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## 1 EIAr Addendum

Below is a summary of the amendments to this Traffic Statement as a result of the An Bord Pleanála Further Information request and the relocation of the Car Park in the Strabane site, following unsuccessful Land Owner Negotiations.

## Changes to EIAr due to the Relocation of the Car Park in Strabane Site

## Proposed Development Summary (Strabane Proposals) - Relocation of the Car Park - Car Parking Numbers

The Strabane carpark location was relocated to the existing halting site, resulting in a minimal alteration to parking numbers (an additional 4 car spaces and 1 less bus space) in response to the following environmental constraints:

- Avoiding an area of Japanese Knotweed (to the south-eastern end of the halting site)
- Maintaining the original footprint of the halting site hardstanding area to maintain habitats.

As such, the proposed asphalt surfaced car park will now include 125 car park spaces and 11 disabled bays as well as the provision for two loading / bus bays.

The Flow Diagrams have been amended to reflect the changes above which amount to no material change to the original Traffic Statement assessment or mitigation measures.

The proposed change in parking numbers is considered nominal and to have no material difference to the traffic modelling outputs. As such, the traffic model was not re-simulated and therefore, within the report, the Traffic Generation and the Flow Diagrams may have negligible differences to the Modelling outputs.

## Relocation of the Car Park - Emergency / Maintenance Access

The relocation of the Car Park in Strabane Site resulted in the removal of the emergency and maintenance access/exit from/to Park Road (as this access relied on private land acquisition which was subject to unsuccessful land owner negotiations). Emergency and maintenance access/exit will now be facilitated by the primary entrance and exit to the park, at an existing spur to the A5 Barnhill Roundabout.

## Changes to EIAr due to ABP FI Request / Further Consideration of Construction Traffic

The indicative high level construction phase programme, developed in response to the Board's Further Information request, provides further clarity in the peak periods of construction traffic in relation to the indictive programme and duration of HGV movements in particular. Each of the other areas referred to within the Further Information request have been considered and addressed in under section heading, "Additional Temporary Construction Traffic".

The following appendix have been added to inform the ABP FI request.

- Appendix F - Indicative High Level Construction Phase Programme
- Appendix G - Cut Fill - Indicative Volumes / Areas

The construction of the proposed scheme has been highlighted within the original TS in terms of HGVs, LGVs, fuel deliveries, cranes, and oversized loads etc, a maximum of 30 HGV (one way) movements
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in relation to crane ballast in preparation for the lift has been identified as the focused period of HGV traffic over a short period of time. Please refer to the indictive construction phase programme contained in Appendix F.

## Predicted Daily Vehicle Trips

The predicted daily trips have been identified in section heading, 'Additional Temporary Construction Traffic' which represents the most onerous predicted traffic generation movements during the construction phase. The indicative construction phase programme contained in Appendix F is helpful in considering the time periods of most likely HGV movements over likely 2month periods, October to December for mobilisation and July to September for bridge construction. The volume of fill to be imported during the above periods will amount to less than the predicted 30 HGV (one way) movements assessed in the original TS. However, as the contractor will be required to submit a final Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) post award of contract the temporary traffic volumes can be raised within that document's construction programme.

## Cut Fill Balance

It is expected the cut / fill balance will require the import of approximately $15,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}-25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of material. However, this is over the construction period of the scheme and can be programmed to ensure no concentrated HGV movements. That said, even with concentrated HGV movement this will amount to less than the original anticipated 30 HGV (one way) vehicles considered in the original TS.

Appendix $G$ contains a cut fill analysis of the proposed scheme. In reality it is expected the import material will be significantly less as the cut / fill analysis contained in Appendix G excludes excavations in relation to construction footprint for drainage, roads, carparks formation levels. Therefore, the actual impact is predicted to be significantly less in terms of traffic movements regarding import material.

## Other Material Import

The compressive indictive construction programme is helpful in providing information relation to the construction sequence. The material in relation to the building, carparks, play parks etc are insignificant in relation to the ballast for the bridge and will occur over time, therefore the traffic impact will be modest over a longer period of time within the construction programme. The resulting factor of the latter is the traffic impact will be modest.

## Trips Generated by Workers and Visitors to the Site

Traffic generation of workers and visitors, LGV's are estimated at 10 (one way) trips per day to the compound including workers within the LGV with 20 (one-way trips) for staff arriving at the compounds for work in vans. It is anticipated that contractor's staff will have a slight and temporary adverse local impact considering they are already on the surrounding road network, therefore diverted trip rather than new trips. Visitors to the site are expected to be out of peak hour traffic times and infrequent in nature, it is not expected visitors will have any meaningful implications in relation to the EIAr.

## Vehicle Types and Distribution During Am \& PM Traffic Peaks

Vehicle types have been described within the body of the original TS, the distribution will be subject to the awarded contractor but will likely have a balanced approach along the N14/N15 and therefore approach to the site. It is not expected that any significant HGV movements in particular will occur within the AM or PM peak periods. With exception to isolated periods of blacktopping roads the latter would be considered normal in relation to a project of this nature and scale.
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## Cumulative Impact and Permitted Development Either Side of Border

Please refer to Chapter 15 of the Addendum EIAR for full consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts arising from the Project in association with other development on both Strabane and Lifford sides of the Project, as well as the interaction between potential impacts on different environmental receptors arising from the proposed Project.
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## 2 Introduction / Non-Technical Summary

Hoy Dorman have been commissioned by McAdam Design to prepare a Traffic Statement (TS) for the proposed Riverine Community Park (RCP). As this proposed scheme spans both Northern Ireland (NI) and the Republic of Ireland (ROI) this TS will be submitted to both jurisdictions Planning Offices for assessment. The TS has considered the scheme as a single project, where required the impacts on the Lifford, and Strabane sections have been separated to direct the approving Planning Offices to their respective elements of the document.

The Riverine Community Park project proposes to create circa thirty acres of new community park space and infrastructure at Lifford and Strabane. It proposes to create a neutral, shared space by utilising agricultural land on both sides of the border to accommodate some 200,000 users per year in combination with the Northern Greenway project in Strabane and the Strabane - Lifford Greenway. It will span both sides of the River Foyle and be connected by a new pedestrian and cycle bridge. The Councils propose that the diversity of this offering will make for a more inclusive and shared experience.

The proposed park on the Lifford site will be a designed landscape incorporating indoor and outdoor recreational features, complemented by a naturalised flood plain environment on the Strabane site that will be used for informal recreation and environmental education and conservation activities.

Figure 1: Proposed Project Location Plan
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## The Proposed A5 Improvements

The dualling of the A5 is currently progressing through planning. The alignment and design are fixed however there is no expected timeline for delivery.

Considering the proposed alignment and vesting boundary of the A5 upgrade, once complete, access arrangements to Riverine Community Park from the Strabane side will change. An option to maintain the vehicle; pedestrian; cycle entrance to the RCP in proximity to the entrance presented within this proposal has been supported by both the Riverine and A5WTC Project Teams.

## Existing Conditions

## Strabane (NI)

Strabane is a large town in Northern Ireland which according to the Northern Ireland 2011 Census has a population of circa 13,172 people. The A5 protected route runs along the frontage of the proposed Community Park which straddles the River Foyle. Strabane has excellent footway links from the residential areas to the various town amenities, footways are to a good standard which benefit from both street lighting and dropped kerbs with tactile paving.

The Strabane to Lifford Greenway has already been constructed to the south of the proposed RCP with a ghost pedestrian island to facilitate crossing of the A38 Lifford Road. The Strabane to Cloughcor greenway is currently being designed with proposals to link into the north of the RCP.

The proposed site will be constructed within a part brownfield and part greenfield site and will utilise a historic access and egress from the Asda roundabout, via Branch Road, which previously served Greenbrae Halting Site. The halting site was closed in May 2015, however, was not vacated until August 2016.

## Lifford (ROI)

Lifford is a town in Donegal which according to the 2016 Republic of Ireland Census has a population on circa 1,626 people. There are excellent footway links from the residential areas to the various town amenities, these footway links benefit from both street lighting and dropped kerbs with tactile paving.

The proposed site on the Lifford side of the River Foyle is currently greenfield, access to the RCP will be from Station Road which currently serves as an access to a large carpark that serves a Cinema, The Donegal Council Offices and The Three Rivers Centre.

## Proposed Use of the Riverine Community Park

It is proposed there will be circa 150,000 users of the park per year of which $28,985^{1}$ users will be related to the community pavilion incorporating the refreshment area and community centre with programmed activities. Several major events are planned in the open space during a typical year, traffic and people management will be considered under an Event Management Plan specific to the events.

## Non-Motorised Users Access

Non-Motorised Users (NMU) will benefit of RCP current and future Greenway projects in Strabane NI with the proposed upgrading of an existing uncontrolled road crossing on the A38 Lifford Road just south of ASDA roundabout. This crossing will be upgraded to a Toucan crossing to facilitate pedestrians and cyclists. Lifford currently benefits from a controlled crossing point across the N15 next to Bridge Street.

[^0]
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## Traffic Generation

Traffic generation has been estimated by surveying several community parks across Ireland with peak hour of use from 14:00 - 15:00 on a Sunday with 12:00-15:00 representing the peak period. Saturday followed a similar pattern with similar numbers with weekdays again similar pattern but with less volumes of footfall and vehicle use. The average stay at the parks for vehicles was 2 hours.

The TRICS database has no survey information for parks, therefore surveys were deemed an acceptable alternative. TRICS database was used to determine the vehicle use and peak hours for the refreshment area and community centre. The TRICS vehicle daily profile information for the community pavilion / refreshment area and community centre was then added to the park survey data to create a daily profile of traffic.

## Traffic Counters

Permanent traffic counters were cross check the AADT's from the historic flow diagrams. The TII closest permanent counter (Station Id: TMU N14 020.0 N) was too far from Lifford so was discounted.

The Donegal County Council has a permanent counter however on leg C of Junction 2 (counter ID 206). This counter has an AADT of 18,024 which is comparable to the flow diagrams AADT on the same leg of Junction 2 of 18,991.

This cross checking of the permanent counters with the factored data demonstrates that the data used for the baseline traffic flows is reliable.

## Traffic Attraction / Distribution

In terms of traffic attraction to the proposed RCP a gravity model based on population density and distance to the site was used to determine the likely approach direction to both the Lifford and Strabane accesses. The gravity model information combined with the traffic survey vehicle parking numbers was then used to predict the number of vehicles and direction of approach to Lifford and Strabane.

## Proposed Car / Bus Parking

Strabane - it is proposed to provide an asphalt surfaced car park will include 125 car park spaces and 11 disabled bays. There will be provision for two loading / bus bays. The surface drainage is incorporated within a sustainable drainage strategy using attenuation ponds and swales.

Lifford - it is proposed to provide 68 car parking spaces with additional 6 disabled spaces totalling 74 parking spaces and 2 bus parking facilities. The proposed slipway on the Lifford side will have provision for parking of boat trailers.

## East Donegal Coursing Club Facilities

The East Donegal Coursing Club (EDCC) currently uses the existing site for meetings. The traffic associated with the club is considered existing and will not change as part of the proposed development. The RCP proposes to provide new facilities for the club further north from the existing location as part of this project.

Currently, the Club is only accessible via the riverside access road from Station Road. Under the proposal, the Club will no longer have avail of riverside access, as this access will be implemented within the Riverine Community Park development. As there are no other access routes to the Club, or feasible alternatives, it is proposed that the access to the Club will be redirected via the new access
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provisions to the Riverine Community Park, through which the club and its users will avail of a Right of Way. Refer to "Proposed Development Lifford" of this Chapter for details.

## Summary of Assessment Methodology

This Document is a comprehensive review of the potential transport impacts of the proposed RCP, with an agreed plan to mitigate any adverse consequences. This document:

- Assesses the development proposals against National and Local Transport Policy for both NI and ROI.
- Provides details on the existing baseline traffic within the area of influence.
- Assesses sustainable travel modes to the RCP.
- Assesses the traffic generation associated with the development and the effect on the baseline network.
- Sets out any mitigation measures to facilitate the proposals.

The Contractor will produce a detailed Construction Management Plan to identify dates, durations, dependencies, and constraints for the construction phase.

The methodology is underpinned by current published guidance from both NI and ROI as outlined in Chapter 3.

Large events at the RCP will be supported by an Event Management Plan.
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## 3 Statement of Authority

Martin Hoy has over twenty-five years' experience as a roads and transportation consultant with his career spanning both government and private practice. From an initial position within the Northern Ireland Government (Dfl Roads), Martin progressed to private practice and started Scott Wilson PLC practice in N Ireland focusing on major road schemes, transportation and traffic modelling to public inquiries and expert witness.

In 2009 Martin launched Hoy \& Dorman Limited (HD), a civil engineering, traffic, and expert witness consultancy service to the built environment. Martin is currently working on major developments relating to a range of aspects within civil engineering around the world and on a number of high profiles proposed developments within Ireland and the UK. Martin is a Chartered Engineer; a Fellow of Engineers Ireland; a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers; and a Fellow of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation. yes
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## 4 Policy Context

## Northern Ireland

Relevant Northern Ireland policy documents with regards to transport and planning include:
A review of each of these documents has been undertaken. Comments have been provided, where appropriate, on their relevant application to the proposed development. The guidance documents that have been used within this TS include:

- The Regional Development Strategy 2035
- Ensuring a Sustainable Transport Future - A new Approach to Regional Transportation (April 2012)
- Strategic Planning Policy Statement - Planning for Sustainable Development (September 2015)
- Planning Policy Statement 13: Transportation and Land Use Parking (February 2005).
- Transport Assessment Guidelines for Developments Proposals in Northern Ireland, November 2006.
- Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic, Institute of Environmental Assessment, 1993.
- The IHT Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment, The Institute of Highways \& Transportation, September 1994
- DCAN 11: Access for People with Disabilities, Department of Environment, 1991
- DCAN 15: Vehicular Access Standards, Planning Service and Road Service, 2nd Edition, August 1999.


## Republic of Ireland

- Traffic and Transport Assessment Guidelines, National Roads Authority, May 2014.
- Design Manual for Urban Roads and Streets (DMURS), Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport (DTTAS), March 2013.
- Draft Guidelines on the Information to be Contained in Environmental Impact Assessment Reports, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), August 2017.
- Pedestrian Crossing Specification and Guidance, NRA, April 2011.
- DN-GEO-03060: Geometric Design of Junctions, Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII), June 2017.
- DN-GEO-03031: Rural Road Link Design, TII, June 2017.
- Shared Spaces Capital Development - 2nd Call Application, Economic Appraisal, April 2019 (Draft Final Report)

Predicted traffic generation figures for the construction and operational phases of the proposed development are based on information provided by Donegal County Council.
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## 5 Existing Conditions / Receiving Environment

## Methodology

To inform this study various site visits to both Strabane (NI) and Lifford (ROI) were conducted alongside desktop studies and looking at historical data. To enable the relevant jurisdictions to access the information relevant to themselves this chapter has been split into the existing conditions on the Strabane side of the proposed project and then the existing conditions on the Lifford side.

Site visits were conducted on both neutral weekdays and Sundays, as the visits were conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic queue lengths were observed but may not be representative of pre COVID19 traffic. There is no comparable historic data for queue lengths. This is discussed further within this section of the report.

Manual Classified Turning Counts (MCTC) were obtained on the 13 May 2021 as this data was captured during the COVID-19 Pandemic the counts were compared to historic data obtained in 2013 for the since abandoned Three Rivers Project. This comparison determined that the MCTC data that was captured in 2021 showed a relatively low existing traffic baseline, particularly on the Lifford side of the River Foyle. Therefore, this study has used the historic data from the Three Rivers Project that had already been factored up to 2023 as a baseline. 2023 is the proposed opening year for this application.

To further check the accuracy of the previously factored 2023 flows permanent traffic counters were looked at to cross check the AADT's from the flow diagrams. The TII closest permanent counter Station Id: TMU N14 020.0 N was too far from Lifford so was discounted.

The Donegal County Council has a permanent counter however on leg C of Junction 2 Counter ID 206. This counter has an AADT of 18,024 which is comparable to the flow diagrams AADT on the same leg of Junction 2 of 18,991.

This cross checking of the permanent counters with the factored data demonstrates that the data used for the baseline traffic flows is reliable.
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Figure 2: Schematic of Proposed Development and Local Area


## Description of Junctions within Area of Influence

## Strabane (NI)

## Setting

Strabane is a large town in Northern Ireland which according to the Northern Ireland 2011 Census has a population of circa 13,172 people. The A5 protected route runs along the frontage of the proposed Community Park which straddles the River Foyle. Strabane has excellent footway links from the residential areas to the various town amenities, footways are to a good standard which benefit from both street lighting and dropped kerbs with tactile paving.

## ASDA Roundabout

The ASDA Roundabout is a strategic junction in Strabane which acts as a gateway to the ROI, Figure 3 illustrates the relationship between Strabane and the A5 strategic road network.

The figure shows the location of the controlled crossing on the A5 Bradley Way (part of the Strabane to Lifford Greenway); the uncontrolled crossings at ASDA Roundabout, A38 Lifford Road and Railway Street Roundabout.
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Figure 3: ASDA Roundabout


## Branch Road - Existing Junction of the ASDA Roundabout

The proposed site will be constructed within a part brownfield and part greenfield site, to will utilise a historic access and egress on the Asda roundabout, via Branch Road, which previously served Greenbrae Halting Site, which was closed in May 2015, however, was not vacated until August 2016.

The existing Branch Road Access/Egress will remain as is.


Branch Road Proposed Access/Egress onto ASDA Roundabout

## A5 Bradley Way

The A5 is a protected route, at the ASDA Roundabout from the north is a dual carriageway in both directions with an additional left filter lane to bypass the roundabout onto railway Street. There are
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ghost islands with dropped kerbs and tactile paving at the roundabout and a Toucan Crossing as part of the Strabane to Lifford Greenway.


A5 from the South Toucan Crossing Point to facilitate the Strabane to Lifford Greenway.

## A38 Lifford Road

The A38 Lifford Road is a single lane carriageway heading to the southwest and a dual carriageway in the opposite direction, there is a ghost island with dropped kerbs and tactile paving already in situ.


A38 Lifford Road Showing Bus Layby and Entrance / Exit to the Strabane to Lifford Greenway

## Railway Street

Railway Street is a dual carriageway in both directions with an additional left filter lane to bypass the roundabout and access the A5 heading south. There are two ghost islands with dropped kerbs and tactile paving already in situ. Queueing was noted leading onto the ASDA roundabout however it was freely moving causing little delay.


Railway Street Left Filter Lane onto the A5 Southbound

## The Proposed A5 Improvements

The dualling of the A5 is currently progressing through procurement. The alignment and design are fixed however there is no expected timeline for delivery.
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Considering the proposed alignment and vesting boundary of the A5 upgrade, once complete, access arrangements to Riverine Community Park from the Strabane side will change. An option to maintain the vehicle; pedestrian; cycle entrance to the RCP in proximity to the entrance presented within this proposal has been supported by both the Riverine and A5WTC Project Teams.

## Lifford (ROI)

## Setting

Lifford is a town in Donegal which according to the 2016 Republic of Ireland Census has a population on circa 1,626. There are excellent footway links from the residential areas to the various town amenities, these footway links benefit from both street lighting and dropped kerbs with tactile paving.

The proposed site on the Lifford side of the River Foyle is currently greenfield, access to the community park will be from Station Road which currently serves as an access for a carpark for a Cinema, Donegal District Council offices and The Three Rivers Centre.

## Main Street

Main Street is a narrow carriageway which is bordered by shops and houses on both sides, on-street parking further narrows the road allowing only one car to pass in places. There are well maintained footways which benefit from street lighting.


Main Street heading Northeast - Butcher Street Junction on Left

## Butcher Street

Butcher Street is a narrow carriageway which is bordered by shops and houses on both sides, on-street parking narrows this further allowing only one car to pass in places. There are well maintained footways which benefit from street lighting.


Butcher Street in Both Directions
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## Bridge Street/Foyle View

Bridge Street leads onto Foyle View, there are no centre white line markings along its entirety, there is on street parking with enough room for two vehicles to pass in both directions. There is a wide wellmaintained footway on both sides of the carriageway which benefits from street lighting.


