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### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Motion is instructed by Reside Developments Ltd to prepare this Transport Assessment (TA) to accompany an outline planning application for a residential development on land to the south of Funtley Road, Funtley, Hampshire.
1.2 The site is located to the north of the M27 (between junctions 9 and 10 ), some 3.2 kilometres north of Fareham town centre. The site is bound to the north by Funtley Road, to the south by the M27 motorway, the west by Honeybridge Lane, and by woodland and a railway line to the east. The administrative authorities are Fareham Borough Council (FBC - Local Planning Authority) and Hampshire County Council (HCC - County Highway Authority).
1.3 The site benefits from outline planning consent for a residential development of 55 dwellings (planning application reference: $\mathrm{P} / 18 / 0067 / \mathrm{OA}$ ), which sought vehicular access from an upgraded existing access junction which previously served a farm use and equestrian facility. The proposal seeks to utilise the consented access junction in its same format, albeit with wider pedestrian and public realm improvements.
1.4 The proposals, which are the focus of this TA, seek:
"Outline application to provide up to 125 one, two, three and four-bedroom dwellings including 6 Self/Custom build plots, Community Building or Local Shop (Use Class E \& F.2) with associated infrastructure, new community park, landscaping and access."
1.5 This TA seeks to address the highway aspects relating to the above proposal, namely the proximity of the site to sustainable modes of travel, access to key facilities/services/infrastructure, as well as the impact of the proposal in terms of traffic and parking.
1.6 The remainder of this TA consists of:

- Section 2 considering relevant transport policy at a national and local level;
- Section 3 describing the baseline conditions;
- Section 4 explaining the site development proposals;
$\downarrow$ Section 5 analysing the trip generation of the development proposals;
$\Rightarrow$ Section 6 assessing the impact of the development on the surrounding highway network;
> Section 7 setting out the measures proposed to mitigate the impact of the development; and
- Section 8 providing the summary and conclusions.


### 2.0 Policy Context

2.1 The Transport Assessment will set out details of relevant transport related policies:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (August 2011);
- Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies (June 2015);
- Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan (June 2015);
- Fareham Borough Council Residential Car \& Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (November 2009); and
- Fareham Borough Council Draft Local Plan 2036.


## National Policy

2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2019 sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied.
2.3 The NPPF presumes in favour of sustainable development and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Section 9 of the NPPF deals with 'Promoting Sustainable Transport', with Paragraph 102 stating:
"Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:
a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;
b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised - for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;
c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;
d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account - including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and
e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places."
2.4 Off-street parking provision is referred to by Paragraph 105 which states that local planning authorities should take into account the following if setting local parking standards for development:
"a) the accessibility of the development;
b) the type, mix and use of the development;
c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
d) local car ownership levels; and
e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra low emission vehicles."

### 2.5 Paragraph 106 states:

"Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport."
2.6 Paragraph 108 addresses the relationship between development and sustainable transport as follows:
"In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:
a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location;
b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree."
2.7 Paragraph 109 states:
"Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe."
2.8 Paragraph 110 suggests that development should be located and designed where practical to, among other things, give priority to pedestrians and cycle movements, have access to high quality public transport facilities, create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians and consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport. Additionally, allow efficient delivery of goods and access by emergency vehicles and be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.
2.9 Paragraph 111 states:
"All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed."

## Local Policy

2.10 Local policy is contained within the Fareham Borough Council Local Plan, which comprises the Core Strategy (Local Plan Part 1, adopted August 2011), the Development Sites \& Policies Plan (Local Plan Part 2, adopted June 2015) and the Welborne Plan (Local Plan Part 3, adopted June 2015).

Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (August 2011)
2.11 Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy document relates to transport strategy and infrastructure and states that:
"The Council will, where necessary, work with the Local Highways [sic] Authority, Highways Agency and transport operators to promote, permit, develop and/or safeguard a high quality and sustainable integrated transport system for the Borough."
2.12 Policy CS5 goes on to state that development proposals that generate significant demand for travel and/or are of a high density will be located in accessible areas that are or will be well served by good quality public transport, walking and cycling facilities. An accessible location is considered to be one that provides access to shops, jobs, services and community facilities as well as public transport.
2.13 Part 3 of Policy CS5 states that the Council will permit development that contributes towards and/or provides necessary and appropriate transport infrastructure; does not adversely affect the safety and operation of the strategic and local road network, public transport operations or pedestrian and cycle routes; and is designed and implemented to prioritise and encourage safe and reliable journeys by walking, cycling and public transport.

## Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies (June 2015)

2.14 The Local Plan Part 2: Development Sites and Policies document identifies planning policies within the Borough alongside sites allocated for development within the plan period.
2.15 DSP17 'Existing Employment Sites and Areas' lists Funtley Court, Funtley Hill, as an employment area that is to be protected, which adds to the local amenities near the development site the subject of this Transport Assessment.
2.16 Policy DSP49 relates to improvements to the strategic road network and states that land will be safeguarded for proposals that improve and maintain the effectiveness of junctions on the strategic road network.

Fareham Borough Council Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan (June 2015)
2.17 The Local Plan Part 3: The Welborne Plan sets out the strategic goals and policies that the proposed new community of Welborne will be required to meet. This site is located to the north of Fareham, north of the M27 at Junction 10.
2.18 In relation to Transport, Policies WEL23 - WEL28 relate to highway and non-car improvements that are required as part of the proposals, which indicate that a number of junctions within the Fareham area are likely to require upgrading to accommodate the development. This includes the A27 roundabout junction at Fareham Station. The development also proposes an all movements improvement onto the M27 at Junction 10.
2.19 The Welbourne proposal has now been granted outline planning consent.

Fareham Borough Council Residential Car \& Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (November 2009)
2.20 Parking standards applicable for residential developments within Fareham are contained within the Residential Car \& Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in November 2009.
2.21 Table 1 of the document sets out car and cycle parking standards based on the number of bedrooms provided in the development. Differing standards are also provided where allocated or shared parking spaces are proposed.
2.22 Allocated car parking standards state that one space should be provided for one-bedroom units, two spaces for two and three-bedroom units and three spaces for four or more bedroom units. Unallocated parking should be provided with 0.75 spaces provided for one-bedroom units, 1.25 spaces for twobedroom units, 1.75 spaces for three-bedroom units and 2.25 spaces per four or more bedroom units.
2.23 Cycle parking should be provided at a rate of one space per one-bedroom unit and two spaces for two or more bedroom units, where spaces are allocated for each dwelling, otherwise one space per unit should be provided in a communal storage area.
2.24 Key Requirement 2 of the SPD states that a parking provision below the standards set out within Table 1 will only be considered acceptable in areas of high accessibility or for specific types of residential development that create a lower demand for parking.
2.25 Key Requirement 3 relates to visitor parking and states that:
"In areas where over $50 \%$ of the spaces are allocated, an extra 0.2 spaces per dwelling should be provided."
2.26 Garages are referenced in Key Requirement 5, which states that these will not normally count towards the overall parking provision, and will only count towards provision where clear, unobstructed internal dimensions of 6 metres by 3 metres are provided.

