LPA Ref: P/19/0460/OA
JUNE 2019 | AJ/LB/MH | BRS.4989

OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 125 DWELLINGS, OPEN SPACE, VEHICULAR ACCESS POINT FROM NEWGATE LANE AND ASSOCIATED AND ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE, WITH ALL MATTERS EXCEPT ACCESS TO BE RESERVED

TRANSPORT TECHNICAL NOTE – NEWGATE LANE AND NEWGATE LANE EAST JUNCTION

LAND TO THE NORTH OF GOSPORT ROAD, FAREHAM

ON BEHALF OF BARGATE HOMES LTD

Pegasus Group

First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL

T 01454 625945 | **F** 01454 618074 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Peterborough

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS

©Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited

CONTENTS:

Page No:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION MODELLING	3
3.	HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MODELLING SCENARIO	7
4.	MODIFICATIONS TO METHODOLOGY, FLOWS AND DISRIBUTION	11
5.	MODIFICATIONS TO JUNCTION	14
6.	REVISED MODELLING	16
7.	CONCLUSION	21

	PREPARED BY	CHECKED BY	APPROVED FOR ISSUE
NAME	Lauren Burnley & Matthew Haywood	Anthony Jones	Anthony Jones
SIGNATURE	L Burnley		
DATE	June 2019	June 2019	June 2019

FIGURES:

FIGURE 1:	PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION DESIGN
FIGURE 2:	REVISED JUNCTION DESIGN

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 1:	HIGHWAYS CONSULTEE COMMENTS
APPENDIX 2:	MEETING NOTES (24TH APRIL 2019)
APPENDIX 3:	EMAIL CHAIN WITH HCC HIGHWAYS OFFICER REGARDING GROWTH RATES AND DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION
APPENDIX 4:	AMENDED DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION FLOWS
APPENDIX 5:	PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION REPORTS
APPENDIX 6:	HCC AMENDMENT JUNCTION REPORTS
APPENDIX 7:	AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS TRICS OUTPUT
APPENDIX 8:	AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE FLOWS
APPENDIX 9:	AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE AND TRAVEL PLAN FLOWS
APPENDIX 10:	REVISED JUNCTION REPORTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Technical Note (TN) has been prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Bargate Homes to support an outline planning application (ref: P/19/0460/OA) for a total of 125 dwellings (of which 40% will comprise affordable housing) on land at Newgate Lane, Fareham. Access is proposed via a new priority tee junction at Newgate Lane (historic alignment).

1.2 This TN considers the issues raised by the highway authority at Hampshire County Council (HCC) in its consultee response to outline planning application P/19/0460/OA dated 23rd May 2019, appended to this TN at **Appendix 1**.

APPENDIX 1 – HIGHWAYS CONSULTEE COMMENTS

1.3 It has also been produced further to a meeting held between HCC Highways and Pegasus Group on 24th April 2019, of which the agreed meeting notes are included at **Appendix 2**. The meeting was held to discuss the highways and transportation issues associated with the adjacent proposed development (ref: P/18/1118/OA), of which are generally considered to be also applicable to this development.

APPENDIX 2 – MEETING NOTES (24TH APRIL 2019)

1.4 It was agreed at the meeting held with HCC Highways that, at present, the most suitable junction option to progress at the Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East is the signalised design. Although, the left turn out only option considered in the Transport Assessment (TA) has not been dismissed totally. At the time of writing the existing submission, the outcome of the Stubbington Bypass was not determined and therefore both scenarios of with and without the bypass were assessed as DS2 and DS1 respectively. Since the submission of the TA, the Secretary of State for Transport has confirmed the Inspector's recommendation to the outcome of the Public Inquiry, and the Stubbington Bypass is now considered committed development.

1.5 Although this TN assesses both the DS1 and DS2 scenarios, it is considered that the DS2 results should be afforded more weight as the Stubbington Bypass is likely to be implemented prior to the site being constructed, given that the current application is for outline permission and a reserved matters application is yet to be submitted.

1.6 An outline planning application (ref: P18/1118/OA) was submitted by Fareham Land LP for the proposed residential development for the land to the immediate

south of the planning application site for 75 dwellings. A consultation response to this planning application was issued by the highway authority on the 11th April 2019. The matters included are the same as those issued for the Fareham Land LP planning application.

1.7 This TN considers the cumulative traffic impact of the development of both parcels of land for a total of 200 dwellings and addresses the following issues in turn:

i. Proposed junction modelling with consideration to comments made by HCC in its consultation response dated 23rd May 2019;

ii. Proportion of traffic assignment to the proposed northbound merger lanes;

iii. Amendments to junction design to increase the efficacy of its operation; and

iv. Amendments to the forecast trip generation to allow for a more representative traffic forecast with consideration to the housing tenure type and also the targets set out in the Travel Plan.

1.8 This TN concludes that a safe and operational signalised junction can be provided at Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East for the DS2 scenario to accommodate the cumulative traffic impact of 200 dwellings associated with the planning applications P/18/1118/OA and P19/0460/OA.

2. PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION MODELLING

2.1 The proposed methodology informing the junction modelling below is included within the associated TA at **Chapter 11**.

2.2 LinSig (version 3.2) has been used to model improvements to the Newgate Lane and Newgate Lane East junction. The proposed signalised junction, including phasing and staging, is illustrated at **Figure 1**.

FIGURE 1 – PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION DESIGN

2.3 Further to comments provided by the highway authority in its consultation response dated 23rd May 2019, the vehicle traffic flow numbers used within the model have been converted to PCUs and our workings have been provided to HCC for review on the 29th May 2019. No response has yet been received to date. It is assumed for the purpose of this TN that the workings provided are acceptable.

Revised Growth Rates and Committed Development

2.4 Following the meeting held with HCC Highways on 24th April 2019, a subsequent email was sent by Pegasus Group to confirm the required changes to the TEMPro growth rates to account for the Daedalus committed development. The relevant emails are included at **Appendix 3**.

APPENDIX 3 – EMAIL CHAIN WITH HCC HIGHWAYS OFFICER REGARDING GROWTH RATES AND DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION

2.5 The Daedalus committed development has subsequently been removed from the growth rates previously used and assigned to the network manually.

2.6 It was agreed by HCC Highways at **Appendix 3** that although the Daedalus TA suggests that Fareham will have 902 jobs and 0 households and Gosport 3206 jobs and 200 households, it is most appropriate to only apply the Fareham rates to the TEMPro growth rate. This methodology provides the most representative growth rate.

2.7 Subsequent to the above, the Fareham jobs and households have been removed to provide a revised growth rate which allows for the Daedalus traffic to be manually assigned to the network. The amended growth rates are as below, these have been applied to all scenarios included within this TN.

i. 2024 AM – 1.0333; and

ii. 2024 PM – 1.0348.

Daedalus Committed Development Distribution

2.8 As per the advice detailed at **Appendix 3**, the traffic flow distribution of the Daedalus development was extracted from the associated TA and manually assigned to the existing network.

2.9 Firstly, this has been done with consideration to the TA that supported the Daedalus planning application (ref: 11/00282/OUT). However, this data only showed traffic associated with the Daedalus committed development up to the Peel Common Roundabout as that was the limit of the assessment for that planning application.

2.10 For the purposes of this TN and updated modelling, the Daedalus committed traffic travelling northbound on the Peel Common Roundabout on the recently opened Newgate Lane Bypass to the additional junctions upstream have been assigned on a pro-rata turning count basis.

2.11 The amended flows accounting for the Daedalus committed development are included at **Appendix 4**.

APPENDIX 4 – AMENDED DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION FLOWS

Proposed Signalised Junction Design at Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East

2.12 The proposed signalised junction design set out in the previously submitted TA that was considered by the highway authority in its consultation response, and shown at **Figure 1** of this TN, provides for widening the Newgate Lane Southern Relief Road (NLSRR) to provide 2 lanes northbound, 1 through lane southbound and a dedicated right-turn lane for traffic entering into Newgate Lane (minor arm). The outside lane heading northbound on the Newgate Lane bypass before the signal stop lines was proposed to be 60 metres in length on the approach and 71 metres in length exiting the junction.

2.13 Dedicated left and right turn lanes were also proposed on the Old Newgate Lane minor arm, comprising a 30 metre flare at the left turn with a stacking length of 16 metres.

2.14 The scheme currently does not allow for any dedicated controlled pedestrian crossing facilities. However, the layout of the signalised junction does allow for any potential allocated site located to the east to improve the junction to provide dedicated controlled pedestrian crossing facilities, as appropriate.

Updated Modelling and Results of the Proposed Signalised Improved to the Newgate Lane Bypass / Old Newgate Lane Priority Right Turn Lane Junction

2.15 The results of the updated modelling of this scenario to account for amended the traffic flows from vehicles to PCUs are included below at **Table 1**.

2.16 **Table 1** also demonstrates lane 2/1 allocations varying from 50% / 50% - 90% / 10%. Only 50% / 50% lane allocation results were submitted as part of the TA reviewed by the highway authority.

Table 1 – Updated Modelling Results - PCUs

Scenario	Split on NGLRR s inside lane (%)	Split on NGLRR s outside lane (%)	Original model PRC (%)	Delay (pcuHr)
2024 AM DS1	50	50	-6.4	20.2
	60	40	-13	42.9
	70	30	-18.3	78.25
	80	20	-22.9	109.78
	90	10	-26.9	135.99
2024 PM DS1	50	50	-4.1	14.31
	60	40	-4.1	14.5
	70	30	-4.1	14.7
	80	20	-4.1	15.01
	90	10	-4.1	15.36
2024 AM DS2	50	50	-6.6	20.4
	60	40	-13.2	44.01
	70	30	-18.5	79.4
	80	20	-23.1	110.93
	90	10	-27	137.13
2024 PM DS2	50	50	44.5	6.69
	60	40	44.5	6.85
	70	30	39.5	7.08
	80	20	36.1	7.36
	90	10	35.6	7.67

2.17 The results at **Table 1** demonstrate that the proposed signalised junction is not forecast to operate efficiently for any of the lane distribution percentages in this scenario, with the exception of 2024 PM DS2 for all lane splits where the junction is forecast to operate significantly within capacity. The junction result reports are included at **Appendix 5**.

APPENDIX 5 – PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION REPORTS

3. HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL MODELLING SCENARIO

HCC Comment

3.1 Further to the receipt of the highway authority's consultation response and the meeting held with HCC on 24th April 2019 (**Appendices 1 & 2**), the junction methodology used in LinSig has also been amended to take into consideration the suggestions below for the proposed signalised junction design proposed in the TA considered by the highway authority and included at **Figure 1** of this TN.

Methodology

i. It is noted that the traffic flows have been inputted as vehicles and not PCU's (addressed in **paragraph 2.3**);

ii. The base flows appear correct; however, the other scenarios do not appear to align with the provided traffic flow diagrams;

Modelling

iii. Lane 1/2 (Newgate Lane northbound offside lane)

- Reduce the actual use of the flared lane to 1 PCU per cycle to provide a realistic usage reflecting the short flare and merge lengths;

- Lock the traffic assignment on the Newgate Lane northbound approach to 90% nearside lane and 10% offside lane;

iv. Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – Physically the flare lane is no more than 1 or 2 PCU long and the flare length should be reduced accordingly;

v. Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – the saturation flow does not include the turning radius for this movement. This should be included in the saturation flow measurements;

vi. The following intergreens require changing;

- Phase A to D intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds as modelled;

- Phase C to A intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds to match that for phase C to B intergreen; and

- Phase D to C intergreen should be 6 seconds to match that for the phase B to C intergreen.

Modelling

3.2 Each of the above points have been applied to the model, the results of which are below at **Table 2**.

3.3 However, it should be noted that Pegasus Group does not agree with the assumptions that 90% of traffic will use the nearside lane and that 10% will only use the outside lane on the northbound approach lanes to the junction. It is considered that the vehicle proportions using the lanes will vary depending on the phasing at the junction. For example, it is considered that there will be a much more even split of vehicles using the lanes when the northbound approach is subject to a red light phase. Also, it is considered that there will be a more even split of traffic using the lanes should slower and more cumbersome vehicles be using the nearside lane holding up smaller vehicles, who would seek to overtake these vehicles.

3.4 For the purpose of this assessment the lane percentage split has been analysed from 50% / 50% - 90% / 10% to demonstrate the PRC and delay for each. The results are shown below at **Table 2** and the junction result reports are included at **Appendix 6**.