Bridge Street Priority T Junction onto the N15


Foyle View Leading to Bridge Street. Main Street on Right

## N15 South

N15 South is a single lane carriageway with consistent well-maintained footways which benefit from street lighting and dropped kerbs.


N15 South from Three Coins Roundabout

## N15 East

N15 East is a single lane carriageway in both directions, there is a pelican crossing with a central island prior to the roundabout, this benefits from dropped kerbs and tactile paving. There are consistent footways which are lit with street lighting
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## Letterkenny Road

Letterkenny Road is a single carriageway in both directions with consistent well-maintained footways with dropped kerbs and street lighting. There is a ghost island at the roundabout for pedestrians.


N14 Letterkenny Road from Three Coins Roundabout

## Strabane to Lifford Greenway

The Strabane to Lifford Greenway has already been constructed to the south of the proposed Riverine Community Park with a ghost pedestrian island to facilitate crossing of the A38 Lifford Road. The Strabane to Cloughcor greenway is currently being designed with proposals to link into the north of the Riverine Community Park.

The Strabane to Lifford Greenway crosses pedestrians over the N15 by way of a Toucan crossing which benefits from tactile paving.


N14 Crossing Point for Strabane to Lifford Greenway

## Traffic \& Surveys and Peak Hours

Traffic Surveys were undertaken on 13 May 2021 at the following locations:

- Junction 1 - Asda Roundabout - A5 Barnhill Road / Railway Street / A5 Bradley Way / A38 Lifford Road / Branch Road
- Junction 2 - Priority T-Junction - N15 / Bridge Street
- Junction 3 - Priority T-Junction - Main Street / Bridge Street
- Junction 4 - Priority T-Junction - Main Street / Butcher Street
- Junction 5 -Three Coins Roundabout - N14 / Butcher Street / N15 (to Strabane) / N15 (to Clady)
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Park Road was also surveyed however the data was not used as the entrance and exit to the proposed development was decided to be from the Branch Road leg of the Asda Roundabout.

Due to the effects of COVID-19 the results of these surveys were compared to historic data and found to be very low especially in Lifford so therefore were inconclusive. It was decided to use the baseline traffic from a previous historic survey which was submitted for planning as part of the 3 Rivers Project. This historic data was recorded in 2013 and had already been factored up to 2023 using NRFT growth factor.

The Three Rivers Project flows demonstrated that the PM peak represented the more onerous peak hour in terms of baseline traffic, this historic PM peak data was therefore used to ensure a robust assessment, the development traffic was then added and factored up to 2028 and 2038 using TII Central growth factor.

The peak hour for the proposed Riverine is 14:00-15:00 on a Sunday so in reality the proposed development traffic will be at its peak when the baseline traffic is significantly less than the PM peak that has been used on the flow diagrams.

A copy of the Three Rivers Project flow diagrams can be found within Appendix A

## Vehicle Mix within Area of Influence

In terms of HGV's the surveys conducted has shown an average of $5.4 \%$ HGV use in the vicinity of ASDA Roundabout (Junction 1) in NI and 6.1\% HGV for the Three Coins Roundabout (Junction 5) in ROI. The above are illustrated in Figure 4. This is consistent with counter information from traffic counter published information

Figure 4: Vehicle Mix at Strategic Junctions


Junction 1 - ASDA Roundabout in NI


Junction 5 - Three Coins Roundabout in ROI

## Vehicle Delay / Existing Queuing

## Methodology

COVID-19 has limited the available information in relation to queuing within the assessment area. Traffic and queue length surveys undertaken on 13 May 2021 were inconclusive as the volume of traffic surrounding areas were low with little to no queuing at all junctions during the PM peak hour (17:00 18:00) or a Sunday afternoon proposed park peak hour (14:00-15:00).
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Therefore, a series of site visits and spot surveys were undertaken on Thursday 5, Saturday 7 \& Sunday 6 August 2021 to provide a level of base line queuing. However, as the baseline traffic volumes was used from historic data from the Three Rivers Retail application in 2011 factored to 2023 there was no means to relate observed queuing to the baseline traffic data used. The additional surveys do provide information on the baseline queuing and can be considered with the proposed development traffic to predict impact.

## Strabane (NI)

Junction 1-A5 / ASDA Roundabout was also not considered further as the impact of the proposed development flows were so low ranging from $0.5 \%-1.4 \%$.

## Lifford (ROI)

The following junctions have been modelled using Junction 10 software and therefore have been considered further in relation to queue lengths and delay.

- Junction 2 - N15 / Bridge Street
- Junction 3 - Main Street / Bridge Street
- Junction 4 - Main Street / Butcher Street

In advance of assessing queue lengths Figure 5 illustrates the 2023 base traffic within the Flow Diagrams on the Lifford side of the proposed development with Figure 6 illustrating the proposed development flows. This will provide some contrasting in relation to the proposed development flows compared to the existing baseline.

Figure 5: 2023 Baseline Existing Flows (Lifford)
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Figure 6: 2023 Propsoed Development Flows (Lifford)
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Figure 7: Queue Length \& Delay Locations


Table 1: Maximum Observed Queuing (Sunday)

|  | Junction 2 <br> N15 / Bridge Street |  |  | Junction 3 |  |  | Junction 4 <br> Main Street / Bridge Street |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time / Arms | A | B | C | A | B | C | A | B | C |
| 07:00-08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Observed queuing was very light at all three junctions on the Sunday and is consistent with observations within the area on occasions passing through Lifford over the years. It was noted that the controlled pedestrian crossing points between Bridge Street and the Three Coins Roundabout was causing the queues at Junction 2 on Arm A \& C.
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Table 2: Maximum Observed Queuing (Weekday)

|  | Junction 2 <br> N15 / Bridge Street |  |  | Junction 3Main Street / Bridge Street |  |  | Junction 4 <br> Main Street / Butcher Street |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time / Arms | A | B | C | A | B | C | A | B | C |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Observed queuing was very steady at Junction 2 but delay cleared quickly. There is a marked increase in weekday queuing compared to a Sunday which would be the peak day of use regarding the proposed development. This again is consistent with observations within the area on occasions passing through Lifford over the years. It was noted that the controlled pedestrian crossing points between Bridge Street and the Three Coins Roundabout was causing the queues at Junction 2 on Arm A \& C.

Junction 5 - N15 E/Butcher St/ N14/ N15S (Three Coins Roundabout) was not considered further as percentage impact was well below $5 \%$

## Committed Development

This study is not aware of any significant committed development within the area of the proposed development.
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## 6 Proposed Scheme

## Introduction

The following scheme overview has been provided by McAdam Design:
Donegal County Council (DCC) and Derry City \& Strabane District Council (DCSDC) are jointly planning the development of the Riverine Community Park (hereafter referred to as the 'Project') following the award of funding by the SEUPB PEACE IV Shared Space \& Services, with DCC acting as the applicant. The Project will be transboundary in nature, being located on either side of the River Foyle, partly adjacent to Lifford, Co. Donegal and partly adjacent to Strabane, Co. Tyrone, with a pedestrian and footbridge connecting the two sides.

Figure 8: Site Location

(Source: Google Earth)
The site is partially located within the River Finn and the River Foyle and Tributaries Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). The proposed development will extend to a total of 22.7 hectares.

## Bridge Proposal

The pedestrian and cycle bridge will be a transboundary structure, providing the iconic and symbolic connection between the two currently separated lands either side of the border.
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The proposed bridge location is positioned to ensure best connection between both sides of the park. The bridge design takes inspiration from the historic railway proposing a steel truss design.
The pedestrian and cycle bridge will be a steel truss structure with an overall length of approximately 115 m . It will have two spans. The larger span will extend across the river with a length of approximately 88 m . The second span will extend over land from the Lifford riverbank to raised ground. The second span will have a length of 27 m .

## Accommodation Works Proposal

The operational boundary of the Riverine Community Park on the Lifford side is entirely located within lands belonging to East Donegal Coursing Club (EDCC), with the proposed Park boundary occupying approximately fifteen acres of this property, which is currently populated with existing infrastructure associated with Club activities. In order to facilitate the proposed development on the Lifford site, it is therefore necessary to relocate and/or replace all existing infrastructure belonging to the Club. These relocation and/or replacement works are defined as the Accommodation Works and are as follows:

- Demolition of the existing spectator stand and the construction of a new spectator stand to accommodate 123 spectators;
- Relocation of existing hare coursing track and the construction of greyhound training runs;
- Provision of an informal parking area to accommodate 8 cars; and,
- all ancillary development and site services; within the site extending to 6.5 hectares.


## Lifford Summary

Development of the western portion of the new Riverine Community Park (i.e., the area of the development falling within the Donegal County Council area) and the creation of new community park infrastructure with multi-purpose community facilities and amenities. The development will include:

- Construction of a pedestrian and cycle bridge approximately 115 m in length between Lifford and Strabane (the adjacent eastern section of the proposed community park at Strabane, County Tyrone);
- Construction of a single storey community resource building with a gross internal floor area circa $305 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, for use as community space including office and refreshment use;
- Construction of a 300 m 2 maintenance compound, surround by 2.25 m high ibex fencing to include installation of an approximate 4.0 m high by 6.0 m wide by 9.0 m long prefabricated maintenance shed vehicle storage, washdown area and material storage, surround be ibex fence and access gates;
- Provision of a multi-functional outdoor space and external stage area to accommodate circa 3000 persons;
- Creation of play areas, a river walk and river access;
- Construction of walkways and cycleways;
- Associated landscaping inclusive of the wetlands of the River Foyle;
- Amenity lighting;
- Provision of car parking with 74 spaces and provisions for cycle parking;
- Site Security including estate style fencing, 2.4 m high security fencing and lockable vehicle and pedestrian gates
- Construction of a 4.5-6.0 meter wide access road, circa265m in length and provided internally within the park;
- Demolition of the existing spectator stand and the construction of a new spectator stand to accommodate 123 spectators;
- Relocation of existing hare coursing track and the construction of greyhound training runs;
- Provision of an informal parking area to accommodate 8 cars;
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- Provision of a new ESB Substation and diversion underground of existing ESB overhead cables traversing the site;
- Provision of ground mounted electrical kiosk;
- Provision of a new wastewater pumping station for onward transfer of foul wastewater to the local network;
- Reconfiguration of existing cinema drainage soakaway; and,
- all ancillary development, accommodation works and site services; on a site extending to 14.9 hectares.


## Strabane Summary

Development of the eastern portion of the new Riverine Community Park (i.e., the area of the development falling within the Derry City \& Strabane District Council area) and the creation of new community park infrastructure with multi-purpose community facilities and amenities. The development will include:

- a new area of open space;
- vehicle, cycle and pedestrian access;
- car parking area;
- amenity lighting; and,
- all ancillary development and site services; within the site extending to 6.7 hectares.
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## 7 Trip Generation

## Trip Generation - Methodology

This section considers the traffic generation associated with the RCP. The traffic associated with the proposed park / playpark is considered separately as surveys were undertaken at similar parks given TRICS did not contain sufficient database information.

The traffic generation relating to the community pavilion / refreshment area and community centre were considered using TRICS database with the hourly profiles throughout the day combined with the park / playpark traffic to generate an overall traffic generation model to determine the peak hour and associated traffic.

Traffic associated with a few large events will be subject to an Event Management Plan and therefore have not been considered as part of this assessment.

Riverine Community Park Flow Diagrams are contained in Appendix B

## Traffic Generation Associated with Park/Playpark

The TRICS database has a single survey return under Country Park with no indication of the offerings within the park or how it could relate to the proposed development. This assessment therefore considered the best way to get a reflective traffic generation was to survey similar parks.

Lurgan Park (County Armagh) was selected together with Wallace Park in Lisburn (Co Down) as they both are next to (or within) centres of population and have very similar offerings to the Riverine Project including major events.

The surveys to determine the traffic generation were undertaken by surveying the number of parked cars within car parks and the surrounding road network. The surveys were undertaken over two weekends with the average hourly parking number used to provide a parking and vehicle generation profile for the peak use day (Sunday). Discussions were also undertaken with park users and officials to assist in creating a traffic generation profile. With an average of 2 hours stay the parking survey was then used to generate a traffic generation profile over a typical Sunday.

Lurgan has a population of circa 25,000 people with Lifford and Strabane combined circa 16,000 people so the likely person use of the Riverine project will be approximately $38 \%$ less based on population numbers. Lisburn has a population of 45,370 although Wallace Park is to the east of the city.

To ensure a robust traffic generation assessment no discount was applied in relation to population variants relating to Lifford and Strabane comparted to Lurgan or Lisburn. Both surveys were combined with the average used within the peak hour.

The results for Lurgan and Lisburn traffic generation are contained in Table 3, this is the traffic generation which will be carried forward onto the overall model for the Riverine Project and added to the café and community centre use from TRICS.
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Table 3: Trip Rate, Traffic Generation and Parking Survey Results

## PLAYPARK - SURVEY RESULTS

Calculated from survey of Lurgan Park \& Wallace Park with average taken
Count Type: TOTAL VEHICLES GENERATION + PARKED VEHICLES

|  |  |  | ARRIVALS |  | DEPARTURES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | People | Parked Veh | Trip Rate | Veh/hour | Trip Rate | Veh/hour |
| 07:00-08:00 | 19 | 10 | 0.00 | 4 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 38 | 15 | 0.10 | 8 | 0.02 | 2 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 75 | 29 | 0.50 | 18 | 0.03 | 1 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 102 | 46 | 1.23 | 15 | 0.97 | 12 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 166 | 70 | 1.75 | 28 | 0.98 | 16 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 206 | 97 | 1.80 | 34 | 1.04 | 20 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 222 | 112 | 2.00 | 33 | 1.55 | 25 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 252 | 124 | 1.90 | 36 | 1.56 | 30 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 241 | 129 | 1.00 | 21 | 2.00 | 42 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 206 | 117 | 0.53 | 13 | 1.62 | 41 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 188 | 103 | 0.38 | 13 | 0.93 | 36 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 105 | 75 | 0.55 | 12 | 0.70 | 14 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 19 | 31 | 0.35 | 2 | 0.54 | 3 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 19 | 10 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.02 | 5 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 19 | 10 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.10 | 5 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 0 | 5 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 1875 | 982 | 12 | 238 | 12 | 250 |
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## Traffic Associated with Refreshment Area \& Community Centre

The TRICS database was used in relation to the café use under land use (06-HOTEL FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS) as there is no specific land use for café.

TRICS land use (07-LEISURE/Q - COMMUNITY CENTRE) was used to calculate the traffic generating for the community centre. Table 3 sets out the TRICS traffic generation in relation to the café and community centre use.

TRICS information relating to the café and the community centre is contained in Appendix $C$.

## Table 4: TRICS Traffic Generation

TRIP RATE for Land Use
06 - HOTEL FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
Calculation Factor: 100 sqm
Count Type: TOTAL VEHICLES
Proposed development area - 90sqm

|  | ARRIVALS |  | DEPARTURES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Trip Rate | Veh/hour | Trip Rate | Veh/hour |
| 07:00-08:00 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1.0 | 1 | 0.8 | 1 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2.1 | 2 | 0.7 | 1 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2.2 | 2 | 0.9 | 1 |
| $11: 00-12: 00$ | 2.3 | 2 | 1.6 | 1 |
| $12: 00-13: 00$ | 4.6 | 4 | 2.1 | 2 |
| $13: 00-14: 00$ | 3.6 | 3 | 3.9 | 4 |
| $14: 00-15: 00$ | 1.8 | 2 | 2.9 | 3 |
| $15: 00-16: 00$ | 1.2 | 1 | 1.9 | 2 |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 1.8 | 2 | 1.6 | 1 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 3.4 | 3 | 1.7 | 2 |
| $18: 00-19: 00$ | 4.1 | 4 | 3.4 | 3 |
| $19: 00-20: 00$ | 4.1 | 4 | 3.8 | 3 |
| $20: 00-21: 00$ | 2.4 | 2 | 3.5 | 3 |
| $21: 00-22: 00$ | 2.0 | 2 | 2.5 | 2 |
| $22: 00-23: 00$ | 0.8 | 1 | 2.3 | 2 |
| $23: 00-24: 00$ | 0.2 | 0 | 1.9 | 2 |
| T0TALS | 37.6 | 34 | 35.6 | 32 |

TRIP RATE for Land Use
07 - LEISURE/Q - COMMUNITY CENTRE
Calculation Factor: 100 sqm
Count Type: TOTAL VEHICLES
Proposed development area - 120sqm

| ARRIVALS |  | DEPARTURES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trip Rate | Veh/hour | Trip Rate | Veh/hour |
| 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.7 | 1 | 0.3 | 0 |
| 1.1 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 |
| 0.4 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 |
| 0.7 | 1 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 0.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 1 |
| 0.5 | 1 | 0.4 | 1 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 1.3 | 2 |
| 0.4 | 0 | 0.8 | 1 |
| 2.1 | 3 | 1.3 | 2 |
| 3.0 | 4 | 1.7 | 2 |
| 2.7 | 3 | 3.1 | 4 |
| 0.9 | 1 | 1.4 | 2 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 2.3 | 3 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 14.5 | 17 | 15.4 | 19 |
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## Riverine Project Total Generated Traffic

Table 5 combination Tables 3 \& 4 into an hourly traffic profile over a peak day period. This is the proposed traffic generation associated with this project. Please note, the traffic generation and parking numbers should be taken as a best estimation based on comparable surveys of similar parks.

Table 5: Total Traffic Generation \& Parking (Sunday)

|  | ARR | DEP | TOTALS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | Veh/hour | Veh/hour | Veh/hour | Parked Veh |
| 07:00-08:00 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 25 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 22 | 2 | 24 | 48 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 17 | 13 | 31 | 61 |
| $11: 00-12: 00$ | 31 | 18 | 48 | 97 |
| $12: 00-13: 00$ | 39 | 22 | 61 | 123 |
| $13: 00-14: 00$ | 37 | 30 | 66 | 133 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 38 | 33 | 71 | 142 |
| $15: 00-16: 00$ | 23 | 45 | 69 | 137 |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 15 | 44 | 58 | 116 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 19 | 39 | 58 | 115 |
| $18: 00-19: 00$ | 19 | 19 | 38 | 76 |
| $19: 00-20: 00$ | 9 | 10 | 19 | 38 |
| $20: 00-21: 00$ | 3 | 10 | 13 | 26 |
| $21: 00-22: 00$ | 2 | 10 | 12 | 23 |
| $22: 00-23: 00$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| $23: 00-24: 00$ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| T0TALS | 289 | 301 | 590 | 1179 |

## Other Parks / Play Parks Considered and Surveyed

Several other parks were surveyed including Moira Demesne \& Hillsborough Forest Park in NI and Rossmore Forest Park in Monaghan ROI these however were discounted as they did not have similar profiles and rely on a very high dependence on vehicle trips as they are outside a centre of population.

## Delivery Vehicles

The number of delivery vehicles impacting on the peak hours has not been considered as part of this study given that they arrive outside of peak periods and will be minimal in terms of traffic generation.

## Flow Diagrams

Riverine Community Park Flow diagrams are contained in Appendix B the naming convention for each flow diagram is set out below

- FD_01 = 2023 Baseline Traffic - Obtained from Historic Data
- FD_02 = 2023 Development Flows
- FD_03 = 2023 Base + Development Flows
- FD_04 = 2023 Base Factored to 2028 (+5years)
- FD_05 = 2023 Base Factored to 2028 (+5years) + Development Flows
- FD_06 = 2023 Base Factored to 2038 (+15years)
- FD_07 = 2023 Base Factored to 2038 (+15years) + Development Flows
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## 8 Traffic Distribution

## Traffic Distribution to the Network - Methodology

To determine how the average generated traffic of the proposed land use is allocated to the surrounding road network a simple gravity model was used. This model uses factors divided from the relationship of centres of population and distance to the proposed site. The overall traffic numbers are then proportioned in accordance with its factor, from this the direction of travel and approximate number of vehicles is derived. A gravity model is a useful tool to indicate direction and number of vehicles but is reliant on assumptions, engineering judgement and local knowledge.