## Draft Local Plan 2036

2.27 The Local Plan is expected to be tabled at the Executive meeting in October, followed by the full Council meeting. The six-week consultation on the Publication Plan will then take place during the Autumn.. The Draft Local Plan includes site allocations within the Borough, alongside the policies that Fareham BC seeks to apply.
2.28 Draft Policy D1 relates to high quality design and states that development proposals will be permitted where they provide appropriate parking in line with the adopted Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD and Non-residential Parking Standards SPD. Cycle parking storage facilities should be easily accessible to the occupier.
2.29 In relation to sustainable transport, Draft Policy INF2 states that new development should offer maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes and should reduce the need to travel by motor vehicle through the promotion of sustainable and active travel modes. Development should integrate into existing transport networks, not demonstrate a severe cumulative impact, provide an internal layout which is compatible for all users with appropriate servicing and parking provision, fully exploit network improvements which encourage the use of sustainable and active travel modes, mitigate impacts on the local or strategic highway network, and protect or enhance access to public rights of way.
2.30 Within the site allocations, site HA10 relates to land at Funtley Road South which accounts for the consented 55 units on site. The site allocation states that:

- Primary highway access shall be from Funtley Road;
- Safe pedestrian and cycle crossing points across Funtley Road and connectivity with the existing footpath/bridleway network in the vicinity of the site and eastwards towards the centre of Funtley village in order to maximising connectivity to nearby facilities and services;
- Pedestrian and cycle access across an existing bridge over the M27;
- The creation of a vehicular loop road on the site, allowing for pedestrian and cycle permeability across the site; and
- Proposals shall either provide directly, or provide a financial contribution towards the delivery (and maintenance where deemed necessary) of off-site highway improvement and mitigations works.
- The above is addressed in detail within this report where relevant.


## Summary

2.31 The proposal is described in more detail within section 4 of this TA, although it is noteworthy that the scheme layout includes:

- A singular vehicular access point via Funtley Road, as per the previous consent for 55 dwellings;
- Crossing points along Funtley Road to connect with the existing footway network and further residential dwellings;
- The previous planning consent for 55 dwellings included a commitment to create a pedestrian and cycle route across an existing bridge over the M27, substantially improving access to local amenities within the built-up area of Fareham to the south. This link has now been constructed and is open to the general public;
- The creation of a loop road through the site to aid permeability;
- Consideration of the impact of the scheme off-site, and whether improvements are needed beyond those associated with the previous planning consent.
2.32 In summary, the proposed development is located within an accessible location, providing a realistic choice of travel modes. As such, it adheres to both national and local planning policy in allowing for more active and/or sustainable modes of travel.


### 3.0 Site Location and Accessibility

## Site Location

3.1 The application site is located to the west of the village of Funtley, and north of the M27 motorway. The M27 provides access towards Portsmouth and the A3 to the east, as well as the M3 and Southampton to the west. The A3 and M3 both route from the south coast to London.
3.2 Fareham town centre is located approximately 3.2 kilometres south-east of the site. The strategic site location is shown below in Figure 3.1.


Figure 3.1: Strategic Site Location Plan
3.3 The site is bound to the north by Funtley Road, to the south by the M27 motorway, by Honey Lane to the west, and by woodland/ a railway line to the east. The site in relation to the local area is shown in Figure 3.2 below.


Figure 3.2: Local Site Location Plan
3.4 The western boundary of the new garden village of Welborne, as allocated in the Local Plan, will be approximately 300 metres north-east of the site. The new garden village will be a mixed-use development comprising a secondary school, public open space, a community hub, a local centre and a district centre. The scale of this new garden village is such that improvements to the local transport infrastructure will be included in the scheme, from which this proposed development in Funtley will also benefit.

Local Highway Network
3.5 Funtley Road is a single carriageway road with a width of approximately 5.5 metres adjacent to the site. The speed limit is derestricted west of Roebuck Avenue, and 30 miles per hour eastwards towards the road bridge over the railway and on in to Funtley.
3.6 Funtley Road to the east of the site proceeds below the M27 motorway as Funtley Hill, beyond which the eastbound carriageway of the motorway can be accessed at junction 10 . Junction 11 of the M27 is approximately 1.6 km east of junction 10 , from where the westbound carriageway can be reached.
3.7 The M27 motorway links Portsmouth to the east with Cadnam to the west, in the New Forest National Park.
3.8 Heading west from the site, Funtley Road links with the local road network providing access northwards to Knowle and Wickham, and westwards to Whiteley, Park Gate and Titchfield.

## Planning History

3.9 As noted previously, the site benefits from outline planning consent for a residential development of 55 dwellings (planning application reference: P/18/0067/OA), which sought vehicular access from an upgraded existing access junction which previously served a farm use and equestrian facility.
3.10 Whilst officers determined to grant planning consent in 2018 subject to a Section 106 agreement being prepared, formal consent was not granted until August 2020. The planning consent included a raft of mitigation measures to address its impact in highways terms, which included:

- To secure provision of a pedestrian and cycle public right of way through the site from Funtley Road (north) to Thames Drive (south); associated works to upgrade the bridge over the M27 motorway (including structural survey) and commuted sum for future maintenance;
- To secure a financial contribution towards the production of school travel plans in the area ( $£ 15,000$ );
- To secure a financial contribution toward the revision of the existing traffic regulation order (TRO) to allow the speed limit restrictions on Funtley Road to be amended ( $£ 5,000$ ); and
- To secure submission and implementation of a travel plan.
3.11 It was noted in the officer's report (copy attached as Appendix A) that bus route 20 had recently ceased to operate through Funtley, instead diverting via Knowle to the north and east. FBC noted the following in respect of the removal of the service:
"The report to the Planning Committee acknowledged that, whilst bus stops are located close to the site on Funtley Road, the service did not start particularly early or finish late and did not run at all on Sundays. Notwithstanding the already noted shortcomings in the bus service which was previously in place, it was considered that the overall package of measures proposed by the applicant, in particular the proposed improvements to pedestrian and cycle connectivity, would materially improve the sustainability of the location. The cessation of the bus service is therefore not considered to amount to a material change which would alter the conclusions reached on this matter."
3.12 Consideration of further mitigation to address the loss of bus route 20 is considered in this report.