APPENDIX 6 – HCC AMENDMENTS JUNCTION REPORTS

Table 2 – Hampshire County Council Modelling Scenario

Scenario	**Split on NGLRR s inside lane (%)**	**Split on NGLRR s outside lane (%)**	**HCC amended model PRC (%)**	**Delay (pcuHr)**
2024 AM DS1	50	50	-24.6	120.64
	60	40	-26.1	130.99
	70	30	-27.5	139.99
	80	20	-28.8	148.36
	90	10	-30	155.79
2024 PM DS1	50	50	-4.1	15.21
	60	40	-4.1	15.36
	70	30	-4.1	15.46
	80	20	-4.1	15.59
	90	10	-4.1	15.72
2024 AM DS2	50	50	-24.7	121.72
	60	40	-26.3	132.37
	70	30	-27.7	141.12
	80	20	-29	149.48
	90	10	-30.2	156.91
2024 PM DS2	50	50	35.6	7.53
	60	40	34	7.65
	70	30	32.7	7.76
	80	20	31.5	7.88
	90	10	30.3	8

3.5 **Table 2** demonstrates that when the amendments suggested by HCC are applied to the methodology and modelling, the only scenario for which the junction operates efficiently is 2024 PM DS2, as per the results in **Table 1**.

3.6 On further interrogation of the results, in particular the DS2 scenarios, it is considered that the AM peak does not operate efficiently due to the demand of traffic travelling northbound. The modelling shows that this lane is not afforded enough green phase time within the cycle to accommodate the number of vehicles travelling northbound. This is because the current staging sequence physically stops northbound traffic to allow vehicles seeking to turn right into Old Newgate to do so unopposed. This is turn is leading to capacity issues and delay on the Old Newgate Lane minor arm as it is only being allocated a total green time of 7 seconds in the 120 second cycle time.

3.7 As the proposed signalised junction (**Figure 1**) is forecast to operate inefficiently for DS2 AM peak scenarios in particular, the design, proposed stage sequencing the junction has been reviewed and this is considered further in **Section 5** with updated modelling results.

3.8 It should also be noted that the modelling results included at **Tables 1** and **2** are highly robust and represent a scenario where all development traffic is assumed to be generated by privately owned dwellings. The total cumulative quantum of both planning applications is 200 dwellings of which 40% will be affordable housing. **Section 5** has therefore reviewed the trip rates and forecast trip generation.

3.9 Furthermore, no discount has been made to account for the travel plan target of a 10% reduction in vehicle trips. **Section 5** also considers the operation of the proposed signalisation of the Newgate Lane bypass junction with Old Newgate Lane with a reduction in development trips of 10% accounting for the Travel Plan.

4. MODIFICATIONS TO METHODOLOGY, FLOWS AND DISRIBUTION

Traffic Flows

Growth Rates and Daedalus Distribution

4.1 The flows have been updated to reflect the amendments to the growth rate and distribution of Daedalus traffic, these are included at **Appendix 4**.

Affordable and Private Trip Rates

4.2 It is considered that the trip generation and flows previously submitted to support the application were overly robust and accounted for all development traffic to be generated by private units using the trip rates for privately owned houses taken from the Newgate Lane Southern Relief Road (NGLSRR) TA. However, the application proposes 40% affordable housing.

4.3 To provide a more accurate forecast of trip generation to of how the junction could be expected to operate, the forecast development flows have been updated to account for the percentage difference of private and affordable units and the trips associated with them.

4.4 The trip rates for the privately owned houses remain those extracted from the NLSRR TA and are shown below at **Table 3**.

Table 3 – Private Trip Rates – 120 Privately Owned Houses

	AM			PM		
Private	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**
Trip Rate	0.165	0.4	0.565	0.386	0.243	0.629
Trip Gen	20	48	68	46	29	75

4.5 **Table 3** suggests that the proposed private dwellings could be associated with 68 two way vehicle trips in the AM peak and 75 two way vehicle trips in the PM peak.

4.6 In order to establish the number of trips associated with the proposed affordable units, trip rates have been derived from TRICS (version 7.5.1, 2019). TRICS is an industry standard database of trip rates used to quantify the numbers of trips associated with new developments.

4.7 In order to derive a suitable trip rate, the following parameters have been applied:

i. Land use – 03 – Residential;

ii. Category – B – Affordable/Local Authority Houses;

iii. Location – Sites only within England and Wales, excluding Greater London; and

iv. Edge of Town and Suburban Area.

4.8 The full TRICS report is included at **Appendix 7.**

APPENDIX 7 – AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS TRICS OUTPUT

4.9 **Table 4** below summarises the TRICS-derived trips associated with the proposed affordable units.

Table 4 – Affordable Trip Rates – 80 Affordable Homes

	AM			PM		
Affordable	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**
Trip Rate	0.11	0.209	0.319	0.226	0.158	0.384
Trip Gen	9	17	26	18	13	31

4.10 **Table 4** suggests that the proposed affordable dwellings could be associated with 26 two way vehicle trips in the AM peak and 31 two way vehicle trips in the PM peak.

4.11 **Table 5** below comprises the combined private and affordable trip rates extracted from **Tables 3** and **4** which have been inputted into the relevant flow diagrams.

Table 5 – Total Development Trips

	AM			PM		
Total	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**	**Arr**	**Dep**	**2-way**
Trip Gen	29	65	93	64	42	106

4.12 **Table 5** suggests that the proposed development (200 dwellings) will generate circa 93 two way vehicle movements in the AM peak and circa 106 two way vehicle movements in the PM peak.

4.13 The flow diagrams reflecting the above revised trip rates are included at **Appendix 8**.

APPENDIX 8 – AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE FLOWS

Travel Plan Discount

4.14 A discount of 10% has been applied to the development forecast trip numbers to account for the impact of an active Travel Plan associated with the development.

4.15 The flow diagrams accounting for the travel plan discount are included at **Appendix 9**.

APPENDIX 9 – AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE AND TRAVEL PLAN FLOWS

5. MODIFICATIONS TO JUNCTION

5.1 With consideration to the comments provided by HCC, several amendments have been made to the design of the junction which have subsequently affected the model outputs. The revised junction design is illustrated at **Figure 2**.

FIGURE 2 – REVISED JUNCTION DESIGN

5.2 The amendments to the design are set out below.

Arm A (Newgate Lane East Northbound)

Variation in Assignment to Lane 1/2

5.3 As set out in **Section 3**, each flow scenario lane assignment varying from 50% / 50% - 90% / 10% has been modelled.

Lane 1/2 Merge Extended

5.4 To encourage the use of the merge lane, it has been extended to approximately 175 metres which gives further opportunity for drivers to use the lane to overtake any slow moving vehicles. It also provides driver reassurance that there is sufficient length to merge back into lane 2/1.

Lane 1/2 Flare Lane Extended

5.5 To encourage drivers to make use of the merge lane the flare length has been extended to 10 PCUs.

Lane 1/1 Geometry

5.6 Lane 1/1 has been widened to 3.5m wide with a 15m turning radius. This allows for a higher saturation flows and therefore a higher capacity of the lane.

Arm B (Old Newgate Lane)

Lane 2/1 Left Turn Length

5.7 The designated left turn lane has been extended to approximately 30m, therefore allowing for left turners to move more fluidly without being affected by queueing right turners.

Arm C (Newgate Lane East Southbound)

Lane 3/2 Merge Extended

5.8 Lane 3/2 has been extended to allow for a greater proportion of right turners to access the appropriate lane. This therefore prevents right turners being prevented from turning by ongoing traffic queueing.

Lane 3/2 Give Way

5.9 Lane 3/2 has been amended to a give way lane allowing for right turns to take place during the intergreens. This is considered appropriate due to the low number of right turners.

Lane 3/1 Width Increase

5.10 Lane 3/1 has been increased to a width of 4.5m to allow for a higher saturation flow and therefore lane capacity.

Stage Sequence

5.11 Upon further reflection of the volumes of traffic that are forecast to turn right into Old Newgate Lane from the Newgate Lane bypass it is not considered necessary to provide a dedicated right turn green light stage.

5.12 The traffic flow diagrams show that the number of vehicles forecast to perform this manoeuvre in the 2024 DS2 + development scenario morning peak hour is 42 vehicles (one vehicle every 85 seconds) and 51 vehicles in the evening peak hour (one vehicles every 70 seconds). The staging sequence used in the revised LinSig model is shown below.



6. REVISED MODELLING

6.1 The amendments detailed at **Sections 4** and **5** have been applied to the junction design and subsequently inputted to the LinSig (version 3.2) model. The PRC and delay for each of the traffic flow scenarios are detailed below at **Tables 6** and **7**, and **Diagrams 1** and **2**, and the junction report for the affordable/private split and Travel Plan discount is included at **Appendix 10**.

APPENDIX 10 – REVISED JUNCTION REPORTS

Table 6 – Amended Traffic Flow Modelling Results - PRC

Scenario	Split on NGLRR s inside lane (%)	Split on NGLRR s outside lane (%)	Revised model design only PRC (%)	Revised Model & Affordable / Private split PRC (%)	Revised Modelling & Affordable / Private Split & TP – 10 PRC (%)
2024 AM DS1	50	50	47.8	51.2	53
	60	40	41.1	42.7	44.6
	70	30	24	24.1	24.4
	80	20	8.9	9	9.3
	90	10	-2.9	-2.9	-2.7
2024 PM DS1	50	50	1.1	1.5	1.6
	60	40	1.1	1.5	1.6
	70	30	1.1	1.5	1.6
	80	20	1.1	1.5	1.6
	90	10	1.1	1.6	1.6
2024 AM DS2	50	50	63.2	66.7	68.6
	60	40	40.9	42.4	44
	70	30	22.6	23.9	24
	80	20	8.7	8.9	8.9
	90	10	-3.1	-3.1	-3
2024 PM DS2	50	50	53.4	54.5	54.8
	60	40	53.4	54.5	54.8
	70	30	53.4	54.5	54.8
	80	20	53.4	54.5	54.8
	90	10	54.5	54.5	54.8

Diagram 1 –Amended Traffic Flow Modelling Results – PRC - 2024 AM DS1



Diagram 2 – Amended Traffic Flow Modelling Results – PRC - 2024 AM DS2



Table 7 – Amended Traffic Flow Modelling Results – Delay

Scenario	Split on NGLRR s inside lane (%)	Split on NGLRR s outside lane (%)	Revised model design only	Revised Model & Affordable /Private split	Revised Modelling & Affordable /Private Split & TP – 10
2024 AM DS1	50	50	7.84	7.17	6.81
	60	40	8.07	7.46	7.07
	70	30	9.54	8.87	8.52
	80	20	11.49	10.78	10.37
	90	10	15.57	15.57	15.05
2024 PM DS1	50	50	9.5	9.16	9.02
	60	40	9.58	9.22	9.07
	70	30	9.84	9.48	9.33
	80	20	9.93	9.55	9.41
	90	10	9.71	9.71	9.56
2024 AM DS2	50	50	7.47	6.78	6.45
	60	40	7.51	6.84	6.57
	70	30	9.04	8.29	8.02
	80	20	9.93	10.15	9.41
	90	10	9.71	15.04	14.69
2024 PM DS2	50	50	4.92	4.72	4.59
	60	40	4.98	4.77	4.63
	70	30	5.25	5.03	4.89
	80	20	5.32	5.09	4.95
	90	10	5.26	5.26	5.11

6.2 **Tables 6** and **7**, and **Diagrams 1** and **2**, illustrate that the junction generally operates efficiently for each of the scenarios.

6.3 The revised models follow a similar trend to the original and HCC models.

6.4 By using linear interpolation, it can be calculated that the PRC reached 0% (which is an RFC of 0.9) on AM DS1 between 87.54% and 87.75% using the inside lane. Similar results are shown for the AM DS2 scenario, with PRC equalling 0% between 86.34% and 87.48%. This demonstrates that the revised models are exceptionally close to working at the 90% / 10% lane allocation requested by HCC for both the DS1 and DS2 scenarios. It is considered that a 70% / 30% lane allocation would be within the expected range at peak times and that these models demonstrate that the revised junction would work effectively.

6.5 The PM results demonstrate that each model stayed an approximate flat level. This is due to the split of the northbound not having a bearing on how the junction functioned in the PM. The overriding factor is instead the capacity of the southbound inside lane. It is for this reason that the width of the lane was greatly increased in the revised junction arrangement. The DS1 PM scenario had a steady PRC of -4.1% for the original and HCC models, and stayed between 1.1% and 1.6% for the revised models.