## Gravity Model

The gravity model lists several towns throughout ROI and NI with populations within towns obtained from 2016 and 2011 census data respectively. The distances to RCP are taken from the approximately centre of each town to the respective entrances in Lifford and Strabane. The distance is then divided by the population to provide a factor which in turn is used to predict the likely volume of traffic from that centre of population. The number of vehicles approaching from the direction of respective towns can then be allocated to the road network.

There will also be vehicles crossing the Foyle in both directions to use the facilities and carpark, vehicles have been allocated in accordance with the Riverine Community Park Flow Diagrams contained within Appendix B. Figure 8 provides an illustration of the various approaches to RCP available to vehicles. The Gravity Model is shown in Table 6.

Figure 9: Various Approach Roads to RCP
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Table 6: Gravity Model with Approach Direction of Vehicles.
Northern Ireland - 2011 Census

| Town / City | Population | Distance <br> Km | Factor | \% of <br> Overall <br> Traffic | Vehicles <br> Approach from | Vehicles <br> Arriving |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Depry | 27,884 | 23.3 | 1197 | $6.5 \%$ | Barnhill Road | 2.5 |  |
| Claudy | 1,336 | 26.1 | 51 | $0.3 \%$ | Barnhill Road | 0.1 |  |
| Newtownstewart | 1,551 | 16.5 | 94 | $0.5 \%$ | Bradley Way | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Sion Mills | 2,050 | 5.9 | 347 | $1.9 \%$ | Bradley Way | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Castlederg | 2,976 | 16.9 | 176 | $1.0 \%$ | Bradley Way | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Strabane | 13,172 | 1.2 | 10977 | $60.0 \%$ | Refer to text | 22.9 | 0.3 |
| Omagh | 19,659 | 31.9 | 616 | $3.4 \%$ | Bradley Way | 1.3 |  |
| Donemana | 586 | 12.1 | 48 | $0.3 \%$ | Barnhill Road | 0.1 |  |
| Artigarvan | 603 | 5.8 | 105 | $0.6 \%$ | Barnhill Road | 0.1 |  |

Republic of Ireland - 2016 Census

| Letterkenny | 19,274 | 25.7 | 750 | 4.1\% | N14 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ballybofey | 4,852 | 28.9 | 168 | 0.9\% | N15 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Donegal | 2,618 | 49.6 | 53 | 0.3\% | N15 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Lifford | 1,626 | 0.5 | 3252 | 17.8\% | N14 / Main Street | 6.8 | 5.8 |
| Convoy | 1,526 | 15.3 | 100 | 0.5\% | N14 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Raphoe | 1,089 | 10.0 | 109 | 0.6\% | N14 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Killygordon | 614 | 15.5 | 40 | 0.2\% | N15 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Castlefin | 750 | 9.4 | 80 | 0.4\% | N15 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| St Johnston | 523 | 12.4 | 42 | 0.2\% | N14 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Killea | 534 | 23.7 | 23 | 0.1\% | N14 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Newtown Cunningham | 1,080 | 24.5 | 44 | 0.2\% | N14 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Manorcunningham | 675 | 19.0 | 36 | 0.2\% | N14 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| TOTALS | 104,978 |  | 18306 | 100\% | Sub Total | 10 | 8 |
|  | Total Vehicles Arriving and Departing During Peak Hour |  |  |  |  | 38 | 33 |

The total number of vehicles arriving within the peak hour (14:00-15:00) are 38No arriving with 33No departing. Riverine Community Park Flow Diagrams contained within Appendix B set out the traffic distribution to respective approach roads. In Table 4 when vehicles arriving, and departing are shown as fractions of a whole number these have been added together and rounded to the nearest number to represent a vehicle.

## Gravity Model Assumptions

A gravity model is a useful tool to indicate direction and number of vehicles but is reliant on assumptions, engineering judgement and local knowledge. To inform this assessment the assumptions contained within the gravity model are listed below.

1 A proportion of the population of Derry in NI has been used in the gravity modelling as the use of the full population was skewing the results as its population is significantly higher than the Lifford / Strabane area
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2 The traffic associated with Strabane has been allocated to the ASDA roundabout on an engineering judgement basis considering the road networks within the town leading to the ASDA roundabout.
3 The gravity model is considered for an average day and may change in the event of a major event. However, a major event will be subject to an Event Management Plan which will consider traffic specific to that event.

# HoyDorman 

## 9 Junction Operational Assessments

## Methodology

In determining the impact of the generated vehicles on the surrounding road network the total peak hour of development flow traffic was determined in Section 7 then distributed to the road network as discussed in Section 8. The resulting baseline traffic and development traffic together with assessment years is highlighted in the RCP Flow Diagrams in Appendix B.

The most onerous peak hour of existing traffic in the PM was used as the basis for the assessment with the most onerous development flow (Sunday 14:00-15:00) used as the development flows.

The surrounding main road network is considered congested, therefore any junction with a degree of impact greater than $5 \%$ is presented for further assessment and modelling. Junctions 3 \& 4 (Main Street / Bridge Street and Main Street / Butcher Street) were not considered congested but have been modelled. In addition, the other remaining junctions have been considered as part of this study for completeness.

COVID-19 has had an impact on the assessment as current baseline traffic surveys were not reflective of the known traffic levels or queuing within the area. Comments relating to each junction are contained with respective sections.

Junctions 10 software was used to model the respective junction's performance and informed this study of existing and proposed residual capacity remaining.

## Flow Diagram Summary of Results \& Impact Thresholds

RCP Flow Diagrams are contained in Appendix B with the summary results contained within Table 5. Section 3.1.5 of the Institute of Highways and Transportation guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessments (1994) recommends that a detailed impact analysis is required where one or other of the following thresholds are exceeded:

Traffic to and from the development exceeds 10\% of the existing two-way traffic flow on the adjoining highway; or the development traffic exceeds $5 \%$ of the existing two-way traffic flow on the adjoining network where traffic congestion exists or will exist within the assessment period or in other sensitive locations.

Table 6 sets out the various percentages impacts on respective junctions and summarise the results of the Flow Diagrams.

## Assessment Years

The TS will consider the operation of each junction with the base traffic conditions factored +5 \& $+10-$ year assessment periods.

- 2023 - Estimated Opening Year Baseline Traffic (Historic Data)
- 2028 - Design Year (+5 years from estimated opening year)
- 2038 - Design years (+15 years from estimated opening year)

The proposed opening year for the development is anticipated to be 2023. In line with TII Guidelines design years of 2028 and 2038 have been used in this assessment to represent a 5 -year and 15-year
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design horizon for studying any identified impacts of the development on the existing surrounding roads network.

## Traffic Growth Rates

The derived traffic growth used for the TA will be factored to the design years of 2028 and 2038, using the TII central growth rates.

- Assessment year + 5years - 2023 to 2028 TII factor of 0.0555 which equates to a factor of 1.055 this is rounded up on the flow diagrams and shown as $106 \%$
- Assessment year + 15years - 2023 to 2038 TII factor of 0.1089 which equates to a factor of 1.1089 this is rounded up on the flow diagrams and shown as $110.9 \%$

The redistributed traffic will be applied to the model junctions as per the methodology outlined in the previous section.

## Assessment Time Period

The peak hour of 14:00-15:00 on a Sunday has been used in the assessments of the junctions. As the PM from the historic data was the more onerous in terms of existing traffic this was used to form the 2023 baseline.
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## Table 7: Flow Diagrams Summary Results

|  | Junction Impact Details - Peak Hour Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |
|  | A5 / ASDA Roundabout |  |  |  |  | N15 / Bridge St |  |  | Main St / Bridge St |  |  | Main St / Butcher St |  |  | N15 / Butcher St Roundabout |  |  |  |
| Junction Arm Reference | A | B | C | D | E | A | B | C | A | B | C | A | B | C | A | B | c | D |
| FD_01 = 2023 Baseline Traffic - Obtained from Historic PM Peak Data | 1644 | 2018 | 2459 | 2101 | 0 | 2006 | 335 | 1999 | 235 | 155 | 290 | 186 | 315 | 289 | 324 | 2000 | 806 | 1737 |
| FD_02 = 2023 Development Flows | 8 | 29 | 21 | 11 | 51 | 13 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 13 |
| FD_03 = 2023 Base + Development Flows | 1652 | 2047 | 2480 | 2112 | 51 | 2019 | 354 | 2009 | 249 | 163 | 312 | 194 | 321 | 291 | 330 | 2013 | 812 | 1750 |
| Percentage Change / Impact | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 100\% | 0.6\% | 5.4\% | 0.5\% | 5.6\% | 4.9\% | 7.1\% | 4.1\% | 1.9\% | 0.7\% | 1.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.8\% |
| FD_04 = 2023 Base Factored to 2028 (+5years) | 1735 | 2130 | 2595 | 2218 | 0 | 2117 | 354 | 2110 | 248 | 164 | 306 | 196 | 332 | 305 | 342 | 2111 | 851 | 1833 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { FD_05 = } 2023 \text { Base Factored to } 2028 \text { (+5years) + Development } \\ \text { Flows } \end{array}$ | 1743 | 2159 | 2616 | 2229 | 51 | 2130 | 373 | 2120 | 262 | 172 | 328 | 204 | 338 | 307 | 348 | 2124 | 856 | 1847 |
| FD_06 = 2023 Base Factored to 2038 (+15years) | 1823 | 2238 | 2727 | 2330 | 0 | 2224 | 371 | 2217 | 261 | 172 | 322 | 206 | 349 | 320 | 359 | 2218 | 894 | 1926 |
| FD_07 = 2023 Base Factored to 2038 (+15years) + Development Flows | 1831 | 2267 | 2748 | 2341 | 51 | 2237 | 390 | 2227 | 275 | 180 | 344 | 214 | 355 | 322 | 365 | 2231 | 899 | 1939 |

Table 8: Junctions Modelled as Part of this Study

| Ref | Impact <br> Analysis <br> Threshold | Assessed within the TIA Section | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junction 1 <br> ASDA Roundabout Barnhill Rd A5 <br> Railway St / Bradley Way A5 / Lifford Rd | 5\% | No | The traffic surveys demonstrated no signs of capacity issues at this junction with the additional traffic generation impact maximum $1.4 \%$ on Arm B. Although Arm E is $100 \%$ as the proposed access route it should be noted that it has prior historic use and therefore this junction was not modelled |
| Junction 2 N15 / Bridge Street | 5\% | Yes | This junction demonstrates that Arm B has a maximum impact of 5.4\% therefore this junction was modelled. |
| Junction 3 <br> Main Street / Bridge Street | 5\% | Yes | Arm A and Arm C showed maximum impact of 5.6\% and 7.1\% respectively, therefore this junction was modelled. |
| Junction 4 <br> Main Street / Butcher Street | 5\% | Yes | Arm A showed maximum impact of $4.1 \%$ but was modelled as considered closest junction to the Lifford proposed park entrance/ |
| Junction 5 <br> Three Coins Roundabout N15 E/Butcher St/ N14/ N15S | 5\% | No | This junction is showing a maximum impact of $1.8 \%$ on Arm A therefore no modelling was required. |
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Although none of the junctions listed above are congested a threshold of $5 \%$ was used throughout for completeness. Details of the traffic modelling and assessment are provided below with the detailed modelling outputs contained in Appendix D.

## Junctions 10 Software

Junctions 10 was the traffic mathematical software used in the assessment of junctions 2, 3 \& 4 as they are priority junctions rather than signalised which would have required LINSIG modelling.

The summary outputs from the traffic modelling are highlights below together with an assessment of the road traffic capacity network in the area for both existing traffic performance during Opening year, +5 years and +15 years.

## Junctions 10 Modelling Terms

Firstly, the results provided look at how each "arm" or traffic flow stream of the junction would behave in terms of the following:

- Queue (PCU)
- Delay (s)
- Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC)

Secondly, the analysis then provides the operational performance information about how the whole junction would function in terms of the following:

- Junction Delay (s)
- Network residual capacity

Queue (PCU) - This is an estimate of the queue length that would be experienced at the junction. It is based on a default vehicle length of 5.75 m i.e., 1 PCU or 1 car and represents the spacing of vehicles in a stationary queue from front bumper to front bumper.

Delay - This is an estimate of the delay that would be experienced at the junction in seconds.
Ratio to Flow to Capacity (RFC) - The RFC of a junction is one of the main factors influencing queues and delays. It is a measure of traffic intensity. As the RFC tends towards 1.00 , it implies that the junction has reached its design capacity and would then be considered "saturated "and delays are then likely to occur. Typically, an RFC of less than 0.85 is considered to indicate satisfactory performance.

Junction Delay (s) - This is a measure of the overall junction delay in seconds.

Network Residual Capacity (NRC) - This is a measure of the how readily a network may accept an increase in traffic flow under its existing conditions. If the network residual capacity is high, the junction can easily accept an increase in traffic, if the this is low then the junction cannot easily accept an increase in traffic.
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## Junction 2 - N15 / Bridge Street

Table 9: Junction 2 - Modelling Summary

|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Set ID | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Vah) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Junction Delay (s) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Junction } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D1 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 14.23 | 0.31 | B | 232 | A | $-10 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 0.9 | 4.1 | 65.58 | 0.49 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.3 | 1.3 | 7.81 | 0.19 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.36 | 0.01 | A | 3.88 | A | 900\% |
| Stream B-A |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 6.52 | 0.01 | A |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.0 | $\sim 1$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D3 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 16.09 | 0.34 | C | 2.87 | A | $-12 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stroam B-A |  | 1.2 | 5.6 | 76.72 | 0.56 | F |  |  |  |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.3 | 780 | 0.20 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D4 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 21.49 | 0.41 | C | 3.76 | A | $-15 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 1.7 | 7.5 | 117.70 | 0.66 | F |  |  |  |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.4 | 7.83 | 0.21 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D5 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 35.75 | 0.56 | E | 5.59 | A | $-17 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 2.4 | 10.2 | 154.01 | 0.76 | F |  |  |  |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.4 | 782 | 0.22 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D6 | 7.0 | 20.6 | 192.64 | 1.03 | F | 14.62 | B | $-19 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 4.3 | 14.5 | 272.72 | 0.95 | F |  |  |  |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.4 | 7.84 | 0.22 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D7 | 11.5 | 29.8 | 287.48 | 1.13 | F | 21.76 | c | $-21 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 6.6 | 18.5 | 353.41 | 1.08 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.5 | 7.83 | 0.24 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows $\times 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D8 | 16.6 | 37.0 | 381.15 | 1.25 | F | 29.72 | D | $-22 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 9.5 | 22.5 | 443.65 | 1.22 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.6 | 1.1 | 7.81 | 0.25 | A |  |  |  |

The modelling of Junction 2 demonstrates that the junction is approaching saturation prior to the addition of the RCP generated traffic at opening year and throughout assessment years. As with any junction as the RFC on any leg approaches saturation (0.85) the junction becomes very sensitive to additional traffic as the junction is approaching a non-free flowing situation.

The results in Table 9 reflect this. Furthermore, as set out in the Section 1 of this document the above results should be taken as a guide only given the following.

- The traffic baseline surveys obtained in May 2021 were not considered reflective of the junction's usual baseline due to COVID-19 travel restrictions even when COVID-19 factors were applied.
- Given the above, historic traffic date was used from the Three Rivers retail development in 2011 with the Flow Diagrams factored in that study to 2023 opening year. The baseline traffic from the 2021 baseline traffic was significantly lower than the factored flows, however the historic factored flows was the only available information to base the traffic modelling on.
- Given the above, no available queue length information is available as this information was not obtained for Junction 2 - Bridge Street / N15 junction.
- Spot checks on baseline traffic and queue lengths were undertaken in August 2021 but again baseline traffic was significantly lower than the historic factored date available.
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- The modelling has used the most onerous PM peak traffic and combined that with the proposed peak hour traffic of a Sunday afternoon for the proposed RCP development.

Based on engineering judgement and in reality (based on spot checks in August 2021) the actual Sunday baseline traffic of 14:00-15:00 is significantly lower than that used in the PM weekday modelling. Therefore, the actual junction capacity throughout the peak hours of the RCP use at Junction 2 from 14:00-15:00 will operate well within existing capacity.

## Junction 3 - Main Street / Bridge Street

Table 10: Junction 3 - Modelling Summary

|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Set ID | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Vah) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Junction Delay (8) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Junction } \\ \text { Los } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notwork Residual Capacity |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 7.65 | 0.17 | A | 2.88 | A | $258 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.50 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stroam B-AC | D2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.34 | 0.01 | A | 2.00 | A | 900\% |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.74 | 0.01 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 7.72 | 0.18 | A | 2.89 | A | $241 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.55 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stroam B-AC | D4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 7.78 | 0.18 | A | 2.92 | A | $239 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.55 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D5 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 7.86 | 0.19 | A | 2.93 | A | $224 \%$[Stream B-AC] |
| Stroam C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.60 | 0.11 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stroam B-AC | D6 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 7.91 | 0.19 | A | 2.96 | A | $223 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.59 | 0.11 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows +15 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D7 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 7.99 | 0.20 | A | 2.98 | A | $209 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.64 | 0.12 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3-Main St/ Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows $\times 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stroam B-AC | D8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 8.08 | 0.21 | A | 2.99 | A | $197 \%$[Stream B.AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.69 | 0.12 | A |  |  |  |

The modelling of Junction 3 demonstrates that there is sufficient capacity on each of the junction arms the RFC of the 2023 Baseline traffic being 0.17 and 0.10 . The theoretical scenario of double the development flows added to the factored 2028 baseline the RFC is 0.21 and 0.12 showing that even under this scenario there is still ample capacity at this junction.

It is not expected there will be any increase to existing queuing at this junction. For full results of Junction 10 modelling please refer to Appendix D.
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## Junction 4 - Main Street / Butcher Street

Table 11: Junction 4 - Modelling Summary

|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sot ID | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Vah) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Junction Delay (s) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Junction } \\ & \text { Los } \end{aligned}$ | Notwork Residual Capacity |
|  | J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Baseline Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 8.19 | 0.19 | A | 5.05 | A | $\begin{gathered} 182 \% \\ {[\text { Stream C-AB] }} \end{gathered}$ |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.5 | 7.90 | 0.27 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4-Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Development Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B.AC | D2 | 0.0 | -1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | A | 0.00 | F | $\begin{gathered} 900 \% \\ {[ } \end{gathered}$ |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.0 | -1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Base + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B.AC | D3 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 8.39 | 0.20 | A | 5.09 | A | $179 \%$[Stream E-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.5 | 791 | 0.28 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B.AC | D4 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 8.37 | 0.21 | A | 5.17 | A | $167 \%$[Stream C-AB] |
| Stream C.AB |  | 0.4 | 1.7 | 8.08 | 0.29 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4 - Main St/ Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stroam B.AC | D5 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 8.57 | 0.22 | A | 5.21 | A | $164 \%$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C.AB |  | 0.4 | 1.7 | 8.09 | 0.29 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4-Main St / Butcher Street - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D6 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 8.55 | 0.22 | A | 5.29 | A | $154 \%$[Stream C-AB] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.9 | 8.27 | 0.31 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4-Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D7 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 8.76 | 0.23 | A | 5.33 | A | $152 \%$[Stream B.AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.9 | 8.28 | 0.31 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows +15 Years + Development Flows x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B.AC | D8 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 8.96 | 0.24 | A | 5.37 | A | $144 \%$[Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C.AB |  | 0.5 | 1.9 | 8.29 | 0.31 | A |  |  |  |

This junction has significant residual capacity for current and future operating levels of traffic. The RFC for the 2023 baseline being 0.19 and 0.27 . The theoretical scenario of double the development flows added to the factored 2028 baseline the RFC is 0.24 and 0.31 showing that even under this scenario there is still ample capacity at this junction.

It is not expected there will be any increase to existing queuing at this junction. For full results of Junction 10 modelling please refer to Appendix D.