Site Accessibility
Accessibility on Foot
3.13 There is currently no pedestrian footway on either side of the carriageway adjacent to the site. There is a footway on the northern side of Funtley Road that commences at the junction with Roebuck Avenue to the east of the site. Approximately 100 metres east of Roebuck Avenue the footway switches to the southern side of the carriageway providing access into Funtley. A recently permitted development site on the northern side of Funtley Road (application reference: P/17/1135/OA), which is currently being constructed, proposed a footway extension which would extend the footway on the northern side of Funtley Road beyond Roebuck Avenue.
3.14 Improvements are proposed as part of this application to increase pedestrian permeability with the surrounding road network. This includes linking the proposed site access with the existing network to the east, as well as introducing crossing points for connections to the northern side of the carriageway.
3.15 'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot' (CIHT, 2000) notes that the maximum walk distance for commuting purposes or school trips is two kilometres. Facilities within this distance from the site are referenced later in this section, and are shown on Figure 3.3. Figure 3.3 demonstrates how many local amenities can be accessed within an acceptable walk distance, including doctor's surgeries, food retail stores, and schools for all ages.
3.16 The proposals will also make use of the route over the M27 motorway, which is now operationa.. This will enable both pedestrians and cyclists to access facilities to the south without needing to detour east or west to pass over the M27. It will also provide an improvement for existing residents living in Funtley.

## Accessibility by Cycle

3.17 Government guidance in respect to cycling indicates that people are prepared to cycle up to five kilometres in order to access local facilities or travel to work. The site is accessible by cycle along the adjoining roads in the vicinity of the site, with the neighbouring localities of Whiteley, Knowle and Fareham accessible within 5 kilometres. Figure 3.4 provides an isochrone plan, indicating which locations can be reached within a one, three and five kilometre cycle distance.
3.18 Fareham Town Centre can be reached within a 9-minute cycle (3.2 kilometres), with Fareham Railway Station, a 11-minute cycle ( 3.5 kilometres) from the site. Fareham Railway Station benefits from cycle stands and lockers available. The town has an array of schools, pharmacies, doctor's surgeries, leisure facilities and shops. Further details on travel by rail are set out in the following paragraphs.
3.19 In addition to the bridge over the M27, a cycle-/footpath along the Funtley Deviation, an old railway track located to the west of the site, provides access into north-west Fareham. Consideration of improvements to the Deviation Line are set out later in this report.

## Accessibility by Bus

3.20 The closest bus stops to the site are located south of the M27 on Thames Drive, a 600 metre walk distance from the centre of the development site via the bridge over the M27. These stops are served by bus route ' 20 '. Table 3.1 summarises frequencies from the aforementioned bus stops.

| Service | Route/Destination | Weekday <br> Daytime <br> Frequency | Saturday <br> Daytime <br> Frequency | Sunday <br> Daytime <br> Frequency |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fareham) <br> Faney Lane - The Miners -St Francis, | Funtley Hill - Marlow Close - Henley <br> Gardens - Hill Park Road - The <br> Greendale - Working Mens Club - <br> Hammond Road - Oak Road - <br> Blackbrook Road - Gudge Heath Lane <br> - Fareham Station - Fareham Bus <br> Station | Hourly | Hourly, <br> ending at <br> $16: 45$ | No service |
| 20 (towards <br> Wickham) | Honey Lane - River Lane - Knowle <br> Cottages - Mayles Corner - Knowle <br> Shops - Forrest Lane - Water Tower - <br> Shell Garage - Wickham Bridge - <br> Wickham Square | Hourly | Hourly, <br> ending at <br> $17: 15$ | No service |

Table 3.1: Summary of Bus Services Available
3.21 As noted previously, bus services no longer operate along Funtley Road, although the infrastructure is in place should they recommence. Discussions are on-going with HCC as to whether there is scope to reintroduce bus services along Funtley Road, either via route 20 or an alternative service.

## Accessibility by Rail

3.22 The railway station nearest to the site is Fareham, approximately 3.5 kilometres south in Fareham town centre. Fareham station is accessible by bus and cycle, as described above. The station is operated by South Western Railway (SWR) with their services as well as the Great Western Railway (GWR) service to Cardiff Central and the Southern (S) service to London Victoria serving the station. A summary of the relevant rail services can be seen below in Table 3.2.

| Service | Route/Destination | Weekday Daytime Frequency | Saturday Daytime Frequency | Sunday Daytime Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brighton | Fareham - Cosham - Havant Emsworth - Chichester - Barnham - Ford - Angmering - Goring-bySea - Durrington-on-Sea - West Worthing - Worthing -- Lancing -Shoreham-by-Sea - Southwick Portslade -Hove - Brighton | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 05:29; } \quad 2 \\ & \text { per hour } \\ & \text { until 09:28; } \\ & \text { then hourly } \end{aligned}$ | Hourly | Hourly |
| Cardiff <br> (change at Bristol Temple Meads) | Fareham - Southampton Central Romsey - Salisbury - Warminster Westbury - Trowbridge - Bradford-on-Avon - Bath Spa - Bristol Temple Meads - Filton Abbey Wood - Severn Tunnel Junction Newport (South Wales) - Cardiff Central | Hourly | Hourly | At least hourly |
| London Victoria (change at Crawley) | Fareham - Portchester - Cosham Havant - Emsworth - Southbourne <br> - Chichester - Barnham - Horsham <br> - Crawley - Three Bridges - <br> Gatwick Airport - East Croydon - <br> Clapham Junction - London Victoria | Hourly | Hourly | At least hourly |
| London Waterloo | Fareham - Botley - Hedge End Eastleigh - Shawford - Winchester - Micheldever - Basingstoke Farnborough (Main) - Woking Clapham Junction - London Waterloo | At least hourly | At least hourly | Hourly |
| Portsmouth | Fareham - Portchester - Cosham Hilsea - Fratton - Portsmouth \& Southsea - Portsmouth Harbour | Hourly | Hourly | Hourly |
| Southampton | Fareham - Eastleigh Southampton Airport Parkway Southampton Central | Three services per hour | Two services per hour | Three services per hour |

Table 3.2: Summary of Rail Services
3.23 The Welbourne plan includes a proposal to introduce a new railway station that, if built, would be of direct benefit to Funtley as a whole including the development site. At this stage, it is unclear if this will be brought forward.

