | 17 | | | |
| A-C | 42 | 0.00 | | | 42 | | | |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

### 16:45 - 17:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.27 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:00 - 17:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:15 - 17:30

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.47 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.54 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:30 - 17:45

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 1.17 | 1.53 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.47 | 0.04 | 0.36 | 1.49 | 1.76 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 17:45 - 18:00

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.35 | | | N/A | N/A |

### 18:00 - 18:15

| Stream | Mean (PCU) | Q05 (PCU) | Q50 (PCU) | Q90 (PCU) | Q95 (PCU) | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.28 | | | N/A | N/A |