## Sensitivity Testing

Sensitivity testing of traffic modelling was accounted for by the following

- Within the traffic modelling, doubling the development traffic and adding this to the factored 2028 baseline flows.
- No reduction was made in relation to the population size of the baseline parks surveyed compared to the combined population of Lifford and Strabane. In reality the traffic generation is overestimated.
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## 10 Construction Phase Assessment

## Methodology

The section considers the potential impacts during construction phase of the project. Construction programme is considered and will be influenced by the final detailed design. The key elements of the proposed development together with oversized loads, transport routes, construction compounds are considered. Potential Impacts During the Construction Phase are highlighted, estimates of temporary construction HGV traffic are provided together with mitigation measures and construction phase conclusion.

## Works Staging

The staging of the construction works will be subject to a detailed programme by the successful contractor in advance of commencement of works. It will be cognisant of a list of timeline constraints included in the Contract Documents.
The ES includes information on the following elements of the project construction:

- Outline Construction and Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP).
- Construction methodologies for each classification.
- Drainage works.
- Construction of temporary access roads/tracks and construction compounds.
- Works sequencing.
- Waste management.
- Construction programme.


## Construction Programming

The aim is to have the entire project completed within 9 months. This timescale has been used to assess the worst-case scenario in terms of the potential for traffic impacts. The construction timeline is dependent on the approach taken by the contractor, risk assessments and detailed design.
Several constraints have been identified which will impact upon the programme. These include:

- Minimising disruption to traffic on the A5 at all times
- Minimise disruption and nuisance to local businesses, traders and those living in residential properties close to any works area who could be adversely affected during the construction phase
- Ensuring all construction mitigation measures as identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report are implemented
- Phasing and timing of the River Foyle work to be in line with NIEA Guidance
- Archaeological assessment if deemed required
- Encountering areas with invasive species (Japanese Knotweed, Giant Rhubarb and Rhododendron). Refer to invasive species management plan
- Health and Safety - as in any works project Health and Safety will be specifically addressed.

The relevant constraints will be referenced in the Contract Documents and will form part of the procurement process.

The sequence of Works will broadly be as follows:

- Establish Compounds and environmental measures
- Cut back scrub and brush
- Construct temporary fencing and crossing points
- Construction and placing of the proposed pedestrian / cycleway bridge over the river Foyle
- Undertake excavation and drainage works
- Construction the park, buildings and paths
- Construct the EDCC accommodation works
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- Bring pavement to formation and form verges
- Pavement construction
- Construct permanent fencing, remove temporary fencing, and install signage/fixtures

Working hours shall be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 13.00 on Saturday.

## Construction Compounds

Two construction compounds will be established. In Strabane the compound will utilise the previous Halting Site with vehicular access of the existing leg of the ASADA Roundabout. In Lifford, the compound will be on the existing coursing grounds with access from the local road network i.e., Bridge Street, Main Street and Foyle View.

The purpose of the compounds is to provide adequate storage space and welfare facilities to allow the construction of Riverine Community Park in an efficient and safe manner. The compounds will have safe access to the public road network. The approach to all compound junctions will be adequately signed indicating construction traffic.

Further details of the compounds can be found within the CEMP submitted as part of the application package.

## Potential Impacts During the Construction Phase

The Riverine Community Park construction works will lead to additional construction related traffic on the existing public road network over the duration of the construction works. These impacts will be associated with:

- HGV's transporting materials to and from the site compounds, including materials for the construction of drainage infrastructure, pavement construction, temporary hard standings, new structures, particular pavement construction elements such as board walk sections, pre-cast underpass structure components, structural elements for existing structure repair
- HGV's transporting conventional earthworks machinery such as excavators, dumper trucks, rollers etc.
- Fuel trucks transporting fuel (for plant) to each site compound during the works
- Light goods vehicles (LGVs) such as cars, $4 \times 4 \mathrm{~s}$ and vans used by the workers and supervisory staff involved in the construction works
- Cranes for lifting structure components

Without appropriate mitigation measures, the proposed works have the potential to lead to a negative impact on the road network including:

- Delay and disruption to road users
- Road safety issues should the works not be carried out in line with good traffic management practices
- Inappropriate parking of construction related vehicles along the route of the works
- Soiling of the public road leading to a general lack of cleanliness and poor skid resistance on roads

The construction of the following aspects of the proposed development have been identified as the sources of potential risks in terms of traffic and transportation during the construction phase of the development:

- Oversized Loads associated with the bridge being delivered
- Cranes for the bridge lift

Both the above points will be subject to oversized load procedures for each respective jurisdiction. Risk assessments will also be undertaken as part of this process.
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## Oversized Loads (Bridge Construction and Lifting into Place)

The bridge will be brought to the Lifford side of the site in several parts up to 30 m in length, constructed on site then lifted into place. The crane will be similar to an AK 680 1,200T struct crane which is a large item of plant, please see image below. This crane will require an additional service crane of 200T to 300 T capacity to load the ballast in preparation for the lift. The ballast would be around 300 tons and would be delivered on $30-35$ trailers. The outrigger centres are approx. $14.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 14.5 \mathrm{~m}$ with a jib length of circa $85-100 \mathrm{~m}$ long.

The proposed route to the Lifford construction compound of the bridge sections will be subject to consultation with the Roads Authority in relation to the oversized load application and consultation with Garda Síochána and/or Police Service of Northern Ireland subject to the successful contractor for the bridge manufacture.

Image of an AK 680 1,200T Struct Crane
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## Additional Temporary Construction Traffic

The volume of additional traffic will vary over the 9-month period in accordance with the construction programme. The main elements of construction are the bridge, the community pavilion, the playparks, and cut/fill of material. These elements of construction are not large in terms of physical buildings or heavy civil engineering and will not require a large number of operatives during construction. However, there will be a requirement to import fill material and other construction material.

During the peak of construction, it is anticipated some 15HGV movements / day (one way) on average at the Lifford side of the park. There will also be a focused period of HGV movement with the arrival and erecting of the crane with some 30 HGV (one way) movements in relation to crane ballast in preparation for the lift.

HGV levels on the Strabane side of the park are expected to be significantly lower with some 2-4 HGV / day except for the short period during import material for the car park where HGV numbers will increase to some 20-30HGV's / day for approximately a week.

On both sides of the project there will be the usual mix of vehicles associated with a construction site i.e., fuel trucks, light goods vehicles (LGVs) such as cars, $4 \times 4 \mathrm{~s}$ and vans used by the workers and supervisory staff involved in the construction works. These vehicle numbers are expected to be low as the number of operatives required will be relatively low during the normal operation of the construction phase.

The construction of the proposed scheme has been highlighted within the original TS in terms of HGVs, LGVs, fuel deliveries, cranes, and oversized loads etc, a maximum of 30 HGV (one way) movements in relation to crane ballast in preparation for the lift has been identified as the focused period of HGV traffic over a short period of time. Please refer to the indictive construction phase programme contained in Appendix F.

## Predicted Daily Vehicle Trips

The predicted daily trips have been identified in section heading, 'Additional Temporary Construction Traffic' which represents the most onerous predicted traffic generation movements during the construction phase. The indicative construction phase programme contained in Appendix F is helpful in considering the time periods of most likely HGV movements over likely 2month periods, October to December for mobilisation and July to September for bridge construction. The volume of fill to be imported during the above peak periods will amount to less than the predicted 30HGV (one way) movements assessed in the original TS. However, as the contractor will be required to submit a final Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) post award of contract the temporary traffic volumes can be raised within that document's construction programme.

## Cut Fill Balance

It is expected the cut / fill balance will require the import of approximately $15,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}-25,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ of material. However, this is over the construction period of the scheme and can be programmed to ensure no concentrated HGV movements. That said, even with concentrated HGV movement this will amount to less than the original anticipated 30 HGV (one way) vehicles considered in the original TS.

Appendix $G$ contains a cut fill analysis of the proposed scheme. In reality it is expected the import material will be significantly less as the cut / fill analysis contained in Appendix $G$ excludes excavations in relation to construction footprint for drainage, roads, carparks formation levels. Therefore, the actual impact is predicted to be significantly less in terms of traffic movements regarding import material.
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## Other Material Import

The compressive indictive construction programme is helpful in providing information relation to the construction sequence. The material in relation to the building, carparks, play parks etc are insignificant in relation to the ballast for the bridge and will occur over time, therefore the traffic impact will be modest over a longer period of time within the construction programme. The resulting factor of the latter is the traffic impact will be modest.

## Trips Generated by Workers and Visitors to the Site

Traffic generation of workers and visitors, LGV's are estimated at 10 (one way) trips per day to the compound including workers within the LGV with 20 (one-way trips) for staff arriving at the compounds for work in vans. It is anticipated that contractor's staff will have a slight and temporary adverse local impact considering they are already on the surrounding road network, therefore diverted trip rather than new trips. Visitors to the site are expected to be out of peak hour traffic times and infrequent in nature, it is not expected visitors will have any meaningful implications in relation to the EIAr.

## Vehicle Types and Distribution During Am \& PM Traffic Peaks

Vehicle types have been described within the body of the original TS, the distribution will be subject to the awarded contractor but will likely have a balanced approach along the N14/N15 and therefore approach to the site. It is not expected that any significant HGV movements in particular will occur within the AM or PM peak periods. With exception to isolated periods of blacktopping roads the latter would be considered normal in relation to a project of this nature and scale.

## Cumulative Impact and Permitted Development Either Side of Border

Please refer to Chapter 15 of the Addendum EIAR for full consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts arising from the Project in association with other development on both Strabane and Lifford sides of the Project, as well as the interaction between potential impacts on different environmental receptors arising from the proposed Project.

## Construction Phase Mitigation

## Dust and Dirt

During the construction phase the increase in dust and dirt will be minimised by effective site management. The construction routes will be discussed and agreed with respective roads departments and disruption will be mitigated. The construction routes and the phasing of the scheme will be agreed with respective roads departments.

Wheel washing facilities will be provided for all construction vehicles and construction areas will be fenced-off. It should be noted that a OCEMP has been undertaken and has been included as part of the planning submission.

Any impact will be ameliorated using best practice including damping down excavated material and haul roads when the roads are dry and covering loads of surplus material leaving and entering the site. Wheel washing will be provided on site.

## Construction Days \& Hours

Working hours shall be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 13.00 on Saturday.

## Operatives Travel Behaviour

The Contractor will be required to develop a Construction Travel Plan to ensure operatives vehicles use are kept to a minimum with the use of mini-buses and shared vehicle trips.
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## Construction Phase Conclusion

On the basis of the ES, it is expected that the impact this activity will have on the surrounding road network will be 'temporary' to 'short-term' in duration, and 'moderate' in significance.
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## 11 Non-Motorised User / Park Access

## Methodology

This section sets out an appropriate understanding of relevant existing facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, it assesses suitable crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists. Equestrians in the Lifford or Strabane areas are not expected but have been considered. This section is split into respective towns of Lifford and Strabane for ease of reference.

## Lifford (Pedestrian \& Cycling)

Lifford town centre with Bridge Street, Main Street and Butcher Street will be the main roads leading to Foyle View then into the proposed park. The surrounding footways are narrow in areas but do provide segregation for pedestrians.

The streets are relatively quiet in terms of traffic volumes and therefore provide rood conditions for cyclists. The approach roads to the proposed development benefit from street lighting. There is also an existing pedestrian use next to the proposed park entrance in relation to the cinema and Three Rivers Centre.

In terms of desire lines for non-motorised users there are multiple approaches within Lifford equally as desirable then ultimately is Foyle View and into the proposed park.

Figure 10: Lifford Link Roads / Footways
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Pedestrian Controlled Crossing on N15 (Bridge Street on the left)


Butcher Street


Main Street


Foyle View


Proposed Site Entrance (right)
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## Wider Footway / Cycleway Network

In terms of the wider footway connections Lifford benefits from good footway infrastructure particularly the national road network within the town linking the various populated and rural areas. There is also the Strabane to Lifford Greenway (Route 3) and the proposed Northern Greenway linking into the RCP project to the northern side of the Strabane section. This will have the benefit of the new footbridge as part of the proposed development.

Figure 11: Strabane to Lifford Greenway (Route 3)


In terms of cycling the North West Trail passes through Lifford \& Strabane providing a well-publicised and integral route for wider cycling connections to the RCP proposed scheme.

Figure 12: North West Cycle Trail
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## Equestrians

The nature of narrow streets within Lifford and the proximity of the National Road network N14 \& N15 may discourage equestrian use in relation to accessing the RCP development. However, as with cycling the local streets are lightly trafficked and could provide an access for equestrian users.

## Lifford NMU Mitigation Measures

It is considered non-motorised users will have a safe environment in which to enjoy safe access to both the Lifford and Strabane entrances to the proposed park. As there is already provision of a controlled crossing point on the N15 between Bridge Street and the Three Coins Roundabout combined with relatively low levels of traffic within the town of Lifford no mitigation measures are proposed.

## Strabane (Pedestrian \& Cycling)

The footway network within Strabane is well catered for in relation to pedestrian facilities. Dropped kerbs, tactile paving, and street lighting as well as uncontrolled crossings point on the A38 Lifford Rd are already available extensively throughout the surrounding pedestrian network.

In terms of design lines for NMU users within Strabane they will ultimately be approaching from the east and will require to cross the A5 safely to enter the proposed park. Please refer to Figure 12 which illustrates the relationship between Strabane and the A5 strategic road network. The figure shows the location of the controlled crossing on the A5 Bradley Way (part of the Strabane to Lifford Greenway); refer to Figure 10 \& 11); the uncontrolled crossings at ASDA Roundabout, A38 Lifford Road and Railway Street Roundabout.

Figure 13: Lifford Link Roads / Footways
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A38 Lifford Road Roundabout Uncontrolled Crossing \& Uncontrolled Crossings to circa 150 m Southwest of ASDA Roundabout on the Lifford Road


Uncontrolled Crossing at Railway Street \& A5 Barnhill Road Legs of the ASDA Roundabout


Proposed Site Entrance with Uncontrolled Crossing
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## Wider Footway / Cycleway Network

In terms of the wider footway connections like Strabane, Lifford benefits from good footway infrastructure through the town linking the various populated and rural areas. There is also the Strabane to Lifford Greenway (Route 3) and the proposed Northern Greenway linking into the RCP project to the northern side of the Strabane section. This will have the benefit of the new footbridge as part of the proposed development.

In terms of cycling the North West Trail passes through Lifford \& Strabane providing a well-publicised and integral route for wider cycling connections to the RCP proposed scheme.

Image of North Greenway can be found within the application package.

## Equestrians

The nature of strategic roads and town centre may discourage equestrian use in relation to accessing the RCP development. However, their use has been considered in the mitigation measures in relation to Strabane NMU assessment.

## Strabane Public Transport

Dfl Roads have asked for a GG-142 WCHAR study to be undertaken, this process normally applies to road scheme developments and in this instance has been combined with the NAU Section of this report with the exception of the public transport consideration which are highlighted below. The following information has been provided by the A5WTC consultants and also comments on future development, pedestrian \& cycle routes

## Bus Services:

- Ulsterbus Service 100/101 provides a route between Strabane and Clady via Sion Mills and Glebe, operating between Monday and Saturday
- Ulsterbus Service 102a provides a route between Londonderry and Strabane, operating 7 days per week
- Goldline Express Service 273 provides a route between Belfast and Londonderry via Dungannon, Strabane and Omagh. The service operates 7 days per week
- Bus Service X3 Goldline Express provides a route between Londonderry and Dublin via Dublin Airport, operating on weekdays only.


## Future Development

- Strabane Canal Towpath
- Strabane Pedestrian Project
- Strahans Road School
- Carricklee Landfill Regeneration
- Dfl Western Division Park \& Ride/Share Sites


## Pedestrian Routes

WalkNI (https://walkni.com/) has a number of walking routes around Northern Ireland, varying in distance from 1 mile to over 20 miles. A short walk is classified as up to 5 miles, a medium walk is between 5 and 20 miles and a long walk is over 20 miles.

Mourneside Walk is a short walk from Sion Mills at the Mourne River, with the footpath following the outer perimeter of Herdman's Mill and giving panoramic views of the 19th century weir. The path is a loop around the weir and back to the starting point.
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Strabane Towpath is a short walk (up to 5 miles) from the village of Ballymagorry. The route uses the Strabane Canal which is in the process of being restored. Pedestrians can access excellent views of the River Foyle and across to Donegal.

The Ulster Way is a 675-mile-long distance circular route promoted by WalkNI.

## Cycle Routes

NCR92 is routed along the A38 as it crosses the River Foyle from Lifford to Strabane, continuing through Strabane town centre before running south along the lower eastern valley slopes of the Mourne River and River Strule as far as Newtownstewart.

Sperrin's Cycle Route: The Derg Valley (SCR6) is promoted by CycleNI, offering cyclists a 30-mile round trip from Newtownstewart. It follows the lower eastern slopes of the Strule Valley as far as Sion Mills, before climbing the western slopes of the valley to the south-west of the town along Garden Road and Peacock Road. It descends into Castlederg and then returns along the southern slopes of the Derg River valley, where it joins NCR 95 at Castlebane Road, and follows the national route through the Baronscourt Estate before descending into Newtownstewart.

The North West Trail, a 326km circular cycle route, travels through a wide variety of scenic landscapes, utilising quiet country roads with some traffic-free sections in urban areas.

## Strabane NMU Mitigation Measures

In terms of desire lines from to safely cross pedestrians and cyclists across the A5 Strategic Road and the A38 Lifford road the introduction of controlled crossings will be provided. The location on the A5 crossing will be some 100 m north of the ASADA Roundabout Details. The existing uncontrolled crossing on the A38 Lifford Road will be upgraded to a controlled Toucan crossing. The proposed locations can be found in the Project Description and drawing package.

## Mobility Impaired

Mobility impaired users of the NMU network will benefit from ramped access to the buildings together with dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossings and entrances.
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## 12 Mitigation Measures

## Pedestrians Crossings of Strategic Roads (Strabane)

The existing pedestrian crossing on the A38 Lifford Road will be upgraded to a controlled toucan crossing. A new toucan crossing will be introduced on the A5 Barnhill Road some 100m north of the ADSA Roundabout. Both measures will facilitate the safe movement of pedestrians / cyclists to the proposed RCP and the northern greenway. Both crossings will be subject to the detailed design post planning to disability standards.

## Construction Phase Mitigation (NI \& ROI)

Dust and Dirt
During the construction phase the increase in dust and dirt will be minimised by effective site management. The construction routes will be discussed and agreed with respective roads departments and disruption will be mitigated. The construction routes and the phasing of the scheme will be agreed with respective roads departments.

Wheel washing facilities will be provided for all construction vehicles and construction areas will be fenced-off. It should be noted that a OCEMP has been undertaken and has been included as part of the planning submission.

Any impact will be ameliorated using best practice including damping down excavated material and haul roads when the roads are dry and covering loads of surplus material leaving and entering the site. Wheel washing will be provided on site.

## Construction Days \& Hours

Working hours shall be 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 13.00 on Saturday.

## Operatives Travel Behaviour

The Contractor will be required to develop a Construction Travel Plan to ensure operatives vehicles use are kept to a minimum with the use of mini-buses and shared vehicle trips.

## East Donegal Coursing Club (ROI)

Although there is to be no increase with traffic already associated with the EDCC there will be no events associated with the RCP that will occur on the same day as events at the EDCC. This will be outlined in the Event Management Plan associated with the RCP.
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## 13 Residual Impacts

The TA concludes that the proposed mitigation measures (outlined above) will ensure that the surrounding highway network operates no worse than the existing network with the proposed development constructed and operational and therefore it is anticipated that the proposed development will have a negligible impact upon the surrounding highway network.
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## 14 Conclusions

The creation of the Riverine Community Park will encourage the use of the greenways that have been built or are under construction within the area of Strabane and Lifford thus helping to increase the number of cycling tourists and locals to utilise the off-road routes to access the cross-community park.

The creation of two controlled Toucan crossings will enable the safe crossing of pedestrians across the A38 Lifford Road and the A5 Barnhill Road on the Strabane side of the proposed development.

The modelling demonstrates that the local road network can accommodate the RCP without significant detriment to existing conditions. Although there will be a modest impact on Junction 2 (N15/Bridge Street) this junction is already at or nearing capacity so the additional traffic associated with the park will be negligible in terms of cumulative impact. When considering the above on a Sunday which is the peak hour for the proposed development there is little to no impact on the junction's capacity.