## Accessibility to Key Facilities and Services

3.24 The principle local destinations that residents may travel to are detailed within the following paragraphs. This also includes the distance of the amenity from the site access location, and whether each distance is within a two kilometre and/or a five kilometre walk/cycle distance.
3.25 The accessibility of some of these amenities have been improved by the opening of a new pedestrian and cycle route across the M27 bridge, which is expected to be adopted as a right of way to pedestrians and cyclists. Accessibility has been detailed accordingly.

## Educational Facilities

3.26 Those educational facilities located with five kilometres of the site are detailed within Table 3.3. This table does not provide a comprehensive list, and instead highlights the closest educational establishments to the site.

| Destination | Distance from <br> Site Access <br> (metres) | Within 2km <br> walk distance <br> (25mins) | Within 5km <br> cycle distance <br> (15mins) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orchard Lea Infant and Junior Schools | 900 | Yes | Yes |
| Uplands Primary School | 2,000 | Yes | Yes |
| Henry Cort Community College | 2,500 | No | Yes |
| Boundary Oak School | 3,200 | No | Yes |
| Cornerstone Primary School | 3,200 | No | Yes |
| St. Judes' Catholic Primary School | 3,500 | No | Yes |
| Fareham College | 4,100 | No | Yes |

Table 3.3: Educational Facilities
3.27 Table 3.3 demonstrates that there are a large number of educational facilities located with both an acceptable walk and cycle distance of the site. Within a two kilometre radius future residents would have access to local pre-school and primary school facilities. Numerous schools are located within a five kilometre cycle of the site.

Employment Sites
3.28 Numerous employment sites are located in the vicinity of Funtley and those located within five kilometres of the site are detailed in Table 3.4 below.

| Destination | Distance from <br> site access <br> (metres) | Within 2km <br> walk distance <br> (25 minutes) | Within 5km <br> cycle distance <br> (15 minutes) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Funtley Court Business Park | 950 | Yes | Yes |
| Knowle Village Business Park | 1,400 | Yes | Yes |
| Kiln Acre Business Centre | 2,900 | No | Yes |
| Fareham Industrial Park | 3,300 | No | Yes |
| Solent Business Park, Whiteley | 4,000 | No | Yes |
| Fort Wallington Industrial Estate | 4,500 | No | Yes |
| Segensworth Business Park (North) | 4,300 | No | Yes |
| Segensworth Business Park (South) | 4,500 | Yes |  |

Table 3.4: Nearby Employment Sites

## Retail Facilities

3.29 Retail facilities that are located within five kilometres of the site are detailed in Table 3.5 below.

| Destination | Distance from site <br> access (metres) | Within 2km <br> walk distance <br> (25 minutes) | Within 5km <br> cycle distance <br> (15 minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McColls Newsagent, post office and <br> convenience store | 1,100 | Yes | Yes |
| Co-op, Highlands Road | 1,400 | Yes | Yes |
| Village Express, Knowle | 1,400 | Yes | Yes |
| Hairdresser, Knowle | 1,400 | Yes | Yes |
| Bistro, Knowle | 1,400 | Yes | Yes |
| Garsons Garden Centre | 2,300 | No | Yes |
| Sainsbury's, Broadcut, Fareham | 3,100 | No | Yes |
| Aldi supermarket | 3,300 | No | Yes |
| Abbey Croft Nursery | 3,400 | No | Yes |
| Fareham Shopping Centre |  |  |  |
| clothing, food, gifts, etc. | 3,700 | Yes |  |

Table 3.5: Retail Facilities
Health Facilities
3.30 Those health facilities located within 5 kilometres of the site are detailed within Table 3.6 below.

| Destination | Distance from <br> site access <br> (metres) | Within 2km <br> walk distance <br> (25 minutes) | Within 5km <br> cycle distance <br> (15 minutes) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highlands Dental/Doctors Practice | 1,700 | Yes | Yes |
| Fareham Pharmacy | 1,700 | Yes | Yes |
| Fareham Gudgeheath Lane Surgery | 1,700 | Yes | Yes |
| Uplands Hospital | 2,300 | No | Yes |
| Ravenswood House Hospital | 3,100 | No | Yes |
| West Street Dental Clinic | 3,300 | No | Yes |
| Kings Road Dental Surgery | 3,600 | No | Yes |
| Praills Opticians; Leightons Opticians <br> and Hearing Care; Vision Express; <br> Specsavers | 3,600 | Yes |  |

Table 3.6: Health Facilities
Leisure and Community Facilities
3.31 A range of leisure and community facilities located within 5 kilometres of the site are detailed in Table 3.7 below.

| Destination | Distance from <br> site access <br> (metres) | Within 2km <br> walk distance <br> (25 minutes) | Within 5km <br> cycle distance <br> (15 minutes) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Miners Arms public house | 500 | Yes | Yes |
| Funtley Social Club | 800 | Yes | Yes |
| Funtley Post Office | 1,100 | Yes | Yes |
| Park Lane Recreation Ground | 2,900 | No | Yes |
| Fareham Leisure Centre | 3,100 | No | Yes |

Table 3.7: Leisure Facilities
Summary
3.32 The site can be accessed from the highway in a manner that is consistent with local policy, including the specific requirements for this site by virtue of it being allocated for development in the FBC Local Plan.
3.33 The proposal includes highway improvements for pedestrians in the form of footway extension and crossing facilities on Funtley Road. Improved connectivity to/from the site will also be provided by utilising a new pedestrian and cycle route south through the site, over the M27 motorway. This route provides convenient links with schools, local amenities, as well as bus services on Thames Drive.
3.34 There is a range of local amenities within acceptable walking and/or cycling distances of the site, including:

- Infant, junior, primary and secondary schools;
- A range of local employment locations, including several business/trade/industrial parks;
$>$ Health facilities within walking distance of the site in the form of a doctor's surgery, a dentist and a pharmacy; and
- Retail facilities, including a co-op food store.