6.6 The same trend applied to the DS2 scenario; however, the PRC was at a much higher base level of 30.3% to 44.5% for the original and HCC models, and 53.4% to 54.8% for the revised models. This shows that for the DS2 PM scenario the junction has more than half of the available PRC, meaning that the southbound inside lane size could decrease slightly and the junction would still function well within capacity on the PM peak.

6.7 Whilst the above scenarios do not operate as optimally as the interim scenarios, it is anticipated that the lane usage will fluctuate between 50% / 50% and 90% / 10%. It is therefore considered that the junction will operate efficiently.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 This TN has been prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of Bargate Homes and Sustainable Land Products Ltd to support two outline planning applications (P/18/1118/OA & P/19/0460/OA) for a total of 200 dwellings (of which 40% will comprise affordable housing) on land at Newgate Lane, Fareham.

7.2 This TN concludes that a safe and efficient junction solution can be provided at Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East.

7.3 The assessments carried out show that for the amended methodology and design, whereby private and affordable housing and a travel plan discount has been accounted for, an efficient junction model can be achieved. The view of the Highways Authority and ITS is sought on the acceptability of the junction methodology and design.

FIGURE 1

PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION DESIGN

TITLE: PROPOSED SIGNALISED JUNCTION - OVERVIEW
SCALE: 1:500

TITLE: SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS & SIGNAL PHASING
SCALE: 1:250

Stage Diagram



REV	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION	CHK	APD

First Floor, South Wing
Equinox North
Great Park Road
Almondsbury
Bristol
BS32 4QL

01454 625945
www.pegasusgroup.co.uk
Planning | Design | Environment | Economics

CLIENT: BARGATE HOMES LTD

PROJECT: LAND TO THE NORTH OF GOSPORT RD FAREHAM

TITLE: NLSRR/NEWGATE LANE JUNCTION PLAN SIGNALISED JUNCTION

SCALE @ A1:	CHECKED:	APPROVED:
AS SHOWN	ADS	AJ
CAD FILE:	DESIGN/DRAWN:	DATE:
–	MJB	26/02/19
PROJECT No:	DRAWING No:	REV:
BRS.4989	FIGURE 1	–

Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Copyright Licence number 100042093. Promap. Licence number 100020449. Emapsite Licence number 0100031673. Standard OS licence rights conditions apply. Pegasus accepts no liability for any use of this document other than for its original purpose, or by the original client, or following Pegasus' express agreement to such use. T: 01285 641717 www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

FIGURE 2

REVISED JUNCTION DESIGN

TITLE: PROPOSED SIGNALISED JUNCTION - OVERVIEW
SCALE: 1:500

TITLE: SWEPT PATH ANALYSIS & SIGNAL PHASING
SCALE: 1:250



REV	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION	CHK	APD
A	05/06/19	ADS	AMENDMENTS MADE TO LAYOUT FOLLOWING SUBMSSION	LB	AJ

First Floor, South Wing
Equinox North
Great Park Road
Almondsbury
Bristol
BS32 4QL

01454 625945
www.pegasusgroup.co.uk
Planning | Design | Environment | Economics

CLIENT: BARGATE HOMES LTD

PROJECT: LAND TO THE NORTH OF GOSPORT RD FAREHAM

TITLE: NLSRR/NEWGATE LANE JUNCTION PLAN SIGNALISED JUNCTION

SCALE @ A1:	CHECKED:	APPROVED:
AS SHOWN	ADS	AJ
CAD FILE:	DESIGN DRAWN:	DATE:
–	MJB	26/02/19
PROJECT No:	DRAWING No:	REV:
BRS.4989	FIGURE 2	A

Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Ltd. Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Copyright Licence number 100042093. Promap. Licence number 100020449. Emapsite Licence number 0100031673. Standard OS licence rights conditions apply. Pegasus accepts no liability for any use of this document other than for its original purpose, or by the original client, or following Pegasus' express agreement to such use. T: 01285 641717 www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

APPENDIX 1

HIGHWAYS CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Hampshire County Council

Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Elizabeth II Court West, The Castle
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8UD

Tel: 0300 555 1375 (General Enquiries)
0300 555 1388 (Roads and Transport)
0300 555 1389 (Recycling Waste & Planning)
Textphone 0300 555 1390
Fax 01962 847055

www.hants.gov.uk

Head of Development Planning
Fareham Borough Council
Civic Offices
Civic Way
FAREHAM
Hampshire
PO16 7AZ

Enquiries to	Nick Gammer	*My reference*	6/3/10/224 (APP10135)
Direct Line	01962 846877	*Your reference*	P/19/0460/OA
Date	23rd May 2019	*Email*	nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk

For the Attention of Jean Chambers

Dear Madam

Land at Newgate Lane (South), Fareham – Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and development of up to 125 dwellings, open space, vehicular access point from Newgate Lane and associated and ancillary infrastructure, with all matters except access to be reserved.

Thank you for consultation on the above planning application. An application was submitted in October 2018 for Land at Newgate Lane (North) P/18/1118/OA supported by a Transport Assessment (TA). Initial comments were provided by the highway authority on this application 6th November 2018 and a further Updated TA (Transport Assessment Rev A) was submitted. Further comments requesting additional information and clarification were provided by the highway authority 11th April 2019 in response to this Updated TA. The TA and Updated TA submitted supporting Land at Newgate Lane (North) P/18/1118/OA review both the northern and southern applications as one site.

Regarding this application, Land at Newgate Lane (South) P/19/0460/OA, a very similar TA has been submitted to the Updated TA submitted under the northern application, again considering the cumulative transport impacts of both sites coming forward for a combined total of 200 dwellings. As such, many of the comments are similar or identical to the highway comments dated 11th April 2019 in relation to the northern application. It is understood that this application is to be considered in conjunction with the northern application, P/18/1118/OA.

The recent realignment and upgrade of Newgate Lane makes up part of the 'Improving Access to Fareham and Gosport' strategy. The technical assessment for this strategy assumed development of existing brownfield regeneration sites and not development of greenfield sites along the Newgate Lane corridor. The primary aim of the strategy is to stimulate the provision of employment and investment in employment opportunities within Gosport.

Director of Economy, Transport and Environment
Stuart Jarvis BSc DipTP FCIHT MRTPI

Access Proposal

This application for 125 dwellings proposes a single point of access via a simple T-junction arrangement on old Newgate Lane. It is stated within the TA that this site and the southern proposals will be separate, with no vehicular through route and two separate accesses onto old Newgate Lane. The highway authority beilieve that both developments should be limited to a single point of vehicular access, with a secondary pedestrian/ cycle/ emergency access. This is considered sufficient for the total proposed scale of development, including both the northern and southern sites. A single point of access limits impact on Newgate Lane, which is a lightly trafficked cycle friendly route. Furthermore, using the proposed northern access as the vehicular access results in a shorter distance where the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments overlaps with the cycle route from Peal Common Roundabout to Fareham. Should both developments be permitted, the highway authority will accept two vehicular access points in the short term, if required to accommodate development buildout programmes. However, when the northern access is operational and an internal vehicular link between the northern and southern sites is complete, the southern access should be downgraded to pedestrian/ cycle/ emergency only.

Details of the southern access proposals have been provided within the TA. The engineering principles of this access have been reviewed and the following comments can be made.

1. During the speed data collection period (27th January to 2nd February 2019), there was snow on two days (31st January & 1st February). As such the data does not comply with the requirement of TA22/81 and hence HCC's Technical Guidance Note TG3. Either the speed surveys should be repeated, or the 31st January and 1st February should be removed and the 85th percentile speeds recalculated. The proposed visibility splays at 2.4m by 120m are acceptable in principle, however the extent of land to be dedicated as highway proposed on drawings figure 8 and figure 9 is too extensive and should be limited to that required for visibility splays in accordance with TG3.
2. Forward visibility on old Newgate Lane should be provided for the proposed junctions as this may impact on their location and potential land take.
3. The location of the proposed pedestrian crossing points on both drawings requires review in terms of likely pedestrian desire lines and to minimise land take for visibility splays.
4. Regarding the land required for visibility splays for both vehicular accesses and pedestrian crossings, consideration should be given to restrictive covenants or easements as HCC would not wish to adopt as highway the extents of land indicated.
5. It should be noted that there is existing vegetation along the frontage which would obstruct the achievable visibility. It is also noted visibility splays run through the site. From the masterplan it is not clear what the proposals for the site boundary with Newgate Lane will consist of. The full visibility splays compliant with HCC's Technical Guidance Note TG3, will need to be secured free from obstructions and planting. Required visibility splays cannot be part of any public open space dedication.
6. The proposed accesses are wider than normally expected. The 7m wide access could be reduced in width to reduce the pedestrian crossing distance

at the junction with old Newgate Lane. Section 7.10 of the Update TA states different widths from those shown on the drawings; clarification is required.

7. Tracking of the southern access is acceptable as submitted, however tracking of a 16.5 artic should be provided to demonstrate construction traffic can safely enter and egress the proposed development.
8. Works to the River Alver will require EA approval; the planning authority should consider the environmental impact of this and whether EA approval should be sort prior to any planning permission being granted.

Due to forecast capacity issues, alternative arrangements have been suggested for the junction of Newgate Lane East/ old Newgate Lane. Regarding the two-stage right turn design shown at Figure 12 and the roundabout design shown at Figure 14, the applicant acknowledges these designs are inappropriate and as such these proposals have not been reviewed. Comments on the engineering aspects of the remaining two proposals are given below.

Banned Right Turn

Drawing figure 13 proposes a restrictive turning movement in the form of a left turn only when egressing the old Newgate Lane. The following comments can be made with respect to this design:

- This will require a TRO, which is unlikely to be supported by the police unless significant measures were taken to physically prevent right turns out, as this is likely to create an ongoing enforcement issue.
- The proposed physical measure of the formation of an island on the new Newgate Lane present a hazard for a vehicle entering the right turn lane late.
- There are safety concerns regarding inappropriate manoeuvres at the junction itself to egress to the south or U-turning movements at inappropriate locations north to the north to avoid travelling to Speedfields Park roundabout, which can experience queuing at peak times.

Signalisation

Drawing figure 15 proposes signalisation of the junction. The following comments can be made with respect to the engineering aspects of this design:

- Provision for pedestrians and cyclists should be considered.
- There is concern regarding the two accesses to the south of the junction causing late braking when travelling southbound on a green wave.
- This option impacts on highway ditches (OWC) and street lighting.
- There will be a negative impact on the free flow of traffic, country to the design objectives of Newgate Lane realignment.

Sustainable Travel

Isochrones and specific destinations have been provided, which gives a suitable assessment of walking and cycling distances to specific locations.

Walking and Cycling

Provision of walking and cycling facilities from the site to local amenities is generally of an acceptable standard, however there are notable exceptions. Firstly, the width

of footways on the northern side of Newgate Lane has been reviewed as requested and is 1.5m – 1.8m in width. While acceptable, this is narrower than the optimal provision and an alternative north – south pedestrian and cycle link should be provided internally to the site.

The second concern is in relation to the Woodcote Lane/ Brookers Lane link, including the crossing of Newgate Lane East. As stated in the TA, Peel Common Infant and Junior Schools, accessed via this route, are not currently the catchment schools for the proposed development site. However, it is understood that the school strategy is still developing. It is possible that catchments will change should the site come forward, making the infant/ junior and secondary schools to the east the catchment schools for the application site. However, even if this were to occur, it is considered likely that children from the development will attend a selection of schools in the area. More generally, future residents of the proposed developments will use this link to access bus services and local amenities in Bridgemary. Given the development will increase both crossing movements and traffic flow, a suitable contribution towards improved crossing facilities would be considered adequate mitigation for the development related increase in pedestrian, cycle and traffic movements at this location.

The above further supports the need for a north – south pedestrian and cycle link through the site and from the southern site to Woodcote Lane. This should be secured should this application come forward.

Finally, the route to the current catchment schools of Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools should be reviewed. It is noted the following improvements have been identified as required, however this may not be an exhaustive list. This will be considered following review of the route.

- Extension of off carriageway cycle provision from Crofton Secondary School to Eric Road.
- Improvements to the crossing facilities at the Eric Road/ Stubbington Lane/ Bells Lane junction to accommodate cycles and tying in cycle facilities to the existing provision on Bells Lane.

A contribution will be required for delivery of these works, proportionate to the total dwellings proposed for both parcels.

It is noted that a contribution to provide footway connections from the site access to the Old Newgate Lane/Newgate Lane junction has been proposed in order to provide connections to the HA2 site access should this site come forward. It is considered beneficial to secure this to ensure suitable links can be provided should HA2 come forward. The applicant should provide a design and cost estimate of these works for review.