All significant events to be held at the RCP will be subject to an Event Management Plan which will contain mitigation measures to reduce the traffic impact on the local road network within the area or Lifford and Strabane.

It is expected that construction will have a minimal impact on the local road network and will be ongoing for only 9 months, any oversized loads will be subject to risk assessments that the contractor will carry out and communication with the relevant authorities in each jurisdiction to minimalize any delay within the local area. Any impact associated with construction on the surrounding road network will be 'temporary' to 'short-term' in duration, and 'moderate' in significance.

In conclusion the Transport study confirms there are no residual impacts relating to the proposed development.

Regarding the EIAr Addendum assessment there are no changes to the TS Mitigation Measures or Residual Impact
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## Appendix A: Three Rivers Report Flow Diagrams
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## Appendix B: Riverine Community Park Flow Diagrams
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RIVERINE COMMUNITY PARK - TRAFFIC FLOW DIAGRAMS - OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC (PEAK HOUR SUNDAY 14:00-15:00)
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## Appendix C: TRICS

TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 06-HOTEL, FOOD & DRINK
```

Category : B - RESTAURANTS

## TOTAL VEHI CLES

| Selected regions and areas: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HC HAMPSHIRE | 1 days |
|  | WS WEST SUSSEX | 1 days |
| 04 | EAST ANGLI A |  |
|  | NF NORFOLK | 1 days |
| 05 | EAST MI DLANDS |  |
|  | DS DERBYSHIRE | 2 days |
| 06 | WEST MI DLANDS |  |
|  | ST STAFFORDSHIRE | 1 days |
|  | WM WEST MIDLANDS | 2 days |
| 08 | NORTH WEST |  |
|  | CH CHESHIRE | 2 days |
| 09 | NORTH |  |
|  | CB CUMBRIA | 1 days |
| 10 | WALES |  |
|  | CF CARDIFF | 1 days |
| 11 | SCOTLAND |  |
|  | RF RENFREWSHIRE | 1 days |
| 17 | ULSTER (NORTHERN IRELAND) |  |
|  | AN ANTRIM | 2 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 75 to 400 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 75 to 400 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: 01/01/13 to 25/09/19
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Selected survey days: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Monday | 1 days |
| Tuesday | 1 days |
| Wednesday | 1 days |
| Thursday | 4 days |
| Friday | 3 days |
| Saturday | 4 days |
| Sunday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:
Manual count 15 days
Directional ATC Count 0 days
This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Town Centre 5
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 2
Edge of Town 3
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) 5
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
$\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{b}) \quad 15$ days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

Population within 500m Range:
All Surveys Included
Population within 1 mile:

| 1,001 to 5,000 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5,001 to 10,000 |  |
| 10,001 days |  |
| 15,000 | 1 days |
| 15,001 to 20,000 | 2 days |
| 20,001 to 25,000 | 2 days |
| 25,001 to 50,000 | 6 days |
| 50,001 to 100,000 | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:

| 25,001 to 50,000 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75,001 days |  |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 6 days |
| 250,001 to 500,000 | 1 days |
|  | 7 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.6 to 1.0 | 6 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.1 to 1.5 | 9 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

Travel Plan:
No
15 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:
No PTAL Present 15 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.8.2 210621 B20.20 Riverine Cafe | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2021. All rights reserved | Thursday 01/ 07/ 21 Page 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hoy Dorman 32B Old | ne Moira | cence No: 30490 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 AN-06-B-02 FRANKIE \& BENNY'S
HILSBOROUGH ROAD
LISBURN
Edge of Town
Retail Zone
Total Gross floor area: 275 sqm Survey date: FRIDAY 19/06/15
2
AN-06-B-03 MODERN CUISINE
LISBURN ROAD
BELFAST
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
High Street
Total Gross floor area: 320 sqm Survey date: FRIDAY 25/09/15
3 CB-06-B-01
ITALI AN RESTAURANT
MARKET STREET
CARLISLE
Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area:
150 sqm 25/06/16
4 CF-06-B-02 FRANKIE \& BENNY'S
NEWPORT ROAD
CARDIFF
Edge of Town
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area: 400 sqm
Survey date: SUNDAY 19/10/14
5 CH-06-B-02 ITALI AN RESTAURANT
MILL STREET
MACCLESFIELD
Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: 75 sqm Survey date: SATURDAY 17/09/16
6 CH-06-B-03 PIZZA EXPRESS
MARKET PLACE
MACCLESFIELD
Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: 321 sqm
Survey date: SATURDAY 11/11/17
7 DS-06-B-03 BRITISH RESTAURANT
THORNHILL ROAD
DERBY
LITTLEOVER
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre)
Residential Zone
Total Gross floor area: 350 sqm Survey date: THURSDAY 12/07/18
8 DS-06-B-04 FRENCH RESTAURANT
FRIAR GATE
DERBY
Town Centre
High Street
Total Gross floor area: 180 sqm Survey date: WEDNESDAY 25/09/19
9 HC-06-B-01
PIZZA HUT
BINNACLE WAY
PORTSMOUTH
COSHAM
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area:
325 sqm
Survey date: MONDAY 23/11/15

## ANTRIM

Survey Type: MANUAL
ANTRIM

Survey Type: MANUAL CUMBRIA

Survey Type: MANUAL

## CARDIFF

Survey Type: MANUAL CHESHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL CHESHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL DERBYSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL DERBYSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL HAMPSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters (Cont.)

| 10 | ```NF-06-B-01 I NDI AN RESTAURANT KING STREET GREAT YARMOUTH``` | I NDI AN RESTAURANT | NORFOLK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Town Centre |  |  |
|  | High Street |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 160 | a: 160 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: THURSDAY 1 | THURSDAY 14/09/17 | Survey Type: MANUAL RENFREWSHIRE |
| 11 | RF-06-B-01 INDIAN RESTAURANT |  |  |
|  | LINWOOD ROAD |  |  |
|  | PAISLEY |  |  |
|  | PHOENIX LEISURE PARK |  |  |
|  | Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) |  |  |
|  | No Sub Category |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 17 | a: 175 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: FRIDAY 20/ | FRIDAY 20/06/14 | Survey Type: MANUAL |
| 12 | ST-06-B-01 RESTAURANT |  | STAFFORDSHI RE |
|  | STONE ROAD |  |  |
|  | STOKE-ON-TRENT |  |  |
|  | TRENTHAM |  |  |
|  | Edge of Town |  |  |
|  | Retail Zone |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 25 | a: 259 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: THURSDAY 2 | THURSDAY 24/10/13 | Survey Type: MANUAL |
| 13 | WM-06-B-06 ITALI AN RESTAURANT |  | WEST MI DLANDS |
|  | EARLSDON STREET |  |  |
|  | COVENTRY |  |  |
|  | Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) |  |  |
|  | High Street |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 17 | a: 175 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: THURSDAY 2 | THURSDAY 24/11/16 | Survey Type: MANUAL |
| 14 | WM-06-B-07 INDIAN RESTAURANT |  | WEST MI DLANDS |
|  | AUDNAM |  |  |
|  | STOURBRIDGE |  |  |
|  | AUDNAM |  |  |
|  | Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) |  |  |
|  | High Street |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 37 | a: 370 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: TUESDAY 28 | TUESDAY 28/11/17 | Survey Type: MANUAL |
| 15 | WS-06-B-02 BRITISH FINE DINING |  | WEST SUSSEX |
|  | ARUNDEL ROAD |  |  |
|  | NEAR CHICHESTER |  |  |
|  | TANGMERE |  |  |
|  | Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) |  |  |
|  | Village |  |  |
|  | Total Gross floor area: 130 | a: 130 sqm |  |
|  | Survey date: SATURDAY 0 | SATURDAY 04/10/14 | Survey Type: MANUAL |

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

# TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS <br> TOTAL VEHI CLES <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period 



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected: Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

75-400 (units: sqm)
01/01/13-25/09/19
10
4
1
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 07-LEISURE
Category : Q - COMMUNITY CENTRE
```


## TOTAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

07 YORKSHIRE \& NORTH LI NCOLNSHI RE

## NY NORTH YORKSHIRE <br> 1 days

08 NORTH WEST
CH CHESHIRE 1 days
09 NORTH
TW TYNE \& WEAR 1 days
10 WALES
PS POWYS 1 days
SW SWANSEA 1 days

11 SCOTLAND
FA FALKIRK 1 days
17 ULSTER (NORTHERN IRELAND
1 days
This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS® sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 100 to 500 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 100 to 500 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 13$ to $07 / 11 / 17$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Selected survey days. | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tonday | 3 days |
| Wednesday | 1 days |
| Friday | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

| Selected survey types: | 7 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre 2
Edge of Town 1
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre) 4
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Residential Zone 1
Village 2
High Street 1
No Sub Category 3
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
F2(b) 7 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS $®$.

Population within 500 m Range:
All Surveys Included
Population within 1 mile:

| 1,000 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1,001 to 5,000 | 2 days |
| 5,001 to 10,000 | 1 days |
| 15,001 to 20,000 | 1 days |
| 25,001 to 50,000 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:

| 5,001 to 25,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 50,001 to 75,000 | 2 days |
| 75,001 to 100,000 | 1 days |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 2 days |
| 250,001 to 500,000 | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.6 to 1.0 | 4 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.1 to 1.5 | 3 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

Travel Plan:
No
7 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:
No PTAL Present 7 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 CH-07-Q-01 COMMUNITY CENTRE
WARRINGTON ROAD
MERE
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre)
Village
Total Gross floor area: 100 sqm
Survey date: TUESDAY 07/11/17
2 DO-07-Q-01
COMMUNITY CENTRE
CHURCH ROAD
NEAR BELFAST
MONEYREAGH
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre)
Village
Total Gross floor area: 450 sqm
Survey date: FRIDAY 19/06/15
3 FA-07-Q-02 COMMUNITY CENTRE
PARKHALL DRIVE
FALKIRK
MADDISTON
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Gross floor area: 400 sqm
Survey date: MONDAY 03/06/13
4 NY-07-Q-01 COMMUNITY CENTRE
SHUTE ROAD
CATTERRICK GARRISON
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre)
No Sub Category
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Total Gross floor area: } & 316 \mathrm{sqm} \\ \text { Survey date: WEDNESDAY } & 10 / 05 / 17\end{array}$
5 PS-07-Q-01 COMMUNITY CENTRE HOWELL ROAD
WELSHPOOL
Edge of Town Centre
No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area:
350 sqm
Survey date: TUESDAY 12/05/15
6 SW-07-Q-01 COMMUNITY CENTRE
HIGH STREET
SWANSEA
Edge of Town Centre
High Street
Total Gross floor area
500 sqm
Survey date: TUESDAY 22/10/13
7 TW-07-Q-01
COMMUNITY CENTRE
HIGH STREET
GATESHEAD
WREKENTON
Neighbourhood Centre (PPS6 Local Centre)
No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area: 450 sqm Survey date: FRIDAY 04/10/13

## CHESHIRE

$\qquad$

Survey Type: MANUAL NORTH YORKSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL
Survey Type: MANUAL DOWN

## FALKI RK

Survey Type: MANUAL POWYS

Survey Type: MANUAL

## SWANSEA

Survey Type: MANUAL TYNE \& WEAR

Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

# TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/Q - COMMUNITY CENTRE <br> TOTAL VEHI CLES <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period 



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected: Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

100-500 (units: sqm) 01/01/13-07/11/17
7
0
0
0
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## HoyDorman

## Appendix D: Modelling

THE FUTURE

## Junctions 10

## PICADY 10 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 10.0.0.1499
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2021
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344379777 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: 210809_J2_N15_Bridge St.j10
Path: C:IUsers\MartinHoy\Hoy Dorman\Hoy Dorman - Documents\Civils\2021002_Riverine\Traffic\Modelling Report generation date: 10/08/2021 21:38:06
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows, PM
»J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development
Flows x 2, PM

## Summary of junction performance

|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Set ID | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Junction Delay (s) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Junction } \\ \text { LOS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D1 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 14.23 | 0.31 | B | 2.32 | A | -10\% |
| Stream B-A |  | 0.9 | 4.1 | 65.58 | 0.49 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.3 | 1.3 | 7.81 | 0.19 | A |  |  | [Stream B-A] |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.36 | 0.01 | A | 3.88 | A | $900 \%$ |
| Stream B-A |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 6.52 | 0.01 | A |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.0 | $\sim 1$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | A |  |  | [] |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D3 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 16.09 | 0.34 | C | 2.87 | A | -12\% |
| Stream B-A |  | 1.2 | 5.6 | 76.72 | 0.56 | F |  |  | [Stream B-A] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.3 | 7.80 | 0.20 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D4 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 21.49 | 0.41 | C | 3.76 | A | -15\% |
| Stream B-A |  | 1.7 | 7.5 | 117.70 | 0.66 | F |  |  | [Stream B-A] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.4 | 1.4 | 7.83 | 0.21 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D5 | 1.2 | 5.1 | 35.75 | 0.56 | E | 5.59 | A | -17\% |
| Stream B-A |  | 2.4 | 10.2 | 154.01 | 0.76 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.4 | 7.82 | 0.22 | A |  |  | [Stream B-A] |
|  | J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D6 | 7.0 | 20.6 | 192.64 | 1.03 | F | 14.62 | B | $-19 \%$[Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 4.3 | 14.5 | 272.72 | 0.95 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.4 | 7.84 | 0.22 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D7 | 11.5 | 29.8 | 287.48 | 1.13 | F | 21.76 | C | $-21 \%$[Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 6.6 | 18.5 | 353.41 | 1.08 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.5 | 1.5 | 7.83 | 0.24 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | D8 | 16.6 | 37.0 | 381.15 | 1.25 | F | 29.72 | D | $-22 \%$[Stream B-A] |
| Stream B-A |  | 9.5 | 22.5 | 443.65 | 1.22 | F |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.6 | 1.1 | 7.81 | 0.25 | A |  |  |  |

[^1]File summary
File Description

| Title |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $05 / 05 / 2021$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | AzureAD\MartinHoy |
| 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 | Veh | Veh | 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 | Residual capacity criteria type | RFC <br> Threshold | Average Delay threshold (s) | Queue threshold (PCU) | Use iterations with HCM roundabouts | Max number of iterations for roundabouts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.75 | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Delay | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |  | 500 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ \text { (HH:mm) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 - Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D3 | 2023 - Base + Development | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Growth Factors

| ID | Description | Use TEMPRO | Growth Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2028=+5$ |  | 1.0555 |
| G2 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2038=+15$ |  | 1.1089 |

Growth factors are only active if the Demand Set references them in a Relationship.

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Name | Include in report | Network flow scaling factor (\%) | Network capacity scaling factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1 | $\mathrm{J} 2-\mathrm{N} 15 /$ Bridge St | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 | 100.000 |

THE FUTURE

## J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D1-2023 - Baseline <br> Traffic, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 2.32 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -10 | Stream B-A | 2.32 | A |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | N15 (west) |  | Major |
| B | Bridge Street |  | Minor |
| C | N15 (east) |  | 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 | 8.00 |  |  | 80.0 | $\checkmark$ |  |

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 <br> type | Width at give- <br> way $(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{2 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Estimate flare <br> length | Flare length <br> $(\mathbf{P C U})$ | Visibility to <br> left ( $\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility to <br> right $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | One lane plus <br> flare | 9.30 | 6.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.50 |  | 2.00 | 22 |  |

Slope / Intercept / Capacity
Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-A | 508 | 0.085 | 0.214 | 0.134 | 0.305 |
| B-C | 706 | 0.099 | 0.250 | - | - |
| C-B | 620 | 0.219 | 0.219 | - | - |

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 | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) | Results for central <br> hour only | Run <br> automatically |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | $2023-$ Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | $14: 00$ | $15: 30$ | 15 | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 982 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 149 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1039 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |  |
|  | A | 0 | 123 | 859 |  |
|  | B | 48 | 0 | 101 |  |
|  | C | 976 | 63 | 0 |  |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.68 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 739 | 779 |
|  | B | 112 | 112 |
|  | C | 782 | 827 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 883 | 930 |
|  | B | 134 | 134 |
|  | C | 934 | 988 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1081 | 1139 |
|  | B | 164 | 164 |
|  | C | 1144 | 1210 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1081 | 1139 |
|  | B | 164 | 164 |
|  | C | 1144 | 1210 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 883 | 930 |
|  | B | 134 | 134 |
|  | C | 934 | 988 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 739 | 779 |
|  | B | 112 | 112 |
|  | C | 782 | 827 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th percentile Queue (Veh) | Max LOS | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Total Junction Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.31 | 14.23 | 0.4 | 1.7 | B | 101 | 101 |
| B-A | 0.49 | 65.58 | 0.9 | 4.1 | F | 48 | 48 |
| C-AB | 0.19 | 7.81 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A | 90 | 90 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 949 | 949 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 123 | 123 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 859 | 859 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Junction Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | Start queue (Veh) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 91 | 23 | 459 | 0.198 | 91 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 9.753 | A |
| B-A | 43 | 11 | 181 | 0.238 | 43 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 25.895 | D |
| C-AB | 73 | 18 | 535 | 0.136 | 73 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.777 | A |
| C-A | 861 | 215 |  |  | 861 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 111 | 28 |  |  | 111 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 772 | 193 |  |  | 772 |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 111 | 28 | 369 | 0.301 | 110 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 13.864 |  |
| B-A | 53 | 13 | 107 | 0.494 | 51 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 61.646 |  |
| C-AB | 107 | 27 | 570 | 0.188 | 106 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.745 |  |
| C-A | 1037 | 259 |  |  | 1037 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 135 | 34 |  |  | 135 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 946 | 236 |  |  | 946 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Start queue <br> $(\mathbf{V e h})$ | End queue <br> $(\mathbf{V e h})$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 111 | 28 | 364 | 0.305 | 111 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 14.229 |  |
| B-A | 53 | 13 | 107 | 0.494 | 53 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 65.584 |  |
| C-AB | 107 | 27 | 572 | 0.187 | 107 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7.764 | A |
| C-A | 1037 | 259 |  |  | 1037 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 135 | 34 |  |  | 135 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 946 | 236 |  |  | 946 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Start queue <br> $(\mathbf{V e h})$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 91 | 23 | 457 | 0.199 | 92 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 9.880 | A |
| B-A | 43 | 11 | 182 | 0.238 | 46 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 26.869 | D |
| C-AB | 73 | 18 | 538 | 0.135 | 73 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 7.806 | A |
| C-A | 861 | 215 |  |  | 861 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 111 | 28 |  |  | 111 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 772 | 193 |  |  | 772 |  |  |  |  |

Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.86 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 1.29 | 3.77 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.52 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.43 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 1.37 | 1.66 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.91 | 0.04 | 0.35 | 2.20 | 4.15 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.35 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 0.99 | 1.25 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.32 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.01 | 1.26 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