## Road Safety Review

3.35 An assessment of the Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the highway surrounding the site has been undertaken. Accident record data for the latest five-year period has been reviewed from Crashmap.com, as well as the PIA data acquired for the previous planning consent on this site. The accident records refer only to road traffic accidents that resulted in personal injury.
3.36 The PIA study area includes Funtley Road and River Lane, as well as sections of Funtley Hill, Fontley Road and Titchfield Lane.
3.37 During the five-year period a total of four slight incidents were recorded within the study area, of which three resulted in slight injuries, and one a serious injury. A full summary of the accident descriptions and causation factors is provided at Appendix B, whilst the accident locations are shown below.


Figure 3.5 - Crashmap Extract
3.38 It is noteworthy that the assessment undertaken as part of the consented 55 dwelling scheme illustrated five accidents to have taken place with the above study area. Two accidents have since been excluded as they exceed the five-year threshold. Since late 2017 only one additional accident has occurred, a serious incident at the junction of Funtley Road with Mayles Lane.
3.39 The serious incident involved a pedal cyclist losing control and sustaining an injury. No other vehicles were involved, whilst the accident occurred in dark and icy conditions. It is considered likely that the weather conditions were a causation for the incident.
3.40 Three 'slight' accidents occurred along Funtley Road, all of which involved the driver or a rider losing control due to excessive speed or a poor manoeuvre. Two incidents involved motorcyclists, with a further incident involving a cyclist. No incidents involved pedestrians.
3.41 The PIA data suggests that there is no perceived accident problem or 'hot-spot' on the roads surrounding the proposed site. The proposals, by opening up a cycle route across the M27 south towards Funtley would assist in avoiding the need for cyclists to travel along local roads.

## Baseline Traffic Conditions

3.42 Traffic surveys were carried out on the surrounding road network as part of the previous outline planning application. Surveys were carried out at the following two junctions:

- Titchfield Lane/River Lane/Fontley Road priority junction; and
- North Hill/Old Turnpike/Park Lane/Kiln Road signalised junction.
3.43 Surveys were undertaken on Tuesday $9^{\text {th }}$ January 2018 between 07:00-10:00 hours and 16:00-19:00 hours. The surveys allow for an understand of the network peak periods, which have been established as:

```
* Morning peak = 07:45-08:45 hours; and
| Evening peak = 16:45-17:45 hours.
```

3.44 It is typically considered that traffic surveys become out of date at three years. The above survey data falls within a three year period, and is therefore considered accurate provided appropriate growth factors and committed developments are accounted for.
3.45 As part of the aforementioned development site on the northern side of Funtley Road, an Automatic Traffic Counter (ATC) was laid for a full 7-day period between 21st - 27th October 2016 to assess speeds along Funtley Road. The ATC also allows for an understanding of vehicle flow data adjacent to the development site access on Funtley Road.
3.46 It is noted that this survey exceeds the three-year time period, however the current COVID restrictions mean that carrying out new surveys of traffic flow could underestimate typical volumes. Therefore, in the absence of an alternative source of data for Funtley Road, it is considered more appropriate to uplift the 2016 data to 2020 (and 2025 for future year assessment). All survey data is attached as Appendix C.

## Assessment Years

3.47 The impact of the proposed development is to be tested five years following the registration of the planning application, i.e. 2025.
3.48 Traffic growth figures have been obtained from the TEMPro database version 7.2 for the Fareham 010 area and adjusted with reference to the National Transport Model (NTM) AF15 dataset. Relevant TEMPro growth factors for the weekday morning and evening peak periods are provided within Table 3.8 below.

| Time Period | Weekday Morning Growth <br> Factor | Weekday Evening Growth <br> Factor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $2016-2020$ | 1.0478 | 1.0429 |
| $2018-2020$ | 1.0233 | 1.0210 |
| $2020-2025$ | 1.0728 | 1.0705 |

Table 3.8: TEMPro Growth Factors
3.49 Figures 3.6 and 3.7 illustrate 2020 observed traffic flows on the surrounding highway, whilst Figures 3.8 and 3.9 provide the 2025 uplifted baseline traffic flows.

## Committed Developments

3.50 A review of the Fareham Borough and Winchester City planning portals has been undertaken to identify and development in the area which could be considered as a committed development.
3.51 There is a development site on the northern side of Funtley Road (application reference: $\mathrm{P} / 17 / 1135 / \mathrm{OA}$ ) which was granted planning consent in 2019. The development is currently being constructed, and includes 27 residential dwellings. Traffic flow associated with this site is shown within Figures 3.10 and 3.11 based on the trip distribution shown within Section 6 of this TA.
3.52 As noted previously, the application site benefits from consent for 55 residential dwellings, although the current proposals would supersede this consent.
3.53 Beyond the above, the new garden village of Welborne will be located approximately 300 metres northeast of the site. The new garden village will be a residential led mixed-use development, and will come forward with a raft of highway mitigation measures. These include:

- Contributions to the provision of new bus services;
- A32 access works;
- Off-site Local Highway Network mitigation and safety schemes;
- Residential and employment travel plans; and
- Improvements to existing rights of way.


## Summary

3.54 In summary, the site has a good level of accessibility by public transport, on foot and by cycle, however this will be improved through the development proposals. The PIA data suggests that there is no perceived accident problem, with four incidents resulting in slight injuries occurring in the last 5 years. Driver behaviour caused most incidents as opposed to the layout of the road network itself, whilst there were no locations where more than one incident took place. This indicates that there are no locations on the highway where there is perceived to be a problem in highway safety terms. The site is therefore considered to be in compliance with relevant policy guidance.

### 4.0 Development Proposals

4.1 The proposals constitute the following:
"Outline application to provide up to 125 one, two, three and four-bedroom dwellings including 6 Self/Custom build plots, Community Building or Local Shop (Use Class E \& F.2) with associated infrastructure, new community park, landscaping and access."
4.2 The architect's indicative site layout plan is included for reference at Appendix D.