<u>Public Transport</u>

Bus services 21 and 21A are subsidised and therefore measures should be considered by the applicant to ensure that the service is secured via private funding. The TA states the applicant is willing to enter into discussions with the bus operator.

Evidence of a service level agreement or similar arrangement between the applicant and bus operator is required to ensure the site continues to be served by bus.

Distributions and Assignment

Traffic survey data has been collected by the applicant and surveyed turning proportions of existing traffic have been used to inform the distribution. It has been confirmed that all traffic flow data was collected Wednesday 30th January. The distribution and assignment methodology presented in the TA are agreed.

The highway authority has undertaken recent data collection for the completed scheme including traffic flows on Newgate Lane East. The PM southbound flows appear low. The raw survey data, including queue length surveys, should be provided for review.

Internal Layout and Parking

The TA states that the internal roads will be offered for adoption under section 38 of the Highway Act. HCC's Road Adoptions Team should be consulted on the internal proposals at the earliest opportunity.

It is noted a planning condition securing pedestrian connections between this site and the proposed site to the south is suggested by the applicant. As stated previously, the applicant should provide an internal vehicle link between the northern and southern application to allow a single point of access to be achieved.

Car parking requirements are a matter for the planning authority. However, it is noted that details of the parking requirements have not been put forward within the TA and are stated to be a matter to be dealt with as reserved matters. These should be set out and agreed with the planning authority to ensure suitable levels of parking are provided within the site.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

It is noted that within the TA the applicant makes a commitment to provide an appropriate construction traffic management plan and suggests this is secured via an appropriately worded condition. This is acceptable to the highway authority.

Background Traffic Growth and Committed Development

It is prosed to utilise TEMPro to determine background traffic growth. This approach is considered robust, however, further consideration must be given by the applicant to the inclusion of committed development within any growth forecasting of traffic and therefore within the input flows to junction modelling. It is considered that development traffic from the Gosport Waterfront and Daedalus developments should be manually assigned to the network. Distribution diagrams should be provided

showing committed development flows, which will be added to the TEMPro growthed base flows to give the forecast future year traffic flows. Gosport Waterfront and Daedalus can be removed from TEMPro to avoid double counting. This approach should be applied to both the 2024 and 2036 (sensitivity test) future year assessments.

Junction Assessment

Junction assessments include the following:

- Old Newgate Lane /proposed site access junction
- Newgate Lane East/old Newgate Lane priority junction
- Speedfields Park roundabout and HMS Collingwood signal junction
- Newgate Lane/Longfield Avenue/ Davis Way roundabout
- Peel Common signalised roundabout

The assessment years provide a forecast year 5 years post application (2024) and include a sensitivity test to 2036.

It is noted that junction assessments have been undertaken based on with and without Stubbington Bypass scenarios. The methodology regarding the redistribution of traffic due to the opening of Stubbington Bypass is acceptable, with the differences in SRTM output flows with and without the bypass used to factor the base, forecast and development flows.

It is also noted that the capacity assessments have been undertaken to include both this application's development traffic and traffic generated from the proposed development to the south, totalling 200 dwellings rather than the 125 dwellings proposed in this application. The highway authority is only able to comment on the submitted information.

As detailed above, the forecast network traffic flows are not agreed and therefore the below modelling comments concentrate on the technical build of the junction models. Further comments will be made on the acceptability of the performance and operation of the junctions only after the technically accuracy of the models has been confirmed and the traffic flow data has been agreed.

<u>Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (current layout)</u>

- A FLAT profile has been used, with a 90-minute time period. Single time segment only has not been ticked as per the Junctions 9 user guide.
- It is noted that the traffic flows have been inputted as vehicles and not PCU's.
- The base flows appear correct; however, the other scenarios do not appear to align with the provided traffic flow diagrams.
- No commentary has been provided on the model validation methodology. In addition, modelled queues do not appear to reflect existing traffic conditions.

Until further clarification is provided the models cannot be considered as a sound basis upon which to assess the future operation of this junction during the various traffic flows scenarios as set out within the TA.

Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (Proposed left out only layout)

The future operation with the left turn only layout highlights that the junction will operate within capacity for all scenarios. No Traffic flow diagrams were provided for this option; however, a calculation of the flows appears to show discrepancies in the flows coded into the model. Due to the absence of a scaled drawing, geometries have not been checked and cannot be verified. Further information is therefore required before future modelling results can be considered as reasonable. However, given the concerns raised above with the operation of this junction arrangement, it is not considered appropriate to pursue this design as a possible resolution of future 'with development' capacity issues.

Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East (Proposed signalisation)

- Lane 1/2 (Newgate Lane northbound offside lane) – a 10 PCU flare length has been included in the model for this lane. This grossly overestimates the use of the flared lane and provides an unrealistic capacity on this approach. Based on the flare length of 60 metres, the 115 metre downstream merge on the exit, it is considered that very few drivers would use the offside lane. Drivers within 60 metres of the junction will realise that they will proceed through at the next green and therefore will see little benefit from using the offside lane. Those familiar with the route will realise that using the offside lane will require them to re-join the main traffic stream quickly downstream. Experience at other junctions indicates that drivers are reluctant to use the offside lanes as they derive little personal benefit on the approach yet find themselves having to force their way back to re-join the main flow on the exit. The traffic/lane flows in the model have been assigned on delay based balancing which places 49% of Newgate Lane northbound into the nearside lane and 51% into the offside lane for all scenarios. This lane distribution will not reflect actual lane usage. The model should be changed in two ways to reflect this behaviour;
    - Reduce the actual use of the flared lane to 1 PCU per cycle to provide a realistic usage reflecting the short flare and merge lengths.
    - Lock the traffic assignment on the Newgate Lane northbound approach to 90% nearside lane and 10% offside lane.
- Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – a 7 PCU flare length has been included in the model. Physically the flare lane is no more than 1 or 2 PCU long and the flare length should be reduced accordingly.
- Lane 2/1 (Old Newgate Lane nearside lane) – the saturation flow does not include the turning radius for this movement. This should be included in the saturation flow measurements. Its inclusion would reduce the saturation flow for this movement.
- Only the cyclic order stage change intergreen values have been checked (stage change 1-2-3-1). The following intergreens require changing;
    - Phase A to D intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds as modelled.
    - Phase C to A intergreen should be 6 seconds and not 4 seconds to match that for phase C to B intergreen
    - Phase D to C intergreen should be 6 seconds to match that for the phase B to C intergreen.

No review has been made of the results (forecast traffic delays and queues) pending changes to the model and verification of the traffic flows.

Newgate Lane/ Longfield Avenue / David Way Roundabout

- The traffic flows have been inputted as vehicles and not PCU's.
- No commentary has been provided on model validation methodology and queue length surveys have not been provided. In addition, modelled queues do not appear to reflect traffic conditions on site. Further clarification is required on modelled inputs before the models can be considered as validated.

Peel Common Roundabout

HCC ITS Group supplied two agreed base models for Peel Common roundabout to the applicant's transport consultant;

1. Current partially signalised Peel Common roundabout layout (Gosport Road give way entry)
2. Proposed fully signalised Peel Common roundabout layout (Gosport Road signalised for Stubbington bypass)

The TA has only reviewed layout 2. The model set up of this arrangement is acceptable. However, no model has been supplied for the existing partially signalised roundabout, with Gosport Road as a give way entry (layout 1). An assessment of the current layout should be provided.

There is no summary included with in the TA and only the base scenario modelling outputs appear to have been included in Appendix 10. For any future submission, a summary of modelling results should be provided within the main body of the document and full modelling outputs appended.

No assessment has been made of the traffic delays and queues pending agreement of the input traffic flows.

HMS Collingwood Signalised Junction and Speedfields Roundabout

A number of Linsig models have been submitted, containing both the HMS Collingwood signal junction and Speedfields roundabout. These appear to cover the 2024 and 2036 scenarios and to include a review of increased U-turn movements resulting from the Old Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East proposed left out only layout. The modelling set up is considered acceptable, however the different scenarios are not clearly defined or explained. This should be corrected with any future submission and a summary of modelling results should be provided within the main body of the document.

No assessment has been made of the traffic delays and queues pending agreement of the input traffic flows.

HA2 Emerging Allocation

For clarity, HA2 is an emerging allocation and is subject to an objection from the highway authority within the Local Plan process. It has not been subject to the full

local plan assessment process and therefore should not be considered as committed development. Regarding the junction of old Newgate Lane/Newgate Lane East, the form of junction would change as a result of development on the HA2 site, with a roundabout arrangement proposed. The proposals for a roundabout cannot be considered as secured for the purpose of this application. Regardless, the applicant was requested by officers at Fareham Borough Council to consider NMU connectivity between the development site and HA2. A possible design has been submitted in Figure 12; this has been reviewed and the following comments are made.

- It has not been confirmed within the TA that the proposed roundabout is a compliant design to TD16/07.
- More detailed information is required to ascertain if the proposal is acceptable in geometric terms.
- Vehicle tracking and confirmation that the proposed footways are “shared use” is required.
- This option impacts on highway ditches (OWC) and street lighting.

Personal Injury Accident Analysis

A full PIA assessment has been undertaken within the submitted Transport Statement for the most recent available 5-year period. The highway authority does not consider there are any accident patterns that will be exacerbated by the forecast development traffic in the area surrounding the site.

Travel Plan

The Travel Plan has been reviewed against initial comments and there remain a number of items that require resolution before this Travel Plan can be approved.

- The developer’s own policies regarding sustainable travel should be included in the policy section of the Travel Plan and can take the form of either a statement of support or a quote from the developer’s website.
- All figures are missing from the main body of the travel plan. These must be included.
- Appendix 2 - Footway/ Highway Improvements, appears to relate to the northern application.
- Photos of the surrounding highway network should be included in the site audit.
- An example survey must be appended to the travel plan.
- Appendix 4 “COSTS OF TRAVEL PLAN MEASURES” is blank. This is required in order to set out the Travel Plan Bond.
- The Travel Plan must include a commitment to pay HCC’s monitoring and approval fees.

The Travel Plan will require further work, as set out above, as it does not meet the minimum standards set out in HCC’s “A guide to development related travel plans”. The issues raised should be addressed in a new revision of the Travel Plan before it

can be considered acceptable for submission in conjunction with the proposed residential site.

Recommendation

Additional information is required in order to support the application.

- Address comments in relation to the access proposals.
- Address comments in relation to the proposed alternative arrangements for the junction of Newgate Lane East/ old Newgate Lane.
- Confirmation of a single vehicular access point and provision of an internal north/ south pedestrian, cycle and vehicular link.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution towards improved crossing facilities at the Woodcote Lane/ Brookers Lane crossing of Newgate Lane East.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution towards mitigation of the route to Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools.
- Agreement of a suitable contribution to provide footway connections to HA2, should this site come forward.
- Evidence of a service level agreement or similar arrangement between the applicant and bus operator.
- Inclusion of committed development within traffic forecasts.
- Consideration of junction modelling comments.
- Resolution of the remaining Travel Plan comments.

Should you be minded to determine the application before this information has been supplied for review, the highway authority should be contacted for reasons for refusal.

I trust the above is clear, but please do not hesitate Nick Gammer on the above number should you wish to discuss anything further.

Yours Sincerely,

Ben Clifton
Transport Team Leader – Highways Development Planning

APPENDIX 2

MEETING NOTES (24TH APRIL 2019)

Lauren Burnley

From: Gammer, Nick <Nick.Gammer@hants.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 May 2019 09:46
To: Tony Jones
Cc: Lauren Burnley
Subject: Land at Newgate Lane (North). Fareham
Attachments: HMS Daedalus TA.pdf

Hi Tony

I've made a few amendments to the meeting summary in red below.

This is the link to the TG3 (visibility splay) guidance as requested:
https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/constructionstandards/technicalguidancenotes

Regarding committed development, please see attached the TA for Daedalus (11/00282/OUT). You'll need to do some work to calculate the Newgate Lane flows. Gosport Waterfront is part of Daedalus as you'll see from the TA.

I'll send further information regarding improvements to the walking and cycling routes between the development and the current catchment schools of Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools in due course.