## J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D2 - 2023 - <br> Development Traffic, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| Warning | Vehicle Mix |  | HV\% is zero for all movements / time segments. Vehicle Mix matrix should be completed whether working in <br> PCUs or Vehs. If HV\% at the junction is genuinely zero, please ignore this warning. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 3.88 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 900 |  | 3.88 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 6 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 11 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 5 | 1 |
|  | B | 6 | 0 | 5 |
|  | C | 1 | 3 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.17 |
|  | B | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
|  | C | 0.25 | 0.75 | 0.00 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 5 | 5 |
|  | B | 8 | 8 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 5 | 5 |
|  | B | 10 | 10 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 7 | 7 |
|  | B | 12 | 12 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 7 | 7 |
|  | B | 12 | 12 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 5 | 5 |
|  | B | 10 | 10 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 5 | 5 |
|  | B | 8 | 8 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max LOS | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 5.36 | 0.0 | 0.5 | A |  |  |
| B-A | 0.01 | 6.52 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5 |  |  |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | $\sim 1$ | A | 6 |  |
| C-A |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 4 | 1 | 678 | 0.007 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.348 |  |
| B-A | 5 | 1 | 559 | 0.010 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.502 |  |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1238 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 4 | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0.90 | 0.22 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 6 | 1 | 677 | 0.008 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.360 |  |
| B-A | 7 | 2 | 559 | 0.012 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.518 | A |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1238 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 6 | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1 | 0.28 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 6 | 1 | 677 | 0.008 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.360 | A |
| B-A | 7 | 2 | 559 | 0.012 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.518 | A |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1238 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 |  |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 6 | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1 | 0.28 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 4 | 1 | 677 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.348 |  |
| B-A | 5 | 1 | 559 | 0.010 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.505 |  |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1238 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 4 | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0.90 | 0.22 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean (Veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q05 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q50 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q90 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q95 } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A |
| B-A | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | N/A |  |
| reability of exactly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D3 - 2023 - Base + <br> Development, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 2.87 | $A$ |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -12 | Stream B-A | 2.87 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2023 - Base + Development | PM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ONE } \\ \text { HOUR } \end{gathered}$ | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 988 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 160 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1043 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 128 | 860 |
|  | B | 54 | 0 | 106 |
|  | C | 977 | 66 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.66 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |  |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |  |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |  |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 744 | 783 |
|  | B | 120 | 120 |
|  | C | 785 | 830 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 888 | 935 |
|  | B | 144 | 144 |
|  | C | 938 | 991 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1088 | 1146 |
|  | B | 176 | 176 |
|  | C | 1148 | 1214 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1088 | 1146 |
|  | B | 176 | 176 |
|  | C | 1148 | 1214 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 888 | 935 |
|  | B | 144 | 144 |
|  | C | 938 | 991 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 744 | 783 |
|  | B | 120 | 120 |
|  | C | 785 | 830 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.34 | 16.09 | 0.5 | 2.1 | C | 106 | 106 |
| B-A | 0.56 | 76.72 | 1.2 | 5.6 | F | 54 | 54 |
| C-AB | 0.20 | 7.80 | 0.4 | 1.3 | A | 96 | 96 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 947 | 947 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 128 | 128 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 860 | 860 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 95 | 24 | 453 | 0.210 | 95 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 10.034 | B |
| B-A | 49 | 12 | 180 | 0.269 | 48 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 27.057 |  |
| C-AB | 77 | 19 | 540 | 0.143 | 77 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.767 | A |
| C-A | 860 | 215 |  |  | 860 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 115 | 29 |  |  | 115 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 773 | 193 |  |  | 773 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 117 | 29 | 349 | 0.334 | 116 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 15.367 |  |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 105 | 0.565 | 56 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 70.099 | F |
| C-AB | 114 | 29 | 579 | 0.198 | 114 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.715 | A |
| C-A | 1034 | 258 |  |  | 1034 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 141 | 35 |  |  | 141 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 947 | 237 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 117 | 29 | 340 | 0.343 | 117 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 16.085 |  |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 105 | 0.565 | 59 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 76.722 | F |
| C-AB | 114 | 29 | 581 | 0.197 | 114 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.736 |  |
| C-A | 1034 | 258 |  |  | 1034 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 141 | 35 |  |  | 141 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 947 | 237 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 95 | 24 | 450 | 0.212 | 96 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 10.215 |  |
| B-A | 49 | 12 | 181 | 0.268 | 52 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 28.498 |  |
| C-AB | 77 | 19 | 543 | 0.142 | 78 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 7.798 |  |
| C-A | 860 | 215 |  |  | 860 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 115 | 29 |  |  | 115 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 773 | 193 |  |  | 773 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.35 | 0.35 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 1.10 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.99 | 5.61 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.52 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.51 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 1.50 | 2.06 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 1.19 | 0.04 | 0.37 | 2.97 | 5.62 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 1.10 | 1.30 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 1.20 | 1.41 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

## J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D4 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 3.76 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -15 | Stream B-A | 3.76 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G1 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1037 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 157 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1097 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 130 | 907 |
|  | B | 51 | 0 | 107 |
|  | C | 1030 | 66 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.68 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 780 | 822 |
|  | B | 118 | 118 |
|  | C | 826 | 873 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 932 | 982 |
|  | B | 141 | 141 |
|  | C | 986 | 1042 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1141 | 1202 |
|  | B | 173 | 173 |
|  | C | 1207 | 1277 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1141 | 1202 |
|  | B | 173 | 173 |
|  | C | 1207 | 1277 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 932 | 982 |
|  | B | 141 | 141 |
|  | C | 986 | 1042 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 780 | 822 |
|  | B | 118 | 118 |
|  | C | 826 | 873 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.41 | 21.49 | 0.7 | 2.9 | C | 107 | 107 |
| B-A | 0.66 | 117.70 | 1.7 | 7.5 | F | 51 | 51 |
| C-AB | 0.21 | 7.83 | 0.4 | 1.4 | A | 101 | 101 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 996 | 996 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 130 | 130 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 907 | 907 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 96 | 24 | 442 | 0.217 | 96 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 10.375 |  |
| B-A | 46 | 11 | 163 | 0.280 | 45 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 30.320 |  |
| C-AB | 80 | 20 | 540 | 0.148 | 80 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.795 | A |
| C-A | 906 | 226 |  |  | 906 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 117 | 29 |  |  | 117 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 815 | 204 |  |  | 815 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 117 | 29 | 306 | 0.384 | 116 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 18.845 |  |
| B-A | 56 | 14 | 84 | 0.663 | 51 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 99.716 | F |
| C-AB | 121 | 30 | 587 | 0.206 | 120 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.682 | A |
| C-A | 1086 | 272 |  |  | 1086 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 143 | 36 |  |  | 143 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 998 | 250 |  |  | 998 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 117 | 29 | 284 | 0.413 | 117 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 21.490 | C |
| B-A | 56 | 14 | 84 | 0.663 | 55 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 117.700 | F |
| C-AB | 121 | 30 | 589 | 0.205 | 121 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.704 |  |
| C-A | 1086 | 272 |  |  | 1086 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 143 | 36 |  |  | 143 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 998 | 250 |  |  | 998 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 96 | 24 | 436 | 0.220 | 97 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 10.684 |  |
| B-A | 46 | 11 | 164 | 0.278 | 51 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 33.065 |  |
| C-AB | 80 | 20 | 544 | 0.147 | 81 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 7.831 |  |
| C-A | 906 | 226 |  |  | 906 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 117 | 29 |  |  | 117 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 815 | 204 |  |  | 815 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.37 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.52 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.23 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.60 | 0.60 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 1.47 | 0.04 | 0.38 | 3.81 | 7.12 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.71 |  |  | A | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean (Veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q05 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q50 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q90 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q95 } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.68 | 0.03 | 0.34 | 1.58 | 2.93 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 1.66 | 0.04 | 0.43 | 4.44 | 7.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.42 | 0.04 | 0.36 | 1.18 | 1.35 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A |
| B-A | 0.40 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 1.30 | 1.32 |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  | N/A |  |
| reaching marker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | N/A |
| :---: |

THE FUTURE

# J2-N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |  | 5.59 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -17 | Stream B-A | 5.59 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ (\mathrm{HH}: \mathrm{mm}) \end{array}\right\|$ | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D4+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1043 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 168 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1101 | 100.000 |

[^2]Demand (Veh/hr)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To |  |  |  |
|  | A | A | B | C |
|  | B | 57 | 135 | 908 |
|  | C | 1031 | 69 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.66 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages


Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 785 | 826 |
|  | B | 127 | 127 |
|  | C | 829 | 876 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 937 | 987 |
|  | B | 151 | 151 |
|  | C | 989 | 1046 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1148 | 1209 |
|  | B | 185 | 185 |
|  | C | 1212 | 1281 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1148 | 1209 |
|  | B | 185 | 185 |
|  | C | 1212 | 1281 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 937 | 987 |
|  | B | 151 | 151 |
|  | C | 989 | 1046 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 785 | 826 |
|  | B | 127 | 127 |
|  | C | 829 | 876 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max LoS | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.56 | 35.75 | 1.2 | 5.1 | E | 112 | 112 |
| B-A | 0.76 | 154.01 | 2.4 | 10.2 | F | 57 | 57 |
| C-AB | 0.22 | 7.82 | 0.5 | 1.4 | A | 107 | 107 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 994 | 994 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 135 | 135 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 908 | 908 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr $)$ | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 100 | 25 | 435 | 0.230 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 10.718 | B |
| B-A | 51 | 13 | 162 | 0.314 | 50 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 31.945 |  |
| C-AB | 85 | 21 | 546 | 0.155 | 84 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.782 |  |
| C-A | 905 | 226 |  |  | 905 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 121 | 30 |  |  | 121 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 816 | 204 |  |  | 816 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 123 | 31 | 262 | 0.468 | 121 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 25.036 |  |
| B-A | 62 | 16 | 82 | 0.760 | 56 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 119.850 |  |
| C-AB | 129 | 32 | 598 | 0.216 | 128 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 7.647 |  |
| C-A | 1083 | 271 |  |  | 1083 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 148 | 37 |  |  | 148 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 999 | 250 |  |  | 999 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Junction Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | Start queue (Veh) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 123 | 31 | 221 | 0.557 | 122 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 35.753 | E |
| B-A | 62 | 16 | 82 | 0.763 | 61 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 154.014 | F |
| C-AB | 129 | 32 | 600 | 0.216 | 129 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 7.674 | A |
| C-A | 1083 | 271 |  |  | 1083 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 148 | 37 |  |  | 148 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 999 | 250 |  |  | 999 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 100 | 25 | 426 | 0.236 | 104 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 11.296 |  |
| B-A | 51 | 13 | 163 | 0.313 | 59 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 36.702 |  |
| C-AB | 85 | 21 | 550 | 0.154 | 85 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7.819 |  |
| C-A | 905 | 226 |  |  | 905 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 121 | 30 |  |  | 121 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 816 | 204 |  |  | 816 |  |  |  |  |

Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 0.44 | 0.04 | 0.36 | 1.18 | 1.34 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.84 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.84 | 1.47 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 2.00 | 0.05 | 0.50 | 5.34 | 8.47 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.44 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.73 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 1.17 | 0.04 | 0.40 | 2.94 | 5.07 |  |  | N/A |
| B-A | 2.39 | 0.05 | 0.61 | 6.47 | 10.22 |  | Nrobability of exactly |  |
| reaching marker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | N/A |
| :---: |
| C-AB |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.48 | 0.80 |  |  | N/A |
| B-A | 0.48 | 0.03 | 0.32 | 1.44 | 1.91 |  |  | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 |  | N/A |  |

THE FUTURE

# J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D6 - 2038 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 <br> Years, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 14.62 | B |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -19 | Stream B-A | 14.62 | $B$ |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1089 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 165 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1152 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 136 | 953 |
|  | B | 53 | 0 | 112 |
|  | C | 1082 | 70 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.68 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 820 | 864 |
|  | B | 124 | 124 |
|  | C | 867 | 917 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 979 | 1031 |
|  | B | 149 | 149 |
|  | C | 1036 | 1095 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1199 | 1263 |
|  | B | 182 | 182 |
|  | C | 1269 | 1341 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1199 | 1263 |
|  | B | 182 | 182 |
|  | C | 1269 | 1341 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 979 | 1031 |
|  | B | 149 | 149 |
|  | C | 1036 | 1095 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 820 | 864 |
|  | B | 124 | 124 |
|  | C | 867 | 917 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 1.03 | 192.64 | 7.0 | 20.6 | F | 112 | 112 |
| B-A | 0.95 | 272.72 | 4.3 | 14.5 | F | 53 | 53 |
| C-AB | 0.22 | 7.84 | 0.5 | 1.4 | A | 112 | 112 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 1040 | 1040 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 136 | 136 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 953 | 953 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 101 | 25 | 424 | 0.238 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 11.113 |  |
| B-A | 48 | 12 | 145 | 0.329 | 47 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 36.246 |  |
| C-AB | 88 | 22 | 548 | 0.160 | 87 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.797 | A |
| C-A | 948 | 237 |  |  | 948 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 123 | 31 |  |  | 123 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 856 | 214 |  |  | 856 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 123 | 31 | 138 | 0.891 | 110 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 100.987 | F |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 62 | 0.951 | 48 | 0.5 | 3.1 | 196.935 | F |
| C-AB | 137 | 34 | 608 | 0.225 | 136 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 7.599 | A |
| C-A | 1132 | 283 |  |  | 1132 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 150 | 38 |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1049 | 262 |  |  | 1049 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 123 | 31 | 120 | 1.029 | 110 | 3.7 | 7.0 | 192.639 | F |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 62 | 0.949 | 54 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 272.725 | F |
| C-AB | 137 | 34 | 610 | 0.224 | 137 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 7.630 |  |
| C-A | 1132 | 283 |  |  | 1132 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 150 | 38 |  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1049 | 262 |  |  | 1049 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 101 | 25 | 402 | 0.250 | 127 | 7.0 | 0.3 | 14.348 |  |
| B-A | 48 | 12 | 145 | 0.331 | 63 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 51.031 | F |
| C-AB | 88 | 22 | 552 | 0.158 | 88 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7.841 |  |
| C-A | 948 | 237 |  |  | 948 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 123 | 31 |  |  | 123 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 856 | 214 |  |  | 856 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.03 | 1.30 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.46 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 1.27 | 1.42 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 3.68 | 0.07 | 1.31 | 9.93 | 14.93 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 3.12 | 0.12 | 1.45 | 7.22 | 9.85 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.93 |  |  | A | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean (Veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q05 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q50 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q90 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q95 } \\ & \text { (Veh) } \end{aligned}$ | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 6.96 | 0.34 | 4.28 | 15.69 | 20.64 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 4.33 | 0.13 | 1.96 | 10.52 | 14.51 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.50 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 1.29 | 1.42 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.98 | 1.44 |  |  | N/A |
| B-A | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 1.30 | 2.46 |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  | N/A |  |
| reaching marker |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D7 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 21.76 | C |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -21 | Stream B-A | 21.76 | C |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Start } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationsh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | $\begin{gathered} \text { ONE } \\ \text { HOUR } \end{gathered}$ | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D6+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1095 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 176 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1156 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To |  |  |  |
|  | A | A | B | C |
|  | B | 59 | 141 | 954 |
|  | C | 1083 | 73 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.66 |
|  | C | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages


Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 824 | 868 |
|  | B | 133 | 133 |
|  | C | 870 | 920 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 984 | 1037 |
|  | B | 158 | 158 |
|  | C | 1039 | 1099 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1206 | 1270 |
|  | B | 194 | 194 |
|  | C | 1273 | 1346 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1206 | 1270 |
|  | B | 194 | 194 |
|  | C | 1273 | 1346 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 984 | 1037 |
|  | B | 158 | 158 |
|  | C | 1039 | 1099 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 824 | 868 |
|  | B | 133 | 133 |
|  | C | 870 | 920 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 1.13 | 287.48 | 11.5 | 29.8 | F | 117 | 117 |
| B-A | 1.08 | 353.41 | 6.6 | 18.5 | F | 59 | 59 |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 7.83 | 0.5 | 1.5 | A | 119 | 119 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 1037 | 1037 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 141 | 141 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 954 | 954 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 105 | 26 | 416 | 0.253 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 11.556 |  |
| B-A | 53 | 13 | 144 | 0.369 | 52 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 38.605 |  |
| C-AB | 93 | 23 | 554 | 0.167 | 92 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.779 |  |
| C-A | 947 | 237 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 127 | 32 |  |  | 127 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 857 | 214 |  |  | 857 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 129 | 32 | 116 | 1.106 | 103 | 0.3 | 6.9 | 170.973 | F |
| B-A | 65 | 16 | 60 | 1.081 | 50 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 240.606 | F |
| C-AB | 146 | 36 | 620 | 0.236 | 145 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 7.562 |  |
| C-A | 1127 | 282 |  |  | 1127 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 156 | 39 |  |  | 156 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1050 | 262 |  |  | 1050 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 129 | 32 | 114 | 1.125 | 110 | 6.9 | 11.5 | 287.481 | F |
| B-A | 65 | 16 | 60 | 1.082 | 56 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 353.412 |  |
| C-AB | 146 | 36 | 622 | 0.235 | 146 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 7.593 | A |
| C-A | 1127 | 282 |  |  | 1127 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 156 | 39 |  |  | 156 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1050 | 262 |  |  | 1050 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Start queue <br> $(\mathrm{Veh})$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 105 | 26 | 375 | 0.280 | 150 | 11.5 | 0.4 | 19.312 | C |
| B-A | 53 | 13 | 142 | 0.375 | 77 | 6.6 | 0.7 | 71.409 | F |
| C-AB | 93 | 23 | 558 | 0.166 | 94 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7.827 |  |
| C-A | 947 | 237 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 127 | 32 |  |  | 127 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 857 | 214 |  |  | 857 |  |  |  |  |

Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 1.11 | 1.31 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 0.55 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 1.45 | 1.56 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 6.88 | 0.49 | 4.53 | 14.81 | 19.12 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 4.28 | 0.31 | 2.69 | 8.94 | 11.59 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.53 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.53 | 0.98 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 11.48 | 1.25 | 8.49 | 23.63 | 29.75 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 6.59 | 0.45 | 4.30 | 14.25 | 18.47 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.54 | 0.04 | 0.45 | 1.34 | 1.46 |  | N/A |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean (Veh) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q05 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q50 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q90 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Q95 } \\ \text { (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Percentile message | Marker message | Probability of reaching or exceeding marker | Probability of exactly reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.40 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 1.43 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 0.66 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 1.25 | 2.94 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

THE FUTURE

## J2 - N15 / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Minor arm visibility to <br> right | Arm B - Minor arm <br> geometry | Visibility to right expected to have two components if the arm has two lanes, or two lanes in a flared section. |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D8-2028 - Theoretical <br> Scenario - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows <br> x 2, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Arm A Direction | Arm B Direction | Arm C Direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 29.72 | D |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | -22 | Stream B-A | 29.72 | D |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ \text { (HH:mm) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1101 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 187 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1160 | 100.000 |

Origin-Destination Data

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.65 |
|  | C | 0.93 | 0.07 | 0.00 |

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 146 | 955 |
|  | B | 65 | 0 | 122 |
|  | C | 1084 | 76 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages


Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.061 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.061 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 829 | 873 |
|  | B | 141 | 141 |
|  | C | 873 | 923 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 990 | 1042 |
|  | B | 168 | 168 |
|  | C | 1043 | 1102 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 1212 | 1276 |
|  | B | 206 | 206 |
|  | C | 1277 | 1350 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 1212 | 1276 |
|  | B | 206 | 206 |
|  | C | 1277 | 1350 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 990 | 1042 |
|  | B | 168 | 168 |
|  | C | 1043 | 1102 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 829 | 873 |
|  | B | 141 | 141 |
|  | C | 873 | 923 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 1.25 | 381.15 | 16.6 | 37.0 | F | 122 | 122 |
| B-A | 1.22 | 443.65 | 9.5 | 22.5 | F | 65 | 65 |
| C-AB | 0.25 | 7.81 | 0.6 | 1.1 | A | 127 | 127 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 1034 | 1034 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 146 | 146 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 955 | 955 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 110 | 27 | 407 | 0.269 | 109 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 12.067 | B |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 143 | 0.410 | 57 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 41.314 | E |
| C-AB | 98 | 24 | 560 | 0.175 | 97 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.763 | A |
| C-A | 945 | 236 |  |  | 945 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 132 | 33 |  |  | 132 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 858 | 215 |  |  | 858 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134 | 34 | 108 | 1.245 | 98 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 223.267 | F |
| B-A | 72 | 18 | 59 | 1.214 | 52 | 0.6 | 5.7 | 291.068 | F |
| C-AB | 155 | 39 | 631 | 0.246 | 154 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 7.529 |  |
| C-A | 1122 | 280 |  |  | 1122 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 161 | 40 |  |  | 161 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1051 | 263 |  |  | 1051 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Junction Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | Start queue (Veh) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134 | 34 | 107 | 1.254 | 105 | 9.3 | 16.6 | 381.151 | F |
| B-A | 72 | 18 | 59 | 1.218 | 57 | 5.7 | 9.5 | 443.645 | F |
| C-AB | 155 | 39 | 633 | 0.245 | 155 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 7.565 | A |
| C-A | 1122 | 280 |  |  | 1122 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 161 | 40 |  |  | 161 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1051 | 263 |  |  | 1051 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 110 | 27 | 331 | 0.332 | 174 | 16.6 | 0.5 | 34.150 |  |
| B-A | 59 | 15 | 137 | 0.427 | 93 | 9.5 | 0.9 | 117.274 | F |
| C-AB | 98 | 24 | 565 | 0.173 | 99 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 7.814 |  |
| C-A | 945 | 236 |  |  | 945 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 132 | 33 |  |  | 132 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 858 | 215 |  |  | 858 |  |  |  |  |

Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.36 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.90 | 1.56 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.38 | 1.43 | 2.28 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 9.34 | 1.49 | 7.22 | 18.02 | 22.26 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| B-A | 5.67 | 0.77 | 4.13 | 10.95 | 13.67 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.57 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.57 | 1.04 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 16.60 | 3.05 | 13.81 | 30.63 | 36.99 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 9.46 | 1.02 | 7.34 | 18.24 | 22.50 |  | N/A |  |  |
| C-AB | 0.59 | 0.05 | 0.47 | 1.09 | 1.09 |  | N/A |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.51 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.51 | 1.32 |  |  | N/A |  |
| B-A | 0.85 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 1.35 | 3.81 |  | N/A |  |  |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 |  | N/A |  |  |

THE FUTURE

## Junctions 10

## PICADY 10 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 10.0.0.1499
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»J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development
Flows x 2, PM

## Summary of junction performance

|  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Set ID | Queue (Veh) | 95\% Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Junction <br> Delay (s) | Junction LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 7.65 | 0.17 | A | 2.88 | A | $258 \%$[Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.50 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.34 | 0.01 | A | 2.00 | A | $900 \%$ |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.0 | 0.5 | 5.74 | 0.01 | A |  |  | [] |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D3 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 7.72 | 0.18 | A | 2.89 | A | $241 \%$[Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.55 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 7.78 | 0.18 | A | 2.92 | A | $239 \text { \% }$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.55 | 0.10 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D5 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 7.86 | 0.19 | A | 2.93 | A | $224 \text { \% }$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.60 | 0.11 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3-Main St / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D6 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 7.91 | 0.19 | A | 2.96 | A | $223 \text { \% }$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.59 | 0.11 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D7 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 7.99 | 0.20 | A | 2.98 | A | $209 \%$[Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.64 | 0.12 | A |  |  |  |
|  | J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | D8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 8.08 | 0.21 | A | 2.99 | A | $197 \text { \% }$ <br> [Stream B-AC] |
| Stream C-AB |  | 0.1 | 0.5 | 6.69 | 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. Junction LOS and Junction Delay are demand-weighted averages. Network Residual Capacity indicates the amount by which network flow could be increased before a user-definable threshold (see Analysis Options) is met.