## Vehicle and Pedestrian/Cycle Access Arrangements

4.3 Access to the development site will be provided via a priority junction to the eastern extent of the site onto Funtley Road, as illustrated within Appendix E. The access design is as per the previous planning consent, with six metre kerb radii and a 5.5 metre internal width.
4.4 Whilst the proposals represent an increase of 70 residential units above that of the previous consent, it is still considered suitable to provide access to the site via a priority junction. The inclusion of a right turn lane would have the effect of widening the highway to the detriment of existing vegetation, as well as potentially increasing vehicle speeds past the site. The aforementioned traffic survey data recorded by way of an automatic traffic counter serves to show how Funtley Road does not attract notable volumes of traffic at present. This is summarised within Table 4.1 below.

| Day of the Week | Weekday Morning Peak <br> Hour (HGVs) |  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour <br> (HGVs) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | EB | WB |
| Monday | $104(10)$ | $128(5)$ | $236(8)$ | $105(3)$ |
| Tuesday | $95(7)$ | $168(4)$ | $257(6)$ | $118(4)$ |
| Wednesday | $82(9)$ | $152(7)$ | $234(5)$ | $125(5)$ |
| Thursday | $91(13)$ | $148(6)$ | $233(6)$ | $101(3)$ |
| Friday | $110(2)$ | $163(6)$ | $226(4)$ | $176(6)$ |
| Average Weekday | $\mathbf{9 6 ( 8 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 2 ( 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 7 ( 6 )}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 ( 4 )}$ |

Table 4.1 - Traffic Volume on Funtley Road
4.5 The above suggests that current traffic flow is low, and therefore the potential for delay to occur associated with vehicles turning into and out of the site is minimal. During the morning peak hour, there is on average 1.5 eastbound vehicles a minute and less than 3 westbound vehicles a minute. During the evening peak hour there is between 3-4 vehicles a minute in each direction.
4.6 Traffic flow is also shown to be tidal, with the majority of vehicles travelling westbound during the morning peak hour, and eastbound during the evening peak hour. As set out in Section 6 of this report, the majority of development related traffic will travel to and from the east, the opposite of the above flow data. With most traffic turning either left in or right out of the site, there would be limited to no benefit in providing a right turn lane at the site access.
4.7 This is considered in more detail later in this report, where an assessment of the capacity of the site access junction is carried out.

## Pedestrian Access

4.8 Internal footways will link with existing external routes to maximise the uptake of sustainable modes. There is an existing footway to the east of the access on the southern side of Funtley Road which the site will connect with. It is proposed to widen the footway for a small section to tie in with the existing bus stop. This will also allow an opportunity to provide a crossing point so that pedestrians can connect with the northern footway and bus stop.
4.9 A further crossing point will be provided on Funtley Road centrally to connect with residential dwellings on the northern side of Funtley Road. This will provide existing residents with safe crossing points into the site to make use of the proposed community/retail facility.
4.10 The previous planning consent on site introduced a new pedestrian and cycle route across an existing bridge over the M27. This involved extensive discussions with Highways England (HE) and HCC to ensure that suitable upgrades were carried out to the bridge as well as wider resurfacing to ensure the route is suitable for its intended users.
4.11 The works to the bridge have been completed, and the new pedestrian and cycle route is open to all users. This is not only to the benefit new residents, but also existing residents within Funtley. This could assist in reducing existing car driver trips on the surrounding road network, as well as mitigate the removal of bus services through Funtley, with bus stops on Thames Drive located within 600 metres of the centre of the application site.

Visibility Splays
4.12 Vehicle speeds along Funtley Road were recorded as part of the aforementioned ATC. Relevant 85th percentile speeds are shown below:

- Eastbound 85th percentile speed $=39.9 \mathrm{mph}$; and
- Westbound 85th percentile speed $=38.5 \mathrm{mph}$.
4.13 It is considered relevant to use this data, since it is the most recent data relating to a section of road immediately adjacent to the development site. Indeed, it is likely that vehicle speeds will be lower at the proposed access junction than shown in the survey since the survey was undertaken in the vicinity of the change in speed limit from 30 mph to derestricted. The proposed access is also located close to the railway bridge east of the site where the one-way arrangement controlled by signals will reduce vehicle speeds further. As such, the observed speeds recorded in October 2016 are considered robust when assessing the proposed access junction.
4.14 Visibility requirements have been assessed based on recorded speeds using the formula contained within MfS. The required visibility splays are as follows:
- Visibility Splay to the east (for westbound speeds) $=61.8$ metres; and
- Visibility Splay to the west (for eastbound speeds) $=65.2$ metres .
4.15 The proposed site access drawing included at Appendix E illustrates the required visibility splays noted above. Visibility splays can be achieved in both directions with some very minor removal of the existing hedgerow/vegetation. This is fully located within the public highway or on land under the client's ownership.


## Parking Provision

## Car Parking

4.16 Parking will be provided to ensure that it is well located to the housing that it serves, and to ensure that on-street parking does not occur to any significant degree. This means that access to all parts of the site will be maintained at all times for use by larger vehicles (refuse trucks and delivery vehicles) and for the emergency services.
4.17 This approach recognises the need to provide sufficient parking spaces to avoid parking that would adversely affect the operation of surrounding streets, but not providing parking to a level that would overly encourage car usage. This is a balanced approach that is consistent with local and national planning policies.
4.18 Relevant standards are those adopted by Fareham Borough Council in 2009, as described within section 2 of this TA.
4.19 Parking on site will be provided fully in accordance with the above parking standards. As the development proposals are being brought forward as part of an outline planning application (other than access), the specific level of parking provision will be dealt with as part of any Reserved Matters application.

## Cycle Parking

4.20 Cycle parking standards are also provided by Fareham Borough Council, and state that for residential dwellings with two or more beds, a minimum of two spaces per unit should be built.
4.21 The development proposal is for dwelling houses with gardens and/or garages, and as such it is proposed that cycle parking can be accommodated within the curtilage of each dwelling. This will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

## Servicing Arrangements

4.22 Servicing and refuse collection will be dealt with at reserved matters stage, however it is anticipated that this will take place from within the site with the layout designed to allow for a large refuse vehicle to manoeuvre without impacting on passing vehicle movements. Guidance has been sought from MfS in this respect, where it is recommended that a carriageway width of 4.8 metres is provided as a minimum for roads that require a HGV to pass a car. It is proposed to create a loop road through the site of 5.5 metres in width, with any minor roads measuring 4.8 metres.
4.23 The provision of turning heads at appropriate locations will allow for a refuse vehicle to turn safely onsite.
4.24 Guidance as to appropriate carry distances is contained within MfS, stating that residents should not be required to carry waste more than 30 metres from the front door of their property to a dedicated storage point. MfS also states that waste collection vehicles should be able to get to within 25 metres of the storage point. The site layout will ensure that the above distances are met by providing turning heads at appropriate locations.
4.25 The proposed site access onto Funtley Road can accommodate a refuse vehicle entering and exiting the site in forward gear, as shown within the drawing attached as Appendix F.