Best wishes

Nick

Nick Gammer BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT
Senior Transport Engineer – Highways Development Planning
Strategic Transport
Hampshire County Council
Economy, Transport & Environment
2nd Floor, EII Court West, The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UD
Tel: 01962 826994
Email: nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk
Web: www.hants.gov.uk

Hampshire County Council

Hampshire County Council operates a pre-application highway advice service for developers.
Hampshire County Council welcomes and encourages discussions before a developer submits a planning application. Please follow this link for further information
https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/highwaysdevelopmentplanning

---

From: Tony Jones <Anthony.Jones@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Sent: 25 April 2019 16:20
To: Gammer, Nick <Nick.Gammer@hants.gov.uk>
Cc: Lauren Burnley <Lauren.Burnley@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Subject: Land at Newgate Lane (North). Fareham

Afternoon Nick

Many thanks for the opportunity to meet with myself and Lauren yesterday. Please find below my summarised notes of the meeting below:

i. The highway authority's position with respect to the development proposals for both Newgate Lane (North) and (South) concerns the impact of the development proposals on the capacity of the Newgate Lane Bypass. The highway authority advised that the Newgate Lane bypass has been constructed to accommodate assumed brownfield regeneration sites and not development of greenfield sites. However, the highway authority acknowledge that it currently did not have any formal policy in place to support an objection to new greenfield development accessing the Newgate Lane bypass. PG advised that the development proposal does not access the Newgate Lane bypass direct in any event. It does so via the Newgate Lane / New gate Lane Bypass right turn lane junction. NG highlighted that while there is no direct access proposed, as there is no alternative route and all development traffic would use Newgate Lane East;

ii. The highway authority ~~is generally in agreement of the proposed development access point to Newgate Lane, but~~ confirmed that the proposed layout and visibility splays for the proposed access should be reviewed with consideration to:

   a. highway authority's Technical Guidance Note TG3;
   b. forward visibility Stopping Site Distance (SSD) requirements for vehicles travelling northbound and southbound on Newgate Lane on approach the proposed access point;
   c. proposed location of pedestrian crossing points with consideration to the visibility splay requirements set out in TG3; and
   d. the proposed minor arm access road width informed by additional vehicle tracking.

iii. PG will also advise that the highway authority ~~will~~ does not seek to adopt the land required to provide the current, extensive proposed visibility splays at the proposed access(es) and it is preferred that these areas ~~will need to~~ should be subject to restrictive covenants or easements that ensures that any vegetations / planting located within the visibility splay envelopes do not have a full grown height of more than 0.6 metres or a canopy height of less than two metres;

iv. PG will confirm if it snowed in Fareham when the traffic counts took place for the w/c 28th January 2019 and also to provide the raw data for the ATC surveys to confirm if the weather conditions affected the results.

v. PG will advise both applicants for Newgate Lane (North) and (South) that the highway authority~~'s preference would be for~~ considers both sites ~~to be~~ should be accessed via one point of access at Newgate Lane with both sites connected via an internal vehicular link. PG will also convey the highway authority's view that should both developments be permitted, it will accept two points of access in the short term to accommodate build programmes. However, the highway authority would then seek to impose an agreement that the southern access should be downgraded to a pedestrian / cycle / emergency access when the northern access is operational and an internal vehicular link between both sites is complete.

   However, PG advised that the ownership of both sites are separate, are subject to separate planning applications and that the proposed access strategy for each site should therefore be assessed on its own merits. PG also advised that the highway authority's position as stated above could lead to potential ransom issues between both applicants to the detriment of the development proposals; NG believes appropriately worded conditions would not lead to a ransom position.

vi. The highway authority raised concerns about the proposed improvements to the Newgate Lane East / Newgate Lane right turn lane junction in the form of banned right turn manoeuvres from the Newgate Lane minor arm as set out in detail in the consultation response dated 11th April 2019. However, PG requested that this option should not be totally discounted at this stage as it could provide a potential fall back solution should the proposed signalised junction improvements to the Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane Bypass junction be determined to not be safe and / or operational to mitigate the impact of the development proposals for both Newgate Lane (North) and (South); NG reiterated that the highway authority has significant concerns regarding the banned right turn proposal.

vii. PG will issue a drawing for 'information only purposes' showing potential pedestrian crossing facilities at the proposed signalised junction improvements to the Newgate Lane East / Newgate Lane junction. This is to confirm to the highway authority that there is scope for pedestrian crossing facilities to be provided at the proposed signalised junction improvement in future, if and when required. However, both PG and the highway authority agreed that there was no need for dedicated pedestrian crossing facilities to be provided associated with the Newgate Lane (North) and (South) planning applications as there are no current desire lines at this location at this time;

viii. PG to confirm that a north – south pedestrian link is to be provided linking the Newgate Lane (North) and (South) development sites;

ix. PG to prepare a drawing and cost estimate of a signal controlled TOUCAN crossing at the Woodcote Lane / Brookers Lane link crossing the Newgate Lane Bypass. The highway authority advised that it would be seeking that the applicants for both Newgate Lane (North) and (South) cover the cost of implementing the crossing via a S106 obligation towards improved pedestrian crossing facilities at the Woodcote Lane / Brookers Lane link.

PG advised that the need for an improved signalised crossing may fall away should the Stubbington Road Relief Road (SRRR) be granted consent and lead to an anticipated reduction in vehicle traffic using the Newgate Lane bypass.

It was therefore agreed that any proposed S106 contribution sought towards ~~the Toucan~~ crossing improvements should include for a trigger mechanism informed by new traffic surveys on Newgate Lane once the SRRR is implemented and pedestrian surveys of the Woodcote Lane / Brookers Lane once the development proposals are complete. Should the surveys show that a TOUCAN crossing is not required, the S106 obligation / agreement should clearly set out an agreed timescale for the monies to be returned to the client. PG advised a maximum period of 5 years, The highway authority advised that it's standard timescales is 10 years for S106 monies to be returned if not~~e~~ used for the purpose originally sought towards;

x. The following improvements have been identified by the highway authority for the walking and cycling routes between the development proposals and the current catchment schools of Crofton Anne Dale Infant and Junior schools and that the applicant should provide a design and cost estimate for both schemes:

a. Extension of off carriageway cycle provision from Crofton Secondary School to Eric Road; and
b. Improvements to the crossing facilities at the Eric Road / Stubbington Lane / Bells Lane junction to accommodate cycles and tying in cycle facilities to the existing provision on Bells Lane.

The highway authority advised that it would also be seeking a S106 contribution from the applicants of both Newgate Lane (North) and (South) proportionate to the total dwellings proposed.

PG advised and subsequently agreed by the highway authority that the onus of preparing the design, cost estimates and any S106 contribution towards implementing the works identified above is the responsibility of the highway authority. The highway authority are to respond to PG on this basis and then PG to consider the reasonableness of the S106 request;

xi. PG to liaise with the operator of bus services 21 and 21A to confirm if it would be seeking any service level agreement with the applicants to maintain or improve the local bus service provision associated with the scheme proposals coming forward. ~~It was agreed that~~ should the bus service operator advise that it did not want to enter into a service level agreement with the applicants for Newgate Lane (North) and (South), further discussions with HCC regarding securing suitable bus provision will be required.~~ that the existing public transport service provision within the vicinity of the site is acceptable to serve the scheme~~;

xii. It was agreed that the methodology to assign development traffic as set out in the Transport Assessment on the local highway network is acceptable;

xiii. PG confirmed that the manual turning count surveys were all carried out on one day, which was the Wednesday the 30th of January 2019. PG to provide the raw survey data for review as NG highlighted that the PM southbound flows appear low when compared to recent HCC traffic counts;

xiv. It was agreed that details concerning the design of the internal layout could be conditioned and addressed as part of a Reserved Matters planning application, although, as above, internal links between the two site should be confirmed and secured by condition;

xv. The highway authority agreed to provide the TAs containing traffic flow diagrams of the committed development it is seeking to be included in the junction modelling assessments for both 2024 and 2036. Clarification was then provided that these traffic flows should then be subtracted in its entirety from the TEMPRO growth rates. PG agreed to consider this and issue updated methodology for agreement with the highway authority before proceeding with additional junction modelling;

xvi. It was agreed that a further Technical Note should be prepared exploring all the possible options for the proposed signalised junction improvements to the Newgate Lane / Newgate Lane East right turn lane junction. The highway authority advised that the comments provided on the modelling assumptions had been provided by colleagues within its ITS department and agreed to set up an additional telephone conference call between PG and ITS to agree scenarios and methodology for future modelling work for the proposed signalised junction improvements.

PG also advised that it had been in consultation with the JCT, the company responsible for setting up the actual modelling package that has been used to model the signalised junction, who have provided comments on both PG modelling work and the highway authority's comments. PG to forward on comments to aid discussions.

xvii. Updated junction modelling assessments and results for the following junctions are ~~sought~~ required by the highway authority:

a. Speedsfield Park roundabout and HMS Collingwood signal junction;
b. Newgate Lane / Longfield Avenue / Davis Way roundabout; and
c. Peel Common signalised roundabout for the following scenarios:
    i. Current partially signalised Peel Common roundabout layout; and
    ii. Proposed fully signalised Peel Common roundabout.

xviii. It was agreed that the sensitivity assessments for 2036 only had to consider the principles of the proposed roundabout access to the HA2 emerging allocation site. It was agreed that the applicants do not need to confirm the compliance of the proposed roundabout junction with guidance, tracking etc. This is for HA2 site to demonstrate should it come forward.

I trust that this is an accurate account of our discussions. However, please provide an comments or alterations for us to consider and review should this not be the case.

In the interim, please do feel free to contact both myself or Lauren should you require any further information.

Kind Regards

Tony Jones
Director

Pegasus Group
PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS
First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL
T 01454 625945 **E** Anthony.Jones@pegasusgroup.co.uk
M 07976 775162 | **DD** 01454 807395 | **EXT** 2024

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester| Peterborough

www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Pegasus Group is the trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd (07277000) registered in England and Wales.
This email and any associated files, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only.
If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person.
If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately. We have updated our Privacy Statement in line with the GDPR; please click here to view it.

Please consider the environment before printing this email message.







APPENDIX 3

EMAIL CHAIN WITH HCC HIGHWAYS OFFICER REGARDING GROWTH RATES AND DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION

Lauren Burnley

From: Gammer, Nick <Nick.Gammer@hants.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 May 2019 10:00
To: Matthew Haywood
Cc: Tony Jones; Lauren Burnley
Subject: RE: P/18/1118/OA - BRS.4989TR - Land To The North Of Gosport Road, Fareham
Attachments: HMS Daedalus TA.pdf

Hi Matthew

That's correct, remove the Daedalus trips from the growth rate and then manually assign to the network. Please show the Daedalus assignment on a traffic flow (stick) diagram. The Fareham (authority) growth rates appear more realistic. Regarding distribution, as I said previously, you'll need to do some work to calculate the Newgate Lane flows. I believe it's possible to calculate the development traffic distribution from the review of Peel Common Roundabout (para 6.13.36 onwards), by comparing Figure 6.17 and Figure 6.19. Alternatively, Peel Common Roundabout was considered in detail at the planning stage, have a look at the documents under 11/00282/OUT on the Gosport Planning Portal; there is a lot of information here (including full modelling outputs) and I'm sure it'd be possible to get a reasonable estimate of Daedalus traffic using Newgate Lane.

Best wishes

Nick

Nick Gammer BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT
Senior Transport Engineer – Highways Development Planning
Strategic Transport
Hampshire County Council
Economy, Transport & Environment
2nd Floor, EII Court West, The Castle, Winchester, SO23 8UD
Tel: 01962 826994
Email: nick.gammer@hants.gov.uk
Web: www.hants.gov.uk

Hampshire County Council

Hampshire County Council operates a pre-application highway advice service for developers.
Hampshire County Council welcomes and encourages discussions before a developer submits a planning application. Please follow this link for further information
https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/developers/highwaysdevelopmentplanning

---

From: Matthew Haywood <Matthew.Haywood@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Sent: 15 May 2019 10:45
To: Gammer, Nick <Nick.Gammer@hants.gov.uk>
Cc: Tony Jones <Anthony.Jones@pegasusgroup.co.uk>; Lauren Burnley <Lauren.Burnley@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Subject: P/18/1118/OA - BRS.4989TR - Land To The North Of Gosport Road, Fareham

Good morning Nick,

I am writing to seek clarification on the TEMPRO growth rates we will be using for the further modelling of the junctions on Newgate Lane.

My understanding of this is that you want us to take away the Daedalus developments trips from the growth rate.

To apply alternative assumptions for growth rates in Tempro it needs to be in the form of 'Jobs' and 'Households'. It is also based on individual areas or whole areas depending.

According to the Daedalus TA, the Fareham area there will have 902 jobs and 0 households, and the Gosport area 3206 jobs and 200 homes. This totals 4108 jobs and 200 homes.