## File summary

File Description

| Title |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $05 / 05 / 2021$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | AzureAD\MartinHoy |
| 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 | Veh | Veh | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |



The junction diagram reflects the last run of Junctions.

## Analysis Options

| Vehicle <br> length <br> ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Calculate <br> Queue <br> Percentiles | Calculate <br> detailed <br> queueing <br> delay | Show <br> lane <br> queues <br> in feet / <br> metres | Show all <br> PICADY <br> stream <br> intercepts | Calculate <br> residual <br> capacity | Residual <br> capacity <br> criteria <br> type | RFC <br> Threshold | Average <br> Delay <br> threshold <br> (s) | Queue <br> threshold <br> (PCU) | Use iterations <br> with HCM <br> roundabouts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.75 | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Max number of |  |  |  |  |
| iterations for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| roundabouts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 - Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D3 | 2023 - Base + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Growth Factors

| ID | Description | Use TEMPRO | Growth Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2028=+5$ |  | 1.0555 |
| G2 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2038=+15$ |  | 1.1089 |

Growth factors are only active if the Demand Set references them in a Relationship.

Analysis Set Details

| ID | Name | Include in report | Network flow scaling factor (\%) | Network capacity scaling factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1 | J3 - Main St / Bridge St | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 | 100.000 |

## J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Baseline Traffic, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D1-2023 - Baseline <br> Traffic, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |  | 2.88 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 258 | Stream B-AC | 2.88 | A |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Bridge St (south) |  | Major |
| B | Main St |  | Minor |
| C | Bridge St (north) |  | 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 | 8.60 |  |  | 100.5 | $\checkmark$ | 1.00 |

[^3]Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | One lane | 3.72 | 27 | 18 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-A | 531 | 0.086 | 0.217 | 0.136 | 0.310 |
| B-C | 681 | 0.093 | 0.234 | - | - |
| C-B | 632 | 0.217 | 0.217 | - | - |

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 | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) | Results for central <br> hour only | Run <br> automatically |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | $2023-$ Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | $14: 00$ | $15: 30$ | 15 | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 110 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 86 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 144 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ |
|  | A | 0 | 15 | 95 |
|  | B | 35 | 0 | 51 |
|  | C | 90 | 54 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.86 |
|  | B | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.59 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.38 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 83 | 88 |
|  | B | 65 | 65 |
|  | C | 108 | 113 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 99 | 105 |
|  | B | 77 | 77 |
|  | C | 129 | 135 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 121 | 128 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 159 | 165 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 121 | 128 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 159 | 165 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 99 | 105 |
|  | B | 77 | 77 |
|  | C | 129 | 135 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 83 | 88 |
|  | B | 65 | 65 |
|  | C | 108 | 113 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.17 | 7.65 | 0.2 | 0.5 | A | 86 | 86 |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 6.50 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 55 | 55 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 89 | 89 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 15 | 15 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 95 | 95 |  |

Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Junction Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | Start queue (Veh) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 19 | 574 | 0.135 | 77 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.248 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 12 | 616 | 0.080 | 49 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.350 | A |
| C-A | 80 | 20 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 13 | 3 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 85 | 21 |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 565 | 0.168 | 95 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.647 | A |
| C-AB | 60 | 15 | 614 | 0.098 | 60 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.501 | A |
| C-A | 98 | 25 |  |  | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 105 | 26 |  |  | 105 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 565 | 0.168 | 95 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.649 |  |
| C-AB | 60 | 15 | 614 | 0.098 | 60 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.501 | A |
| C-A | 98 | 25 |  |  | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 105 | 26 |  |  | 105 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 19 | 574 | 0.135 | 77 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.256 | A |
| C-AB | 49 | 12 | 616 | 0.080 | 49 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.355 |  |
| C-A | 80 | 20 |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 13 | 3 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 85 | 21 |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.50 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.51 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

THE FUTURE

## J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Development Traffic, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D2 - 2023 - <br> Development Traffic, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 2.00 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 900 |  | 2.00 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 8 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 5 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 9 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | C | 6 | 3 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
|  | B | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
|  | C | 0.67 | 0.33 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 6 | 6 |
|  | B | 4 | 4 |
|  | C | 7 | 7 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 7 | 7 |
|  | B | 4 | 4 |
|  | C | 8 | 8 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 9 | 9 |
|  | B | 6 | 6 |
|  | C | 10 | 10 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 9 | 9 |
|  | B | 6 | 6 |
|  | C | 10 | 10 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 7 | 7 |
|  | B | 4 | 4 |
|  | C | 8 | 8 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 6 | 6 |
|  | B | 4 | 4 |
|  | C | 7 | 7 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.01 | 5.34 | 0.0 | 0.5 | A | 5 | 5 |
| C-AB | 0.01 | 5.74 | 0.0 | 0.5 | A | 3 | 3 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 8 | 8 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 4 | 1 | 680 | 0.007 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.332 |  |
| C-AB | 3 | 0.67 | 631 | 0.004 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.732 | A |
| C-A | 5 | 1 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 7 | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 6 | 1 | 679 | 0.008 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.343 |  |
| C-AB | 3 | 0.83 | 630 | 0.005 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.741 |  |
| C-A | 7 | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 9 | 2 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 6 | 1 | 679 | 0.008 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.343 |  |
| C-AB | 3 | 0.83 | 630 | 0.005 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.741 |  |
| C-A | 7 | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 9 | 2 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 4 | 1 | 680 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.334 |  |
| C-AB | 3 | 0.67 | 631 | 0.004 | 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.732 |  |
| C-A | 5 | 1 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 7 | 2 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.01 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

# J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2023 - Base + Development, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D3-2023-Base + <br> Development, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 2.89 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 241 | Stream B-AC | 2.89 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic <br> profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time <br> segment <br> length (min) | Results for <br> central hour <br> only | Run <br> automatically | Relationship <br> type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 2023 - Base + Development | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | $14: 00$ | $15: 30$ | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1+D2 |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 118 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 91 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 153 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 15 | 103 |
|  | B | 35 | 0 | 56 |
|  | C | 96 | 57 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.62 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | $\mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | $\mathbf{B}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.062 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.063 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 89 | 94 |
|  | B | 69 | 69 |
|  | C | 115 | 120 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 106 | 112 |
|  | B | 82 | 82 |
|  | C | 138 | 143 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 130 | 137 |
|  | B | 100 | 100 |
|  | C | 168 | 175 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 130 | 137 |
|  | B | 100 | 100 |
|  | C | 168 | 175 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 106 | 112 |
|  | B | 82 | 82 |
|  | C | 138 | 143 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 89 | 94 |
|  | B | 69 | 69 |
|  | C | 115 | 120 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max LOS | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 7.72 | 0.2 | 0.9 | A | 91 |  |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 6.55 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 91 |  |
| C-A |  |  |  |  | 58 |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  | 96 |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 96 |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 82 | 20 | 575 | 0.142 | 82 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.291 |  |
| C-AB | 52 | 13 | 615 | 0.084 | 52 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.390 | A |
| C-A | 86 | 21 |  |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 13 | 3 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 93 | 23 |  |  | 93 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 100 | 25 | 566 | 0.177 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.716 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 16 | 613 | 0.104 | 64 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.550 | A |
| C-A | 105 | 26 |  |  | 105 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 113 | 28 |  |  | 113 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 100 | 25 | 566 | 0.177 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.722 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 16 | 613 | 0.104 | 64 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.553 | A |
| C-A | 105 | 26 |  |  | 105 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 113 | 28 |  |  | 113 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 82 | 20 | 575 | 0.142 | 82 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.299 | A |
| C-AB | 52 | 13 | 615 | 0.084 | 52 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.392 | A |
| C-A | 86 | 21 |  |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 13 | 3 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 93 | 23 |  |  | 93 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A |  |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.87 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

# J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D4 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 2.92 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 239 | Stream B-AC | 2.92 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G1 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 116 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 91 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 152 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 16 | 100 |
|  | B | 37 | 0 | 54 |
|  | C | 95 | 57 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.86 |
|  | B | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.59 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.38 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 87 | 92 |
|  | B | 68 | 68 |
|  | C | 114 | 119 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 104 | 110 |
|  | B | 82 | 82 |
|  | C | 137 | 142 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 128 | 135 |
|  | B | 100 | 100 |
|  | C | 167 | 174 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 128 | 135 |
|  | B | 100 | 100 |
|  | C | 167 | 174 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 104 | 110 |
|  | B | 82 | 82 |
|  | C | 137 | 142 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 87 | 92 |
|  | B | 68 | 68 |
|  | C | 114 | 119 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 7.78 | 0.2 | 0.9 | A | 91 | 91 |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 6.55 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 58 | 58 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 94 | 94 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 16 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 82 | 20 | 572 | 0.143 | 81 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.342 |  |
| C-AB | 52 | 13 | 615 | 0.084 | 52 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.387 | A |
| C-A | 85 | 21 |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 | 4 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 90 | 23 |  |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 100 | 25 | 563 | 0.178 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.773 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 16 | 614 | 0.104 | 64 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.547 | A |
| C-A | 103 | 26 |  |  | 103 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 110 | 28 |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 100 | 25 | 563 | 0.178 | 100 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.779 | A |
| C-AB | 64 | 16 | 614 | 0.104 | 64 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.547 | A |
| C-A | 103 | 26 |  |  | 103 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 110 | 28 |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 82 | 20 | 572 | 0.143 | 82 | 0 | 0.2 | 7.354 |  |
| C-AB | 52 | 13 | 616 | 0.084 | 52 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.389 |  |
| C-A | 85 | 21 |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 | 4 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 90 | 23 |  |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.49 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.49 | 0.89 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.09 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

# J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 2.93 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 224 | Stream B-AC | 2.93 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ \text { (HH:mm) } \end{gathered}$ | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D4+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 124 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 96 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 161 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 16 | 108 |
|  | B | 37 | 0 | 59 |
|  | C | 101 | 60 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.61 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.062 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.063 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 93 | 98 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 121 | 126 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 112 | 118 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 145 | 150 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 137 | 144 |
|  | B | 105 | 105 |
|  | C | 177 | 184 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 137 | 144 |
|  | B | 105 | 105 |
|  | C | 177 | 184 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 112 | 118 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 145 | 150 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 93 | 98 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 121 | 126 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 7.86 | 0.2 | 1.1 | A | 96 | 96 |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 6.60 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 61 | 61 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 16 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 108 | 108 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 22 | 573 | 0.150 | 86 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.389 | A |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 615 | 0.089 | 55 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.427 | A |
| C-A | 90 | 23 |  |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 | 4 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 97 | 24 |  |  | 97 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Junction } \\ \text { Arrivals (Veh) } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | Start queue (Veh) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 105 | 26 | 564 | 0.187 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.851 | A |
| C-AB | 67 | 17 | 613 | 0.110 | 67 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.596 | A |
| C-A | 110 | 27 |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 119 | 30 |  |  | 119 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 105 | 26 | 564 | 0.187 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.857 | A |
| C-AB | 67 | 17 | 613 | 0.110 | 67 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.598 | A |
| C-A | 110 | 27 |  |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 17 | 4 |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 119 | 30 |  |  | 119 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 22 | 573 | 0.150 | 86 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.401 |  |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 615 | 0.089 | 55 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.429 | A |
| C-A | 90 | 23 |  |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 | 4 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 97 | 24 |  |  | 97 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.60 | 1.06 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

# J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D6 - 2038 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 <br> Years, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 2.96 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 223 | Stream B-AC | 2.96 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 122 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 95 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 160 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 17 | 105 |
|  | B | 39 | 0 | 57 |
|  | C | 100 | 60 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.86 |
|  | B | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.59 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.38 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 92 | 97 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 120 | 125 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 110 | 116 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 144 | 150 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 134 | 142 |
|  | B | 105 | 105 |
|  | C | 176 | 183 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 134 | 142 |
|  | B | 105 | 105 |
|  | C | 176 | 183 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 110 | 116 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 144 | 150 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 92 | 97 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 120 | 125 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 7.91 | 0.2 | 1.1 | A | 95 | 95 |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 6.59 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 61 | 61 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 99 | 99 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 17 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 105 | 105 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 21 | 570 | 0.151 | 86 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.435 |  |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 615 | 0.089 | 54 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.423 | A |
| C-A | 89 | 22 |  |  | 89 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 95 | 24 |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 105 | 26 | 560 | 0.187 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.902 | A |
| C-AB | 67 | 17 | 613 | 0.110 | 67 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.591 | A |
| C-A | 109 | 27 |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 116 | 29 |  |  | 116 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 105 | 26 | 560 | 0.187 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.908 | A |
| C-AB | 67 | 17 | 613 | 0.110 | 67 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.594 | A |
| C-A | 109 | 27 |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 116 | 29 |  |  | 116 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 21 | 570 | 0.151 | 86 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.448 |  |
| C-AB | 55 | 14 | 615 | 0.089 | 55 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.425 |  |
| C-A | 89 | 22 |  |  | 89 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 95 | 24 |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.61 | 1.07 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

## J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D7-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 2.98 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 209 | Stream B-AC | 2.98 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ (\mathrm{HH}: \mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationsh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | $\begin{gathered} \text { ONE } \\ \text { HOUR } \end{gathered}$ | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D6+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 130 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 100 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 169 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 17 | 113 |
|  | B | 39 | 0 | 62 |
|  | C | 106 | 63 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.87 |
|  | B | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.61 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 6 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.062 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.063 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 98 | 103 |
|  | B | 76 | 76 |
|  | C | 127 | 132 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 117 | 123 |
|  | B | 90 | 90 |
|  | C | 152 | 158 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 143 | 151 |
|  | B | 111 | 111 |
|  | C | 186 | 193 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 143 | 151 |
|  | B | 111 | 111 |
|  | C | 186 | 193 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 117 | 123 |
|  | B | 90 | 90 |
|  | C | 152 | 158 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 98 | 103 |
|  | B | 76 | 76 |
|  | C | 127 | 132 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 7.99 | 0.2 | 1.2 | $A$ | 100 | 100 |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 6.64 | 0.1 | 0.5 | $A$ | 64 | 64 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 105 | 105 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 17 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 113 | 113 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 23 | 571 | 0.158 | 90 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.486 |  |
| C-AB | 57 | 14 | 614 | 0.093 | 57 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.463 | A |
| C-A | 94 | 24 |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 102 | 25 |  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 111 | 28 | 561 | 0.197 | 110 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.983 | A |
| C-AB | 71 | 18 | 613 | 0.116 | 71 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.637 | A |
| C-A | 115 | 29 |  |  | 115 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 125 | 31 |  |  | 125 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 111 | 28 | 561 | 0.197 | 110 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.991 |  |
| C-AB | 71 | 18 | 613 | 0.116 | 71 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.640 |  |
| C-A | 115 | 29 |  |  | 115 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 125 | 31 |  |  | 125 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 23 | 571 | 0.158 | 90 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.496 |  |
| C-AB | 57 | 14 | 614 | 0.093 | 57 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.468 |  |
| C-A | 94 | 24 |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 102 | 25 |  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.78 | 1.16 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

# J3 - Main St / Bridge St - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D8-2028 - Theoretical <br> Scenario - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows <br> x 2, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |  | 2.99 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 197 | Stream B-AC | 2.99 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 138 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 105 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 178 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 17 | 121 |
|  | B | 39 | 0 | 67 |
|  | C | 112 | 66 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.88 |
|  | B | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.63 |
|  | C | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages


Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.058 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.060 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 104 | 109 |
|  | B | 79 | 79 |
|  | C | 134 | 139 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 124 | 130 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 160 | 166 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 152 | 160 |
|  | B | 116 | 116 |
|  | C | 196 | 203 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 152 | 160 |
|  | B | 116 | 116 |
|  | C | 196 | 203 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 124 | 130 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 160 | 166 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 104 | 109 |
|  | B | 79 | 79 |
|  | C | 134 | 139 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 8.08 | 0.3 | 1.2 | A | 105 | 105 |
| C-AB | 0.12 | 6.69 | 0.1 | 0.5 | A | 67 | 67 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 110 | 110 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 17 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 121 | 121 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 572 | 0.166 | 95 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.541 |  |
| C-AB | 60 | 15 | 614 | 0.098 | 60 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.503 | A |
| C-A | 100 | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 109 | 27 |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 116 | 29 | 561 | 0.207 | 116 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.073 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 19 | 612 | 0.121 | 74 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.687 | A |
| C-A | 121 | 30 |  |  | 121 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 134 | 33 |  |  | 134 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 116 | 29 | 561 | 0.207 | 116 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.081 | A |
| C-AB | 74 | 19 | 612 | 0.121 | 74 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.690 | A |
| C-A | 121 | 30 |  |  | 121 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 18 | 5 |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 134 | 33 |  |  | 134 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 572 | 0.166 | 95 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 7.555 |  |
| C-AB | 60 | 15 | 614 | 0.098 | 60 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.508 |  |
| C-A | 100 | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 15 | 4 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 109 | 27 |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.89 | 1.22 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.11 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

## Junctions 10

## PICADY 10 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 10.0.0.1499
© Copyright TRL Software Limited, 2021
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL Software:
+44 (0)1344379777 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: 210809_J4_Main_St_Butcher_St.j10
Path: C:IUsers\MartinHoy\Hoy Dorman\Hoy Dorman - Documents\Civils\2021002_Riverine\Traffic\Modelling Report generation date: 10/08/2021 16:23:52
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Baseline Traffic, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Development Traffic, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Base + Development, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows, PM
"J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows, PM
»J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2, PM

## Summary of junction performance



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. Junction LOS and Junction Delay are demand-weighted averages. Network Residual Capacity indicates the amount by which network flow could be increased before a user-definable threshold (see Analysis Options) is met.