### 5.0 Trip Generation

5.1 This section sets out the impact of the development proposals on the highway network. The assessment focuses on the weekday morning and evening peak hours, of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 hours respectively. Consideration is also given to daily trips.

## Existing Site Use

5.2 The site is currently occupied by agricultural fields associated with a farm, as well as an equestrian facility. It therefore has a limited existing traffic impact, particularly during the established weekday peak periods. Whilst the site does also benefit from planning consent for 55 residential units, the current proposal (if approved) would replace this previous consent.
5.3 As a result, for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed that there are no trips associated with the existing site use.

Proposed Residential Development

## Trip Generation

5.4 The trip generation potential of 125 residential dwellings has been assessed using trip rates derived from the TRICS database for the category '03 Residential: A - Houses Privately Owned'. It is noted that the development proposes affordable housing, though the Private Hosing category is utilised to provide a robust assessment. Sites have been selected using the following criteria:

- Sites located in England, excluding Greater London, surveyed since January 2012;
- Sites with up to 300 residential dwellings; and
- Sites in areas classed as suburban and edge of town.
5.5 A summary of the peak hour total person and vehicular trip rates are provided in Table 5.1 below, with the full TRICS output included at Appendix G.

|  | Weekday AM Peak |  | Weekday PM Peak |  | Weekday Daily <br> Movements |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Arr | Dep | Arr | Dep | Arr | Dep |
| Total Person Trip Rates | 0.224 | 0.830 | 0.651 | 0.261 | 4.258 | 4.363 |
| Total Person Trips | 28 | 104 | 81 | 33 | 532 | 545 |
| Vehicular Trip Rates | 0.133 | 0.377 | 0.344 | 0.151 | 2.308 | 2.329 |
| Vehicular Trips | 17 | 47 | 43 | 19 | 289 | 291 |

Table 5.1: Proposed Dwellings - Trip Rates and Resultant Trips
5.6 Table 5.1 indicates that the dwellings could generate 132 two-way total person trips in the weekday morning peak hour, of which 64 could be vehicular trips. In the weekday evening peak hour, the development could generate 114 two-way total person trips, of which 62 could be vehicular trips. Across a typical weekday, the proposed residential development could generate 1,077 two-way total person trips, of which 580 could be vehicular.

## Multi-modal Assessment

5.7 To support the above trip attraction, typical travel modes of the existing resident population have been established with reference to Census data for 'Method of Travel to Work' for the resident population (2011 output) for the Fareham North Ward.
5.8 The Census modal split of travel is summarised in Table 5.2 below. The total person trips identified in Table 5.1 for both the weekday morning and evening peak hour have been assigned based on the Census modal split percentage and are also summarised in Table 5.2 below.

| Mode of Travel | Census <br> Model <br> Split | Weekday AM Peak |  | Weekday PM Peak |  | Weekday Daily <br> Movements |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dep | Arr | Dep | Arr | Dep |  |
| Car Driver | $71 \%$ | 20 | 74 | 58 | 23 | 378 | 387 |
| On Foot | $10 \%$ | 3 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 53 | 55 |
| Train | $7 \%$ | 2 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 37 | 38 |
| Car Passenger | $4 \%$ | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 22 |
| Cycle | $3 \%$ | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| Bus | $2 \%$ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 11 |
| Motorcycle | $2 \%$ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 11 |
| Other | $1 \%$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 5}$ |

Table 5.2: Census Modal Split (Titchfield Common Ward)
5.9 Using the Census data for the Fareham North ward provides an indication of the likely travel patterns that residents would use to travel to work. The car driver modal split is $71 \%$ and results in an increase to 94 two-way vehicular trips in the weekday morning peak hour and 81 two-way vehicular trips during the weekday evening peak hour. Across a typical weekday, the Census modal split results in 765 twoway vehicular trips. Accordingly, the higher Census vehicular figures will be used within the assessment for robustness.
5.10 Whilst car driver is the most popular mode of travel to work, there is a relatively high proportion of pedestrians (10\%), train passengers (7\%) and car sharers (4\%) recorded in the area. The recently opened bridge link will likely increase trips on foot above the existing $10 \%$ recorded. This will be incorporated into targets set out in the accompanying Travel Plan.
5.11 Taking into account the relatively low level of traffic generated by the proposals, it is considered that the traffic flows identified in Table 5.2 can be accommodated onto Funtley Road and surrounding network without material impact on the operational capacity of the road.
5.12 Despite the above, consideration has been given to the impact of the proposals on the surrounding highway network. This is given consideration in the following section of the TA.

### 6.0 Junction Capacity Assessment

6.1 This section of the TA assesses the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network during the weekday morning (08:00-09:00) and evening (17:00-18:00) peak hours.
6.2 As part of the planning consent for 55 dwellings on the application site, HCC requested that junction capacity testing be carried out at the site access junction, as well as two junctions on the surrounding network:

- River Lane/Titchfield Road priority junction; and
- Kiln Road/Park Lane signalised junction.
6.3 The TA accompanying the scheme set out a trip distribution exercise looking at the destination of vehicular trips from the site. For consistency, a similar methodology has been utilised in this report.


## Traffic Distribution and Assignment

6.4 Development traffic has been distributed on the network with reference to the Census data (2011 output) for 'Location of Usual Residence and Place of Work by Method of Travel to Work'. Car driver is selected as the method of travel to work, with the location of usual residence restricted to the 'E00115521' output area within the Fareham district. All districts are included for the place of work, with the most likely exit point on the network calculated accordingly.
6.5 Table 6.1 below summarises the routes out of the network taken by vehicles based on the Census data.

| Destination | Percentage Split | Route Taken |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Eastleigh | $9.8 \%$ | West via River Lane |
| Fareham | $34.8 \%$ | East via Kiln Road |
| Gosport | $3.8 \%$ | East via Kiln Road |
| Havant | $5.3 \%$ | East via Kiln Road |
| Portsmouth | $25.0 \%$ | East via Kiln Road |
| Southampton | $6.8 \%$ | West via River Lane |
| Winchester | $14.4 \%$ | West via River Lane |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | East via Kiln Road |

Table 6.1: $\quad$ Development Traffic Distribution
6.6 The above analysis indicates that $69 \%$ of the potential working population at the site would likely travel east from the site access to reach their place of work, whilst the remaining $31 \%$ would travel west from the site access to reach other localities in the south east.
6.7 Of those travelling east via Kiln Road, some will route north, whilst others will route east or south. Based on the locations set out in Table 6.1 above, it is anticipated that of the $69 \%$ of traffic heading to/from the Kiln Road junction, 30.3\% (Havant and Portsmouth) will route north, 3.8\% (Gosport) will route east, and $34.8 \%$ (Fareham) will route south.
6.8 Based on the above distributions, the weekday morning and evening peak hour development traffic distributions are provided in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 respectively. These development flows have been added into the 2025 baseline traffic flows, to form the 2025 with development flows, in Figures 6.3 and 6.4 for the weekday morning and evening peak hours.