The Tempro area containing the site is Fareham 013, however this does not contain the Daedalus developments. To assume that all of these jobs and households were in this area would result in a growth rate for 2024 of 0.599 and 2036 or 0.6716.

Alternatively the Fareham (Authority) area could be used which would result in a more expected growth rate of 1.0333 for 2024 and 1.1163 for 2036. – I would assume that this is more what you're looking for.

That then brings us on to how to assume the trip distribution through the junction network we are assessing.

There is only one junction we have in common with the Daedalus TA, the Peel Common Roundabout. The problem is that they only assigned traffic to two arms of it in their Saturn modelling.
As such how do you propose we assign these trips through our system?

Kind regards,

Matthew Haywood
Transport Planner

Pegasus Group
PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS
First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL
T 01454 625945 **E** Matthew.Haywood@pegasusgroup.co.uk
DD 01454 807397 | **EXT** 2038

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester| Peterborough

www.pegasusgroup.co.uk
Pegasus Group is the trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd (07277000) registered in England and Wales.
This email and any associated files, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only.
If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person.
If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately. We have updated our Privacy Statement in line with the GDPR; please click here to view it.

Please consider the environment before printing this email message.



APPENDIX 4

AMENDED DAEDALUS DISTRIBUTION FLOWS

2019 Base "DS1" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2019 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2019 Base "DS2" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2019 Base "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



APPENDIX 5

PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED JUNCTION REPORTS

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn original 50 50.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**95.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20.2**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**95.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20.2**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1956:2105	910+878	95.8 : 95.8%	-	-	-	13.0	27.4	42.9	7.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	889	1940	1940	45.8%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	841	1940	1940	43.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	3.6	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -6.4 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 19.39 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -6.4 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 20.20

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.3**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.3**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1936:2105	924+815	58.7 : 58.7%	-	-	-	2.2	7.9	7.2	4.4
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	531	1940	1940	27.4%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	478	1940	1940	24.6%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 13.96 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 14.31

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**95.9%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**95.9%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1956:2105	910+878	95.9 : 95.9%	-	-	-	13.2	27.7	43.6	7.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	895	1940	1940	46.1%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	842	1940	1940	43.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	3.6	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -6.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 19.59 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -6.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 20.40

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**62.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6.7**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**62.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6.7**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	87	-	1004	1933:2105	918+798	58.5 : 58.5%	-	-	-	2.3	8.2	7.3	4.5
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	8	-	109	1750:1711	79+100	60.8 : 60.8%	-	-	-	2.4	78.1	2.7	1.8
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	100	-	1031	1965:1786	1573+82	62.3 : 62.3%	-	-	-	1.7	5.9	11.8	4.6
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	528	1940	1940	27.2%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	467	1940	1940	24.1%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 44.5 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 6.34 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 44.5 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 6.69

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn original 60 40.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**101.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**42.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**101.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**42.9**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1958:2105	1024+661	101.7 : 101.7%	-	-	-	35.7	75.0	84.3	9.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1058	1940	1940	53.7%	-	-	-	0.6	2.0	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	34.1%	-	-	-	0.3	1.4	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -13.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 42.06 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -13.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 42.90

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.5**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.5**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1941:2105	1045+590	62.4 : 62.4%	-	-	-	2.4	8.5	9.2	5.3
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	641	1940	1940	33.0%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	368	1940	1940	19.0%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.14 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 14.50

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**101.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**44.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**101.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**44.0**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1957:2105	1024+660	101.8 : 101.8%	-	-	-	36.8	77.2	85.4	9.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1065	1940	1940	54.0%	-	-	-	0.6	2.0	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	34.0%	-	-	-	0.3	1.4	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -13.2 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 43.17 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -13.2 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 44.01

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**62.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**62.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6.9**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	87	-	1004	1938:2105	1023+602	61.8 : 61.8%	-	-	-	2.5	8.8	9.1	5.3
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	8	-	109	1750:1711	79+100	60.8 : 60.8%	-	-	-	2.4	78.1	2.7	1.8
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	100	-	1031	1965:1786	1573+82	62.3 : 62.3%	-	-	-	1.7	5.9	11.8	4.6
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	623	1940	1940	32.1%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	372	1940	1940	19.2%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 44.5 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 6.50 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 44.5 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 6.85

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn original 70 30.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**106.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**78.2**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**106.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**78.2**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1959:2105	1135+473	106.5 : 106.5%	-	-	-	71.0	149.2	119.8	13.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1226	1940	1940	59.5%	-	-	-	0.7	2.3	0.7	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	24.4%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -18.3 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 77.35 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -18.3 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 78.25

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.7**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**14.7**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1944:2105	1132+445	64.7 : 64.7%	-	-	-	2.6	9.1	11.2	5.9
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	721	1940	1940	37.2%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	288	1940	1940	14.8%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.31 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 14.70

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**106.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**79.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**106.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**79.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1959:2105	1135+473	106.7 : 106.7%	-	-	-	72.1	151.4	120.9	13.2
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1233	1940	1940	59.8%	-	-	-	0.7	2.3	0.7	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	24.4%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -18.5 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 78.49 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -18.5 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 79.40

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**64.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**64.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	87	-	1004	1942:2105	1124+433	64.5 : 64.5%	-	-	-	2.7	9.5	11.7	6.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	8	-	109	1750:1711	79+100	60.8 : 60.8%	-	-	-	2.4	78.1	2.7	1.8
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	100	-	1031	1965:1786	1573+82	62.3 : 62.3%	-	-	-	1.7	5.9	11.8	4.6
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	716	1940	1940	36.9%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	279	1940	1940	14.4%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 39.5 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 6.71 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 39.5 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.08

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn original 80 20.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**110.6%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**109.8**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**110.6%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**109.8**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1959:2105	1245+304	110.6 : 110.6%	-	-	-	102.4	215.2	151.2	16.9
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1394	1940	1940	65.2%	-	-	-	0.9	2.7	0.9	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	15.7%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -22.9 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 108.76 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -22.9 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 109.78

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.0**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1946:2105	1257+277	66.5 : 66.5%	-	-	-	2.9	10.1	14.7	6.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	825	1940	1940	42.5%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	184	1940	1940	9.5%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.59 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.01

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**110.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**110.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**110.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**110.9**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1959:2105	1245+303	110.8 : 110.8%	-	-	-	103.5	217.3	152.4	16.9
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1401	1940	1940	65.5%	-	-	-	0.9	2.7	0.9	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	15.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -23.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 109.90 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -23.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 110.93

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**66.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.4**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**66.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.4**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1944:2105	1237+281	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.8	10.1	14.6	6.6
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	809	1940	1940	41.7%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	186	1940	1940	9.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 36.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 6.95 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 36.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.36

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn original 90 10.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**136.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**136.0**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1960:2105	1353+147	114.2 : 114.2%	-	-	-	128.4	269.8	177.2	19.8
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1562	1940	1940	70.8%	-	-	-	1.2	3.2	1.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	7.6%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1

PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -26.9
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -26.9

Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 134.74
Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 135.99

Cycle Time (s): 120

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1948:2105	1351+140	68.4 : 68.4%	-	-	-	3.2	11.2	16.8	7.4
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	913	1940	1940	47.1%	-	-	-	0.4	1.8	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	96	1940	1940	4.9%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.89 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.36

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**137.1**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.3%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**137.1**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1960:2105	1353+147	114.3 : 114.3%	-	-	-	129.5	271.8	178.3	19.9
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1569	1940	1940	71.1%	-	-	-	1.2	3.2	1.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	7.6%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -27.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 135.86 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -27.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 137.13

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.4%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.7**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.4%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.7**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1946:2105	1352+138	67.4 : 67.4%	-	-	-	3.1	11.0	16.3	7.3
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	902	1940	1940	46.5%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	93	1940	1940	4.8%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 33.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.21 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 33.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.67

APPENDIX 6

HCC AMENDMENT JUNCTION REPORTS

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn HCC 50 50.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**112.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**120.6**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**112.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**120.6**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1956:2105	778+750	112.1 : 112.1%	-	-	-	113.6	238.7	159.7	19.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	889	1940	1940	41.1%	-	-	-	0.3	1.6	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	841	1940	1940	38.7%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -24.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 119.98 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -24.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 120.64

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.2**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.2**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1936:2105	805+710	67.3 : 67.3%	-	-	-	3.1	11.1	17.1	7.3
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	531	1940	1940	27.4%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	478	1940	1940	24.6%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.86 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.21

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**112.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**121.7**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**112.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**121.7**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1956:2105	778+750	112.2 : 112.2%	-	-	-	114.7	240.7	160.7	19.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	895	1940	1940	41.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	842	1940	1940	38.7%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -24.7 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 121.06 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -24.7 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 121.72

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**66.4%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.5**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**66.4%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.5**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1933:2105	809+704	66.4 : 66.4%	-	-	-	3.0	10.9	16.6	7.2
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	528	1940	1940	27.2%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	467	1940	1940	24.1%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 35.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.18 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 35.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.53

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn HCC 60 40.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**113.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**131.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**113.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**131.0**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1958:2105	917+592	113.5 : 113.5%	-	-	-	123.9	260.4	169.8	20.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1058	1940	1940	48.3%	-	-	-	0.5	1.8	0.5	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	30.5%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -26.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 130.30 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -26.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 130.99

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1941:2105	956+539	68.2 : 68.2%	-	-	-	3.3	11.5	17.8	7.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	641	1940	1940	33.0%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	368	1940	1940	19.0%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 14.99 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.36

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**113.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**132.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**113.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**132.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1957:2105	917+591	113.7 : 113.7%	-	-	-	125.3	263.0	171.2	20.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1065	1940	1940	48.6%	-	-	-	0.5	1.8	0.5	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	30.5%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -26.3 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 131.68 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -26.3 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 132.37

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.6**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.6**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1938:2105	941+554	67.1 : 67.1%	-	-	-	3.1	11.3	17.2	7.5
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	623	1940	1940	32.1%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	372	1940	1940	19.2%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 34.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.29 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 34.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.65

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn HCC 70 30.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**140.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**140.0**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1959:2105	1053+439	114.8 : 114.8%	-	-	-	132.9	279.2	178.6	20.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1226	1940	1940	55.4%	-	-	-	0.6	2.1	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	22.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.2	0.1	-

C1

PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -27.5
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -27.5

Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 139.23
Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 139.99

Cycle Time (s): 120

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.5**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.5**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1944:2105	1064+419	68.8 : 68.8%	-	-	-	3.4	11.8	18.3	7.8
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	721	1940	1940	37.2%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	288	1940	1940	14.8%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 15.07 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.46

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.9%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**141.1**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**114.9%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**141.1**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1959:2105	1054+439	114.9 : 114.9%	-	-	-	134.0	281.2	179.7	20.8
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1233	1940	1940	55.7%	-	-	-	0.6	2.1	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	22.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.2	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -27.7 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 140.35 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -27.7 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 141.12

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.8**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**67.8%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.8**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1942:2105	1069+411	67.8 : 67.8%	-	-	-	3.2	11.6	17.7	7.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	716	1940	1940	36.9%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	279	1940	1940	14.4%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 32.7 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.38 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 32.7 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.76

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn HCC 80 20.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**116.0%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**148.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**116.0%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**148.4**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1959:2105	1187+290	116.0 : 116.0%	-	-	-	141.1	296.5	186.6	21.4
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1394	1940	1940	62.3%	-	-	-	0.8	2.5	0.8	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	14.9%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -28.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 147.45 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -28.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 148.36

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.6**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.6**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1946:2105	1202+265	69.5 : 69.5%	-	-	-	3.5	12.2	18.8	8.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	825	1940	1940	42.5%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	184	1940	1940	9.5%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 15.17 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.59

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**116.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**149.5**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**116.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**149.5**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1959:2105	1188+289	116.1 : 116.1%	-	-	-	142.2	298.5	187.8	21.5
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1401	1940	1940	62.6%	-	-	-	0.8	2.5	0.8	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	14.9%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -29.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 148.56 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -29.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 149.48

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**68.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.9**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**68.5%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7.9**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1944:2105	1195+272	68.5 : 68.5%	-	-	-	3.3	11.9	18.1	7.9
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	809	1940	1940	41.7%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	186	1940	1940	9.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 31.5 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.47 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 31.5 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 7.88