File summary
File Description

| Title |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $05 / 05 / 2021$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | AzureAD\MartinHoy |
| 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 | Veh | Veh | perHour | s | - Min | perMin |



## Analysis Options

| Vehicle <br> length <br> (m) | Calculate <br> Queue <br> Percentiles | Calculate <br> detailed <br> queueing <br> delay | Show <br> lane <br> queues <br> in feet/ <br> metres | Show all <br> PICADY <br> stream <br> intercepts | Calculate <br> residual <br> capacity | Residual <br> capacity <br> criteria <br> type | RFC <br> Threshold | Average <br> Delay <br> threshold <br> (s) | Queue <br> threshold <br> (PCU) | Use iterations <br> with HCM <br> roundabouts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.75 | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | Delay | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |  |
| iterations for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| roundabouts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 - Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D3 | 2023 - Base + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Growth Factors

| ID | Description | Use TEMPRO | Growth Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2028=+5$ |  | 1.0555 |
| G2 | Assessment Year 2023 to $2038=+15$ |  | 1.1089 |

Growth factors are only active if the Demand Set references them in a Relationship.

Analysis Set Details

| ID | Name | Include in report | Network flow scaling factor (\%) | Network capacity scaling factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1 | J4 - Main St / Butcher Street | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 | 100.000 |

THE FUTURE

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Baseline Traffic, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D1-2023 - Baseline <br> Traffic, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 5.05 |  |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 182 | Stream C-AB | 5.05 | A |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Main St (east) |  | Major |
| B | Butcher St |  | Minor |
| C | Main St west |  | 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 | 6.10 |  |  | 127.5 | $\checkmark$ | 1.00 |

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 | 18 | 20 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-A | 527 | 0.096 | 0.242 | 0.152 | 0.345 |
| B-C | 680 | 0.104 | 0.262 | - | - |
| C-B | 648 | 0.250 | 0.250 | - | - |

[^4]
## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) | Results for central <br> hour only | Run <br> automatically |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 - Baseline Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | $14: 00$ | $15: 30$ | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 108 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 96 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 191 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 65 | 43 |
|  | B | 41 | 0 | 55 |
|  | C | 37 | 154 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
|  | C | 0.19 | 0.81 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 81 | 83 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 144 | 146 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 97 | 100 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 172 | 174 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 119 | 122 |
|  | B | 106 | 106 |
|  | C | 210 | 213 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 119 | 122 |
|  | B | 106 | 106 |
|  | C | 210 | 213 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 97 | 100 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 172 | 174 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 81 | 83 |
|  | B | 72 | 72 |
|  | C | 144 | 146 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 8.19 | 0.2 | 1.1 | A | 96 | 96 |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 7.90 | 0.4 | 1.5 | A | 156 | 156 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 35 | 35 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 65 | 65 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 43 | 43 |

Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 22 | 556 | 0.155 | 86 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 7.652 |  |
| C-AB | 140 | 35 | 630 | 0.222 | 140 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.337 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 8 |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 58 | 15 |  |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 106 | 26 | 545 | 0.194 | 105 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 8.185 |  |
| C-AB | 173 | 43 | 628 | 0.275 | 172 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 7.884 | A |
| C-A | 38 | 9 |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 72 | 18 |  |  | 72 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 47 | 12 |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 106 | 26 | 545 | 0.194 | 106 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 8.194 |  |
| C-AB | 173 | 43 | 628 | 0.275 | 173 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.897 | A |
| C-A | 38 | 9 |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 72 | 18 |  |  | 72 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 47 | 12 |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 86 | 22 | 556 | 0.155 | 87 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.664 | A |
| C-AB | 140 | 35 | 630 | 0.222 | 140 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.354 |  |
| C-A | 32 | 8 |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 58 | 15 |  |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.18 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.74 | 1.13 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.26 | 1.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Development Traffic, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D2 - 2023 - <br> Development Traffic, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 0.00 | F |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 900 |  | 0.00 | F |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2023 - Development Traffic | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 3 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |  |
|  | A | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
|  | B | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | C | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.67 | 0.33 |
|  | B | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | C | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 0 | 0 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | $\sim 1$ | A | 0 | 0 |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | $\sim 1$ | A | 0 | 0 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0 | 0 | 594 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1296 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0 | 0 | 594 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1296 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0 | 0 | 594 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 |  |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1296 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 |  |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0 | 0 | 594 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 |  |
| C-AB | 0 | 0 | 1296 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 |  |
| C-A | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2023 - Base + Development, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D3-2023-Base + <br> Development, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 5.09 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 179 | Stream B-AC | 5.09 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic <br> profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time <br> segment <br> length (min) | Results for <br> central hour <br> only | Run <br> automatically | Relationship <br> type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 2023 - Base + Development | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | $14: 00$ | $15: 30$ | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1+D2 |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 111 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 100 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 192 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 67 | 44 |
|  | B | 45 | 0 | 55 |
|  | C | 38 | 154 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
|  | C | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | $\mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | $\mathbf{B}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.065 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.065 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 84 | 86 |
|  | B | 75 | 75 |
|  | C | 145 | 146 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 100 | 102 |
|  | B | 90 | 90 |
|  | C | 173 | 175 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 122 | 125 |
|  | B | 110 | 110 |
|  | C | 211 | 214 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 122 | 125 |
|  | B | 110 | 110 |
|  | C | 211 | 214 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 100 | 102 |
|  | B | 90 | 90 |
|  | C | 173 | 175 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 84 | 86 |
|  | B | 75 | 75 |
|  | C | 145 | 146 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max LOS | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 8.39 | 0.3 | 1.2 | A | 100 |  |
| C-AB | 0.28 | 7.91 | 0.4 | 1.5 | A | 100 |  |
| C-A |  |  |  |  | 156 | 36 |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 67 |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 22 | 551 | 0.163 | 90 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.798 |  |
| C-AB | 140 | 35 | 630 | 0.223 | 140 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.345 | A |
| C-A | 32 | 8 |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 60 | 15 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 40 | 10 |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 110 | 28 | 539 | 0.204 | 110 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.377 | A |
| C-AB | 173 | 43 | 628 | 0.275 | 172 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 7.895 | A |
| C-A | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 74 | 18 |  |  | 74 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 48 | 12 |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 110 | 28 | 539 | 0.204 | 110 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.386 | A |
| C-AB | 173 | 43 | 628 | 0.275 | 173 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.909 | A |
| C-A | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 74 | 18 |  |  | 74 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 48 | 12 |  |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 22 | 551 | 0.163 | 90 | 0 | 0.3 | 7.813 |  |
| C-AB | 140 | 35 | 630 | 0.222 | 140 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.365 |  |
| C-A | 32 | 8 |  |  | 32 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 60 | 15 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 40 | 10 |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A |  |
| C-AB | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A |  |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.87 | 1.21 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.26 | 1.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |  | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

THE FUTURE

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D4 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows +5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 5.17 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 167 | Stream C-AB | 5.17 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G1 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 114 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 101 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 202 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 69 | 45 |
|  | B | 43 | 0 | 58 |
|  | C | 39 | 163 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
|  | C | 0.19 | 0.81 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 86 | 88 |
|  | B | 76 | 76 |
|  | C | 152 | 154 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 102 | 105 |
|  | B | 91 | 91 |
|  | C | 181 | 184 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 126 | 129 |
|  | B | 112 | 112 |
|  | C | 222 | 225 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 126 | 129 |
|  | B | 112 | 112 |
|  | C | 222 | 225 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 102 | 105 |
|  | B | 91 | 91 |
|  | C | 181 | 184 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 86 | 88 |
|  | B | 76 | 76 |
|  | C | 152 | 154 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 8.37 | 0.3 | 1.2 | A | 101 | 101 |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 8.08 | 0.4 | 1.7 | A | 165 | 165 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 36 | 36 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 69 | 69 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 91 | 23 | 554 | 0.165 | 91 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.777 | A |
| C-AB | 148 | 37 | 630 | 0.235 | 148 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.466 | A |
| C-A | 33 | 8 |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 62 | 15 |  |  | 62 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 41 | 10 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 112 | 28 | 542 | 0.206 | 111 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.364 |  |
| C-AB | 183 | 46 | 628 | 0.291 | 182 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.066 | A |
| C-A | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 76 | 19 |  |  | 76 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 50 | 12 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 112 | 28 | 541 | 0.206 | 112 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.373 | A |
| C-AB | 183 | 46 | 628 | 0.291 | 183 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 8.082 |  |
| C-A | 39 | 10 |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 76 | 19 |  |  | 76 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 50 | 12 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 91 | 23 | 554 | 0.165 | 91 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 7.792 |  |
| C-AB | 148 | 37 | 630 | 0.235 | 148 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.488 |  |
| C-A | 33 | 8 |  |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 62 | 15 |  |  | 62 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 41 | 10 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.19 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.26 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.89 | 1.22 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.31 | 1.73 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D5 - 2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 5.21 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 164 | Stream B-AC | 5.21 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ (\mathrm{HH}: \mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationshi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 5 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D4+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 117 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 105 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 203 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 71 | 46 |
|  | B | 47 | 0 | 58 |
|  | C | 40 | 163 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
|  | C | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.066 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.065 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 88 | 90 |
|  | B | 79 | 79 |
|  | C | 153 | 154 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 105 | 108 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 182 | 184 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 129 | 132 |
|  | B | 116 | 116 |
|  | C | 223 | 226 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 129 | 132 |
|  | B | 116 | 116 |
|  | C | 223 | 226 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 105 | 108 |
|  | B | 95 | 95 |
|  | C | 182 | 184 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 88 | 90 |
|  | B | 79 | 79 |
|  | C | 153 | 154 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.22 | 8.57 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A | 105 | 105 |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 8.09 | 0.4 | 1.7 | A | 165 | 165 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 37 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 71 | 71 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 46 | 46 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 549 | 0.173 | 95 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.928 | A |
| C-AB | 148 | 37 | 629 | 0.235 | 148 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 7.474 | A |
| C-A | 34 | 9 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 63 | 16 |  |  | 63 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 42 | 10 |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 116 | 29 | 536 | 0.216 | 116 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.558 | A |
| C-AB | 183 | 46 | 627 | 0.291 | 182 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.077 | A |
| C-A | 40 | 10 |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 78 | 19 |  |  | 78 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 | 13 |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 116 | 29 | 536 | 0.216 | 116 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.570 | A |
| C-AB | 183 | 46 | 628 | 0.291 | 183 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 8.093 | A |
| C-A | 40 | 10 |  |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 78 | 19 |  |  | 78 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 | 13 |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 24 | 548 | 0.173 | 95 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 7.942 |  |
| C-AB | 148 | 37 | 629 | 0.235 | 149 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.493 |  |
| C-A | 34 | 9 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 63 | 16 |  |  | 63 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 42 | 10 |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.41 | 0.03 | 0.25 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.27 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.97 | 1.29 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.42 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.31 | 1.73 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D6-2038 - Factored <br> Base Flows +15 <br> Years, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows +5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |

## 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 |  | 5.29 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 154 | Stream C-AB | 5.29 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationship |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2038 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years | PM | $\begin{gathered} \text { ONE } \\ \text { HOUR } \end{gathered}$ | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D1*G2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 120 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 106 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 212 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 72 | 48 |
|  | B | 45 | 0 | 61 |
|  | C | 41 | 171 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
|  | C | 0.19 | 0.81 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.067 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.067 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 90 | 93 |
|  | B | 80 | 80 |
|  | C | 159 | 162 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 108 | 111 |
|  | B | 96 | 96 |
|  | C | 190 | 193 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 132 | 135 |
|  | B | 117 | 117 |
|  | C | 233 | 236 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 132 | 135 |
|  | B | 117 | 117 |
|  | C | 233 | 236 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 108 | 111 |
|  | B | 96 | 96 |
|  | C | 190 | 193 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 90 | 93 |
|  | B | 80 | 80 |
|  | C | 159 | 162 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.22 | 8.55 | 0.3 | 1.3 | A | 106 | 106 |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 8.27 | 0.4 | 1.9 | A | 174 | 174 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 38 | 38 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 72 | 72 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 48 | 48 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 96 | 24 | 551 | 0.174 | 96 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.904 | A |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 629 | 0.248 | 155 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7.595 | A |
| C-A | 35 | 9 |  |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 65 | 16 |  |  | 65 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 43 | 11 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 29 | 538 | 0.218 | 117 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.541 |  |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 628 | 0.306 | 192 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.249 | A |
| C-A | 41 | 10 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 79 | 20 |  |  | 79 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 52 | 13 |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> (Veh) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 29 | 538 | 0.218 | 117 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.553 |  |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 628 | 0.306 | 192 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 8.265 | A |
| C-A | 41 | 10 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 79 | 20 |  |  | 79 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 52 | 13 |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 96 | 24 | 551 | 0.174 | 96 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 7.920 | A |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 629 | 0.247 | 156 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.616 | A |
| C-A | 35 | 9 |  |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 65 | 16 |  |  | 65 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 43 | 11 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.98 | 1.29 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.34 | 1.92 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.21 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D7-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 5.33 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 152 | Stream B-AC | 5.33 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Start } \\ \text { time } \\ \text { (HH:mm) } \end{gathered}$ | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | Relationship type | Relationsh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2028 - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | Simple | D6+D2 |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 123 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 110 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 213 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 74 | 49 |
|  | B | 49 | 0 | 61 |
|  | C | 42 | 171 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
|  | C | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C | 7 | 0 | 0 |

Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.066 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.065 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 92 | 95 |
|  | B | 83 | 83 |
|  | C | 160 | 162 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 110 | 113 |
|  | B | 99 | 99 |
|  | C | 191 | 194 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 135 | 139 |
|  | B | 122 | 122 |
|  | C | 234 | 237 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 135 | 139 |
|  | B | 122 | 122 |
|  | C | 234 | 237 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 110 | 113 |
|  | B | 99 | 99 |
|  | C | 191 | 194 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 92 | 95 |
|  | B | 83 | 83 |
|  | C | 160 | 162 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 8.76 | 0.3 | 1.4 | A | 110 | 110 |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 8.28 | 0.4 | 1.9 | A | 174 | 174 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 39 | 39 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 74 | 74 |
| AC |  |  |  |  |  | 49 | 49 |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 99 | 25 | 546 | 0.182 | 99 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 8.051 | A |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 629 | 0.248 | 156 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7.603 | A |
| C-A | 35 | 9 |  |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 67 | 17 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 44 | 11 |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 122 | 30 | 533 | 0.228 | 121 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.741 |  |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 627 | 0.307 | 192 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.260 | A |
| C-A | 42 | 10 |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 82 | 20 |  |  | 82 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 54 | 13 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 122 | 30 | 533 | 0.228 | 122 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.756 | A |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 627 | 0.307 | 192 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 8.278 | A |
| C-A | 42 | 10 |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 82 | 20 |  |  | 82 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 54 | 13 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 99 | 25 | 546 | 0.182 | 100 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 8.070 | A |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 629 | 0.248 | 156 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.624 | A |
| C-A | 35 | 9 |  |  | 35 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 67 | 17 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 44 | 11 |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.29 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.05 | 1.36 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.34 | 1.93 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

# J4 - Main St / Butcher Street - 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Demand Sets | D8-2028 - Theoretical <br> Scenario - Factored <br> Base Flows + 15 Years <br> + Development Flows <br> x 2, PM | Time results are shown for central hour only. (Model is run for a 90 minute period.) |
| Warning | Demand Set <br> Relationship | D5-2028 - Factored <br> Base Flows + 5 Years <br> + Development Flows, <br> PM | Demand Set relationships are chained. This may slow down the file. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | Two-way | Two-way |  | 5.37 | A |

## Junction Network

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold | Network delay (s) | Network LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 144 | Stream B-AC | 5.37 | A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time <br> Period <br> name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finish } \\ & \text { time } \\ & \text { (HH:mm) } \end{aligned}$ | Time segment length (min) | Results for central hour only | Run automatically | R |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2028 - Theoretical Scenario - Factored Base Flows + 15 Years + Development Flows x 2 | PM | ONE <br> HOUR | 14:00 | 15:30 | 15 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |


| Vehicle mix varies over turn | Vehicle mix varies over entry | Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Profile type | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 126 | 100.000 |
| B |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 114 | 100.000 |
| C |  | ONE HOUR | $\checkmark$ | 214 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0 | 76 | 50 |
|  | B | 53 | 0 | 61 |
|  | C | 43 | 171 | 0 |

Proportions

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.40 |
|  | B | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.53 |
|  | C | 0.20 | 0.80 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages


Average PCU Per Veh

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.064 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.064 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

## Detailed Demand Data

## Demand for each time segment

| Time Segment | Arm | Demand (Veh/hr) | Demand in PCU (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:00-14:15 | A | 95 | 97 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 161 | 163 |
| 14:15-14:30 | A | 113 | 116 |
|  | B | 103 | 103 |
|  | C | 192 | 195 |
| 14:30-14:45 | A | 138 | 142 |
|  | B | 126 | 126 |
|  | C | 235 | 238 |
| 14:45-15:00 | A | 138 | 142 |
|  | B | 126 | 126 |
|  | C | 235 | 238 |
| 15:00-15:15 | A | 113 | 116 |
|  | B | 103 | 103 |
|  | C | 192 | 195 |
| 15:15-15:30 | A | 95 | 97 |
|  | B | 86 | 86 |
|  | C | 161 | 163 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max 95th <br> percentile Queue <br> (Veh) | Max Los | Average Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Total Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 8.96 | 0.3 | 1.4 | A | 114 | 114 |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 8.29 | 0.5 | 1.9 | A | 174 | 174 |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 40 |
| AB |  |  |  |  |  | 76 | 76 |
| AC |  |  |  |  | 50 | 50 |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

14:15-14:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 103 | 26 | 541 | 0.190 | 103 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 8.201 |  |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 628 | 0.248 | 156 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7.611 | A |
| C-A | 36 | 9 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 68 | 17 |  |  | 68 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 45 | 11 |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 126 | 32 | 528 | 0.239 | 126 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 8.936 | A |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 627 | 0.307 | 192 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 8.271 | A |
| C-A | 43 | 11 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 84 | 21 |  |  | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 55 | 14 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |

14:45-15:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 126 | 32 | 528 | 0.239 | 126 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 8.959 | A |
| C-AB | 192 | 48 | 627 | 0.307 | 192 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 8.288 | A |
| C-A | 43 | 11 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 84 | 21 |  |  | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 55 | 14 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |  |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Junction <br> Arrivals (Veh) | Capacity <br> $($ Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh $/ \mathbf{h r})$ | Start queue <br> $($ Veh $)$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 103 | 26 | 541 | 0.190 | 103 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 8.223 |  |
| C-AB | 156 | 39 | 629 | 0.248 | 156 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 7.635 |  |
| C-A | 36 | 9 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 68 | 17 |  |  | 68 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 45 | 11 |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |

## Queue Variation Results for each time segment

## 14:15-14:30

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.23 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.23 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

14:30-14:45

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |  | N/A | N/A |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.46 | 0.48 |  |  | N/A | N/A |

## 14:45-15:00

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.10 | 1.42 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.31 | 1.34 | 1.93 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

15:00-15:15

| Stream | Mean <br> (Veh) | Q05 <br> (Veh) | Q50 <br> (Veh) | Q90 <br> (Veh) | Q95 <br> (Veh) | Percentile <br> message | Marker <br> message | Probability of reaching or <br> exceeding marker | Probability of exactly <br> reaching marker |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.24 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.34 |  |  | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## HoyDorman

## Appendix E: Site Location Plan



## HoyDorman

Appendix F: Indictive Construction Phase Programme


## HoyDorman

## Appendix G: Cut Fill - Indictive Volumes / Areas




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Shared Spaces Capital Development - 2nd Call Application, Economic Appraisal, April 2019 (Draft Final Report)
    Page $10 \mid 66$

[^1]:    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. Junction LOS and Junction Delay are demand-weighted averages. Network Residual Capacity indicates the amount by which network flow could be increased before a user-definable threshold (see Analysis Options) is met.

[^2]:    Origin-Destination Data

[^3]:    Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

[^4]:    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.