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn HCC 90 10.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**117.0%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**155.8**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**117.0%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**155.8**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1713	1960:2105	1320+144	117.0 : 117.0%	-	-	-	148.3	311.6	193.7	22.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	133	1750:1711	97+55	87.7 : 87.7%	-	-	-	4.8	129.1	6.0	2.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1039	1965:1786	1595+76	62.2 : 62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.6	11.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1562	1940	1940	69.2%	-	-	-	1.1	3.0	1.1	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	7.4%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -30.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 154.64 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -30.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 155.79

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.7**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**93.7%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**15.7**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1020	1948:2105	1318+137	70.1 : 70.1%	-	-	-	3.5	12.4	19.2	8.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	105	1750:1711	87+89	59.5 : 59.5%	-	-	-	2.3	78.6	2.4	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1565	1965:1786	1611+59	93.7 : 93.7%	-	-	-	9.4	21.7	44.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	913	1940	1940	47.1%	-	-	-	0.4	1.8	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	96	1940	1940	4.9%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 15.25 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -4.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.72

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**117.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**156.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**117.2%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**156.9**	-	-	-
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1715	1960:2105	1321+143	117.2 : 117.2%	-	-	-	149.4	313.5	194.8	22.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	141	1750:1711	96+59	90.9 : 90.9%	-	-	-	5.5	141.3	6.8	3.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	753	1965:1786	1576+95	45.0 : 45.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1569	1940	1940	69.4%	-	-	-	1.1	3.0	1.1	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	7.4%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -30.2 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 155.74 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -30.2 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 156.91

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**69.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**69.1%**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1+1/2	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	88	-	1004	1946:2105	1319+135	69.1 : 69.1%	-	-	-	3.4	12.2	18.6	8.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1750:1711	73+92	66.1 : 66.1%	-	-	-	2.6	85.2	2.9	1.9
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U	B		1	101	-	1031	1965:1786	1588+83	61.7 : 61.7%	-	-	-	1.6	5.5	11.0	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	902	1940	1940	46.5%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	93	1940	1940	4.8%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 30.3 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.54 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 30.3 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 8.00

APPENDIX 7

AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS TRICS OUTPUT

Calculation Reference: AUDIT-563501-180426-0403

TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

Land Use : 03 - RESIDENTIAL
Category : B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

Selected regions and areas:

02	SOUTH EAST		
	ES	EAST SUSSEX	1 days
03	SOUTH WEST		
	DV	DEVON	1 days
04	EAST ANGLIA		
	SF	SUFFOLK	1 days
07	YORKSHIRE & NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE		
	NY	NORTH YORKSHIRE	1 days
	WY	WEST YORKSHIRE	2 days
08	NORTH WEST		
	MS	MERSEYSIDE	1 days

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS® sub-region in the selected set

Secondary 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: Number of dwellings
Actual Range: 14 to 280 (units:)
Range Selected by User: 14 to 280 (units:)

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys

Date Range: 01/01/03 to 19/09/13

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:

Tuesday	3 days
Wednesday	1 days
Thursday	3 days

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

Selected survey types:

Manual count	7 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:

Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)	4
Edge of Town	3

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	4
Built-Up Zone	1
No Sub Category	2

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:

C3	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 1 mile:

1,001 to 5,000	2 days
10,001 to 15,000	3 days
15,001 to 20,000	1 days
25,001 to 50,000	1 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	2 days
50,001 to 75,000	1 days
75,001 to 100,000	3 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	5 days
1.1 to 1.5	2 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 DV-03-B-01 TERRACED DEVON
HAM DRIVE

PLYMOUTH
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 35
Survey date: WEDNESDAY *06/07/05* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

2 ES-03-B-01 BUNGALOWS EAST SUSSEX
BOWLEY ROAD

HAILSHAM
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 14
Survey date: THURSDAY *03/07/03* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

3 MS-03-B-01 TERRACED MERSEYSIDE
TARBOCK ROAD
SPEKE
LIVERPOOL
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 16
Survey date: TUESDAY *18/06/13* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

4 NY-03-B-01 TERRACED HOUSING NORTH YORKSHIRE
NORTHALLERTON ROAD
NORBY
THIRSK
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
No Sub Category
Total Number of dwellings: 280
Survey date: THURSDAY *20/09/07* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

5 SF-03-B-01 SEMI D./TERRACED SUFFOLK
A1144 ST PETERS STREET

LOWESTOFT
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
No Sub Category
Total Number of dwellings: 46
Survey date: TUESDAY *20/09/05* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

6 WY-03-B-02 MIXED HOUSES WEST YORKSHIRE
WHITEACRE STREET
DEIGHTON
HUDDERSFIELD
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 54
Survey date: TUESDAY *17/09/13* *Survey Type: MANUAL*

7 WY-03-B-03 TERRACED HOUSES WEST YORKSHIRE
LINCOLN GREEN ROAD

LEEDS
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Built-Up Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 29
Survey date: THURSDAY *19/09/13* *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 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.049	7	68	0.141	7	68	0.190
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.110	7	68	0.209	7	68	0.319
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.129	7	68	0.135	7	68	0.264
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.112	7	68	0.127	7	68	0.239
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.137	7	68	0.108	7	68	0.245
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.124	7	68	0.131	7	68	0.255
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.133	7	68	0.103	7	68	0.236
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.120	7	68	0.146	7	68	0.266
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.167	7	68	0.118	7	68	0.285
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.141	7	68	0.143	7	68	0.284
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.226	7	68	0.158	7	68	0.384
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.131	7	68	0.091	7	68	0.222
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			1.579			1.610			3.189

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL OGVS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.006
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.004
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.006
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			0.008			0.008			0.016

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL PSVS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.008
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.004
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.004
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.000
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			0.008			0.008			0.016

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.011	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.017
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.008	7	68	0.010
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.013	7	68	0.019
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.006
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.008
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.008
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.008
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.002
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.019	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.023
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.011	7	68	0.017	7	68	0.028
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.013	7	68	0.011	7	68	0.024
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.015	7	68	0.017	7	68	0.032
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			0.097			0.088			0.185

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.049	7	68	0.188	7	68	0.237
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.156	7	68	0.371	7	68	0.527
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.150	7	68	0.179	7	68	0.329
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.154	7	68	0.177	7	68	0.331
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.173	7	68	0.133	7	68	0.306
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.160	7	68	0.167	7	68	0.327
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.169	7	68	0.116	7	68	0.285
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.167	7	68	0.186	7	68	0.353
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.283	7	68	0.154	7	68	0.437
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.219	7	68	0.226	7	68	0.445
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.302	7	68	0.236	7	68	0.538
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.207	7	68	0.131	7	68	0.338
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			2.189			2.264			4.453

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.019	7	68	0.044	7	68	0.063
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.053	7	68	0.270	7	68	0.323
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.103	7	68	0.084	7	68	0.187
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.074	7	68	0.118	7	68	0.192
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.070	7	68	0.072	7	68	0.142
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.105	7	68	0.076	7	68	0.181
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.049	7	68	0.051	7	68	0.100
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.072	7	68	0.080	7	68	0.152
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.211	7	68	0.124	7	68	0.335
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.124	7	68	0.070	7	68	0.194
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.152	7	68	0.127	7	68	0.279
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.082	7	68	0.074	7	68	0.156
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			1.114			1.190			2.304

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL PUBLIC TRANSPORT USERS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.002
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.019	7	68	0.019
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.017	7	68	0.021
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.002
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.011	7	68	0.015
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.008
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.025	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.031
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.006	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.008
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.013	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.015
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.004	7	68	0.004
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.011	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.011
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.002	7	68	0.000	7	68	0.002
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			0.073			0.065			0.138

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/B - AFFORDABLE/LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSES
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL PEOPLE
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

	ARRIVALS			DEPARTURES			TOTALS		
Time Range	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate	No. Days	Ave. DWELLS	Trip Rate
00:00 - 01:00									
01:00 - 02:00									
02:00 - 03:00									
03:00 - 04:00									
04:00 - 05:00									
05:00 - 06:00									
06:00 - 07:00									
07:00 - 08:00	7	68	0.078	7	68	0.241	7	68	0.319
08:00 - 09:00	7	68	0.211	7	68	0.669	7	68	0.880
09:00 - 10:00	7	68	0.264	7	68	0.293	7	68	0.557
10:00 - 11:00	7	68	0.236	7	68	0.295	7	68	0.531
11:00 - 12:00	7	68	0.251	7	68	0.219	7	68	0.470
12:00 - 13:00	7	68	0.278	7	68	0.247	7	68	0.525
13:00 - 14:00	7	68	0.247	7	68	0.177	7	68	0.424
14:00 - 15:00	7	68	0.245	7	68	0.270	7	68	0.515
15:00 - 16:00	7	68	0.525	7	68	0.285	7	68	0.810
16:00 - 17:00	7	68	0.354	7	68	0.316	7	68	0.670
17:00 - 18:00	7	68	0.477	7	68	0.373	7	68	0.850
18:00 - 19:00	7	68	0.306	7	68	0.222	7	68	0.528
19:00 - 20:00									
20:00 - 21:00									
21:00 - 22:00									
22:00 - 23:00									
23:00 - 24:00									
Total Rates:			3.472			3.607			7.079

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:	14 - 280 (units:)
Survey date date range:	01/01/03 - 19/09/13
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	7
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	1
Surveys manually removed from selection:	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.

APPENDIX 8

AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE FLOWS

2019 Base "DS1" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2019 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2036 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development and proposed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development and proposed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2019 Base "DS2" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2019 Base "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2036 Base "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2036 Base + Development "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



APPENDIX 9

AMENDED PRIVATE AND AFFORDABLE AND TRAVEL PLAN FLOWS

2019 Base "DS1" From NGLSS TA

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Newgate Lane / Longfield Avenue / Daivs Way flows in the 2019 "DS1" scenario were extracted from ARCADY model in the Newgate Lane Southern Section Transport Assessment Appendix H.

Newgate Lane South / Old Newgate Lane Priority Junction 2019 "DS1" scenario - flows taken from the PICADY model in Appendix H of the NGLS Transport Assessment.

Peel Common Roundabout (NGL/Rowner Rd/Gosport Rd/Broom Way) flows taken from Future Year SRTM model 2019 "DS1" scenario. Extracted from Appendix G of the NGLS TA.

Speedsfield Pard/ HMS Collingwood/NGL flows taken from Future Year SRTM model 2019 "DS1" scenario and weighted based on flows from the surrounding junctions. Extracted from Appendix G of the NGLS TA.



2019 Base "DS1" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2019 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19.



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then Development traffic added.



2036 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development and proposed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS1 scenario represents the existing situation without the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development and proposed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2019 Base "DS2" **AM - 0800 - 0900**

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2019 Base "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic was observed Wednesday 30/01/19



2024 Base "DS1"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base "DS1"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.033333

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2024 Base + Daedalus + Development "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.0348

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2024 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2036 Base "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development traffic added.

Traffic derived from observed flow with alternative assumption growth rate and traffic associated with committed development distributed on a pro-rata basis.



2036 Base + Development "DS2"

AM - 0800 - 0900

Growth Rate: 1.1163

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



2036 Base + Development "DS2"

PM - 1700 - 1800

Pegasus Group

Growth Rate: 1.1184

Key:

362	Total Vehicle Flow (Vehicles)
5	HGV/Bus Flow (Vehicles)

Notes & Sources of Information

The DS2 scenario represents the situation with the proposed Stubbington Bypass.

Traffic observed Wednesday 30/01/19 grown to 2036 then committed development and proposed development traffic added.



APPENDIX 10

REVISED JUNCTION REPORTS

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn Lturn Filter 50 50.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**98.9%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**20.2**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**98.9%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**20.2**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	868	1959	1665	52.1%	-	-	-	1.1	4.7	8.3	3.9
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	841	1000	850	98.9%	-	-	-	14.4	61.7	38.8	3.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1759:1720	117+68	58.8 : 58.8%	-	-	-	2.3	77.3	2.9	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1033	2065:1786	1686+71	58.8 : 58.8%	42	0	0	1.5	5.2	10.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	880	1940	1940	45.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	841	1940	1940	43.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -9.9 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 19.36 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -9.9 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 20.16

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.6**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.6**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	530	1946	1654	32.0%	-	-	-	0.5	3.5	3.8	2.4
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	478	1000	850	56.2%	-	-	-	1.0	7.4	5.2	2.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	93	1759:1720	117+115	40.1 : 40.1%	-	-	-	1.7	66.6	1.8	1.4
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1557	2065:1786	1705+53	88.6 : 88.6%	47	0	0	6.0	13.9	34.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	524	1940	1940	27.0%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	478	1940	1940	24.6%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 9.22 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.57

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**99.1%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**19.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**99.1%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**19.9**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	871	1958	1664	52.3%	-	-	-	1.1	4.7	8.3	3.9
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	842	1000	850	99.1%	-	-	-	14.6	62.6	39.1	3.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	116	1759:1720	117+77	59.7 : 59.7%	-	-	-	2.5	76.7	3.0	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	747	2065:1786	1671+87	42.5 : 42.5%	37	0	0	0.8	4.0	5.7	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	887	1940	1940	45.7%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	842	1940	1940	43.4%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -10.1 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 19.08 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -10.1 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 19.88

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	524	1943	1652	31.7%	-	-	-	0.5	3.4	3.7	2.3
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	467	1000	850	54.9%	-	-	-	0.9	7.2	4.9	2.1
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	97	1759:1720	91+115	47.1 : 47.1%	-	-	-	1.9	70.2	2.2	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1022	2065:1786	1684+74	58.1 : 58.1%	43	0	0	1.4	5.0	10.2	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	520	1940	1940	26.8%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	467	1940	1940	24.1%	-	-	-	0.2	1.2	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 4.76 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 5.10

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn Lturn Filter 60 40.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**79.1%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**9.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**79.1%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**9.0**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1037	1960	1666	62.2%	-	-	-	1.6	5.7	11.8	4.6
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	672	1000	850	79.1%	-	-	-	2.6	14.0	11.9	3.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1759:1720	117+68	58.8 : 58.8%	-	-	-	2.3	77.3	2.9	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1033	2065:1786	1686+71	58.8 : 58.8%	42	0	0	1.5	5.3	10.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1049	1940	1940	54.1%	-	-	-	0.6	2.0	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	34.6%	-	-	-	0.3	1.4	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 13.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 8.12 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 13.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 8.97

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.4**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	640	1949	1657	38.6%	-	-	-	0.7	3.8	4.9	2.8
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	368	1000	850	43.3%	-	-	-	0.6	5.9	3.2	1.6
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	93	1759:1720	117+115	40.1 : 40.1%	-	-	-	1.7	66.6	1.8	1.4
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1557	2065:1786	1705+53	88.6 : 88.6%	47	0	0	6.0	13.9	34.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	634	1940	1940	32.7%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	368	1940	1940	19.0%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 9.00 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.36

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**79.1%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**8.5**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**79.1%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**8.5**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1041	1959	1665	62.5%	-	-	-	1.7	5.8	11.8	4.6
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	672	1000	850	79.1%	-	-	-	2.6	14.0	11.9	3.0
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	116	1759:1720	117+77	59.7 : 59.7%	-	-	-	2.5	76.7	3.0	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	747	2065:1786	1671+87	42.5 : 42.5%	37	0	0	0.8	4.1	5.7	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1057	1940	1940	54.5%	-	-	-	0.6	2.0	0.6	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	672	1940	1940	34.6%	-	-	-	0.3	1.4	0.3	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 13.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.60 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 13.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 8.47

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**4.9**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**4.9**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	619	1947	1655	37.4%	-	-	-	0.6	3.7	4.8	2.8
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	372	1000	850	43.8%	-	-	-	0.6	5.9	3.3	1.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	97	1759:1720	91+115	47.1 : 47.1%	-	-	-	1.9	70.2	2.2	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1022	2065:1786	1684+74	58.1 : 58.1%	43	0	0	1.4	5.0	10.2	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	615	1940	1940	31.7%	-	-	-	0.2	1.4	0.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	372	1940	1940	19.2%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 4.57 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 4.92

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn Lturn Filter 70 30.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**72.3%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**8.5**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**72.3%**	**42**	**0**	**0**	**8.5**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1205	1960	1666	72.3%	-	-	-	2.5	7.4	16.7	5.4
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	504	1000	850	59.3%	-	-	-	1.1	7.9	5.8	2.2
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1759:1720	117+68	58.8 : 58.8%	-	-	-	2.3	77.3	2.9	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1033	2065:1786	1686+71	58.8 : 58.8%	42	0	0	1.6	5.5	10.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1217	1940	1940	62.7%	-	-	-	0.8	2.5	0.8	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	26.0%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 24.4 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 7.51 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 24.4 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 8.52

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.3**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.3**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	720	1951	1658	43.4%	-	-	-	0.8	4.1	6.0	3.2
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	288	1000	850	33.9%	-	-	-	0.4	5.1	2.3	1.3
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	93	1759:1720	117+115	40.1 : 40.1%	-	-	-	1.7	66.6	1.8	1.4
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1557	2065:1786	1705+53	88.6 : 88.6%	47	0	0	6.0	13.9	34.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	714	1940	1940	36.8%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	288	1940	1940	14.8%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 8.95 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.33

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**72.6%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**8.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**72.6%**	**37**	**0**	**0**	**8.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1209	1960	1666	72.6%	-	-	-	2.5	7.4	16.8	5.4
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	504	1000	850	59.3%	-	-	-	1.1	7.9	5.8	2.2
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	116	1759:1720	117+77	59.7 : 59.7%	-	-	-	2.5	76.7	3.0	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	747	2065:1786	1671+87	42.5 : 42.5%	37	0	0	0.9	4.4	5.7	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1225	1940	1940	63.1%	-	-	-	0.9	2.5	0.9	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	504	1940	1940	26.0%	-	-	-	0.2	1.3	0.2	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 24.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 6.99 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 24.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 8.02

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**4.9**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**4.9**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	712	1949	1657	43.0%	-	-	-	0.8	4.0	5.9	3.2
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	279	1000	850	32.8%	-	-	-	0.4	5.0	2.1	1.2
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	97	1759:1720	91+115	47.1 : 47.1%	-	-	-	1.9	70.2	2.2	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1022	2065:1786	1684+74	58.1 : 58.1%	43	0	0	1.4	5.1	10.2	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	708	1940	1940	36.5%	-	-	-	0.3	1.5	0.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	279	1940	1940	14.4%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 4.52 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 4.89

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn Lturn Filter 80 20.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**82.4%**	**0**	**0**	**42**	**10.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**82.4%**	**0**	**0**	**42**	**10.4**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1373	1961	1667	82.4%	-	-	-	4.0	10.5	25.2	6.1
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	336	1000	850	39.5%	-	-	-	0.5	5.5	2.8	1.5
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1759:1720	117+68	58.8 : 58.8%	-	-	-	2.3	77.3	2.9	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1033	2065:1786	1686+60	58.8 : 70.0%	0	0	42	2.2	7.5	10.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1385	1940	1940	71.4%	-	-	-	1.2	3.2	1.2	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	17.3%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 9.3 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 9.03 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 9.3 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 10.37

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.4**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.4**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	824	1953	1660	49.6%	-	-	-	1.0	4.5	7.6	3.7
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	184	1000	850	21.6%	-	-	-	0.2	4.4	1.3	0.8
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	93	1759:1720	117+115	40.1 : 40.1%	-	-	-	1.7	66.6	1.8	1.4
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1557	2065:1786	1705+53	88.6 : 88.6%	47	0	0	6.0	13.9	34.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	818	1940	1940	42.2%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	184	1940	1940	9.5%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 8.99 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.41

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**82.6%**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**9.8**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**82.6%**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**9.8**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1377	1961	1667	82.6%	-	-	-	4.1	10.6	25.3	6.1
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	336	1000	850	39.5%	-	-	-	0.5	5.5	2.8	1.5
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	116	1759:1720	117+77	59.7 : 59.7%	-	-	-	2.5	76.7	3.0	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	747	2065:1786	1671+60	42.5 : 61.7%	0	0	37	1.4	6.8	5.7	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1393	1940	1940	71.8%	-	-	-	1.3	3.3	1.3	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	336	1940	1940	17.3%	-	-	-	0.1	1.1	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 8.9 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 8.48 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): 8.9 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.85

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.0**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	805	1951	1658	48.5%	-	-	-	1.0	4.4	7.2	3.6
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	186	1000	850	21.9%	-	-	-	0.2	4.4	1.3	0.8
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	97	1759:1720	91+115	47.1 : 47.1%	-	-	-	1.9	70.2	2.2	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1022	2065:1786	1684+74	58.1 : 58.1%	43	0	0	1.4	5.1	10.2	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	801	1940	1940	41.3%	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	186	1940	1940	9.6%	-	-	-	0.1	1.0	0.1	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 4.55 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 4.95

Basic Results Summary

User and Project Details

Project:	
Title:	
Location:	
Additional detail:	
File name:	NGL Sig jctn Lturn Filter 90 10.lsg3x
Author:	
Company:	
Address:	

Scenario 1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1' (FG1: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**92.4%**	**0**	**0**	**42**	**15.0**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**92.4%**	**0**	**0**	**42**	**15.0**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1541	1961	1667	92.4%	-	-	-	8.3	19.4	41.6	6.8
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	168	1000	850	19.8%	-	-	-	0.2	4.3	1.1	0.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	109	1759:1720	117+68	58.8 : 58.8%	-	-	-	2.3	77.3	2.9	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1033	2065:1786	1686+60	58.8 : 70.0%	0	0	42	2.2	7.5	10.3	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1553	1940	1940	80.1%	-	-	-	2.0	4.6	2.0	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	8.7%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -2.7 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 13.01 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): -2.7 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 15.05

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1' (FG2: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS1', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.6**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**88.6%**	**47**	**0**	**0**	**9.6**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	912	1954	1661	54.9%	-	-	-	1.2	4.9	9.0	4.1
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	96	1000	850	11.3%	-	-	-	0.1	3.9	0.6	0.4
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	93	1759:1720	117+115	40.1 : 40.1%	-	-	-	1.7	66.6	1.8	1.4
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1557	2065:1786	1705+53	88.6 : 88.6%	47	0	0	6.0	13.9	34.2	6.7
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	906	1940	1940	46.7%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	96	1940	1940	4.9%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 9.10 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 1.6 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 9.56

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2' (FG3: '2024 Base + Dev AM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**92.7%**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**14.7**	-	-	-
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	**92.7%**	**0**	**0**	**37**	**14.7**	-	-	-
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	1545	1961	1667	92.7%	-	-	-	8.5	19.9	41.8	6.9
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	168	1000	850	19.8%	-	-	-	0.2	4.3	1.1	0.7
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	116	1759:1720	117+77	59.7 : 59.7%	-	-	-	2.5	76.7	3.0	2.1
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	747	2065:1786	1671+60	42.5 : 61.7%	0	0	37	1.4	6.8	5.7	3.2
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	1561	1940	1940	80.5%	-	-	-	2.0	4.7	2.0	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	168	1940	1940	8.7%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): -3.0 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 12.61 Cycle Time (s): 120
PRC Over All Lanes (%): -3.0 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 14.69

Basic Results Summary

Scenario 4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2' (FG4: '2024 Base + Dev PM DS2', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')

Network Layout Diagram



Basic Results Summary

Network Results

Item	Lane Description	Lane Type	Full Phase	Arrow Phase	Num Greens	Total Green (s)	Arrow Green (s)	Demand Flow (pcu)	Sat Flow (pcu/Hr)	Capacity (pcu)	Deg Sat (%)	Turners In Gaps (pcu)	Turners When Unopposed (pcu)	Turners In Intergreen (pcu)	Total Delay (pcuHr)	Av. Delay Per PCU (s/pcu)	Mean Max Queue (pcu)	Back of Uniform Q At End of Red(pcu)
Network	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Old Newgate Ln/Newgate Lane	**-**	**-**	**-**		**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**58.1%**	**43**	**0**	**0**	**5.1**	**-**	**-**	**-**
1/1	NGL s Left Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	898	1952	1659	54.1%	-	-	-	1.2	4.9	8.8	4.0
1/2	NGL s Ahead	U	A		1	101	-	93	1000	850	10.9%	-	-	-	0.1	3.9	0.6	0.4
2/2+2/1	Old NGL Right Left	U	C		1	7	-	97	1759:1720	91+115	47.1 : 47.1%	-	-	-	1.9	70.2	2.2	1.6
3/1+3/2	NGL N Ahead Right	U+O	B	D	1	101	0	1022	2065:1786	1684+74	58.1 : 58.1%	43	0	0	1.5	5.1	10.2	4.4
6/1	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	894	1940	1940	46.1%	-	-	-	0.4	1.7	0.4	-
6/2	Ahead	U	-		-	-	-	93	1940	1940	4.8%	-	-	-	0.0	1.0	0.0	-

C1 PRC for Signalled Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): 4.66 Cycle Time (s): 120

PRC Over All Lanes (%): 54.8 Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): 5.11