## Junction Capacity Modelling

## Site Access Capacity Assessment

6.9 The proposed site access junction has been assessed using the Junction 9.0 software. Table 6.2 below provides a summary of the operation of the priority junction during the morning and evening peak periods for the '2025 with Development' scenario. The 'Junctions 9' summary report for the assessment is included for reference at Appendix H .

| Vehicle Movement | AM Peak Period (07:45-08:45) |  |  | PM Peak Period (16:45-17:45) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (PCU) | RFC | Delay <br> (S) | Queue <br> (PCU) | RFC | Delay <br> (S) |
| Left out of Site | 0.0 | 0.04 | 7.30 | 0.0 | 0.01 | 7.06 |
| Right out of Site | 0.1 | 0.12 | 9.48 | 0.0 | 0.04 | 9.38 |
| Right turn into Site | 0.0 | 0.01 | 6.18 | 0.0 | 0.03 | 6.37 |

Table 6.2: Site Access Junction 2025 Capacity Testing
6.10 Based on the summary above, the junction is shown to operate well within capacity when accounting for development traffic, with no queuing on Funtley Road or the internal site access road. Driver delay is shown to be negligible.

## River Lane/Titchfield Road Priority Junction

6.11 The River Lane/Titchfield Road priority junction has also been assessed using the Junction 9.0 software. Table 6.3 below provides a summary of the operation of the priority junction during the morning and evening peak periods for the ' 2025 without Development' scenario, and the ' 2025 with Development' scenario. The 'Junctions 9' summary report for the assessment is included for reference at Appendix I.

| Vehicle Movement | 2025 Base |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ Base with Development |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> (PCU) | RFC | Delay <br> (S) | Queue <br> (PCU) | RFC | Delay <br> (S) |
| Left out of Site | 0.3 | 0.24 | 8.02 | 0.4 | 0.28 | 8.57 |
| Right out of Site | 0.3 | 0.22 | 14.02 | 0.3 | 0.22 | 14.38 |
| Right turn into Site | 0.3 | 0.22 | 6.71 | 0.4 | 0.24 | 6.76 |

Table 6.3: $\quad$ Site Access Junction 2025 Capacity Testing - AM Peak Period

| Vehicle Movement | 2025 Base |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ Base with Development |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ | RFC | Delay <br> $(\mathbf{S})$ | Queue <br> $(\mathbf{P C U})$ | RFC | Delay <br> $(\mathbf{S})$ |
| Left out of Site | 0.3 | 0.22 | 8.05 | 0.3 | 0.23 | 8.20 |
| Right out of Site | 0.1 | 0.08 | 12.72 | 0.1 | 0.08 | 13.03 |
| Right turn into Site | 0.5 | 0.33 | 8.62 | 0.7 | 0.36 | 9.01 |

Table 6.4: $\quad$ Site Access Junction 2025 Capacity Testing - PM Peak Period
6.12 Based on the summary above, the junction is shown to operate well within capacity when accounting for development traffic, with no queuing on Funtley Road or the internal site access road. Driver delay is shown to be negligible.

## Kiln Road/Park Lane Signalised Junction

6.13 To assess the impact of the development on the above junction, the LinSig Version 3.2 modelling software has been used. The LinSig models have been prepared with reference to the junction layout diagrams and timing information obtained from HCC for the previous planning conssent, alongside relevant baseline traffic flow and queue data described in this report. The observed models correlate closely with the observed queues recorded.
6.14 The LinSig model accounts for the signalised pedestrian crossings located across all arms of the junction. The LinSig has been modelled with a cycle time of 254 seconds in the weekday morning peak hour and 270 seconds in the weekday evening peak hour.
6.15 Table 6.5 below summarises the 2020 baseline junction operation during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, with the LinSig output included for reference at Appendix J.

| Arm | Weekday Morning Peak Hour |  | Weekday Evening Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) |
| North Hill | $94.6 \%$ | 15 | $97.6 \%$ | 34 |
| Old Turnpike | $96.2 \%$ | 10 | $93.8 \%$ | 14 |
| Park Lane | $99.0 \%$ | 18 | $93.1 \%$ | 14 |
| Kiln Road | $93.7 \%$ | 30 | $96.3 \%$ | 18 |

Table 6.5: 2020 Baseline LinSig Results Summary
6.16 Table 6.5 indicates that the junction operates at capacity during both weekday 2020 observed peak hours. Queuing reaches 30 vehicles on Kiln Road during the morning peak hour and 34 vehicles on North Hill during the evening peak hour.
6.17 Tables 6.6 and 6.7 below summarise the junction operation in the 2025 baseline and with development scenarios for the weekday morning and evening peak hours respectively. This reflects five years after planning submission (2020). The LinSig results for these scenarios are also included within the output at Appendix J.

| Arm | 2025 Baseline |  | 2025 with Development |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) |
| North Hill | $101.2 \%$ | 20 | $103.8 \%$ | 24 |
| Old Turnpike | $103.0 \%$ | 14 | $103.6 \%$ | 15 |
| Park Lane | $106.4 \%$ | 28 | $109.4 \%$ | 33 |
| Kiln Road | $100.5 \%$ | 42 | $108.9 \%$ | 79 |

Table 6.6: 2025 Weekday Morning Peak Hour LinSig Results Summary

| Arm | 2025 Baseline |  | 2025 with Development |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) |
| North Hill | $104.4 \%$ | 54 | $107.5 \%$ | 66 |
| Old Turnpike | $100.1 \%$ | 18 | $100.9 \%$ | 19 |
| Park Lane | $99.4 \%$ | 18 | $109.4 \%$ | 30 |
| Kiln Road | $103.0 \%$ | 26 | $109.1 \%$ | 38 |

Table 6.7: 2025 Weekday Evening Peak Hour LinSig Results Summary
6.18 Tables 6.6 and 6.7 illustrate how uplifting traffic flow to 2025 will result in the junction exceeding capacity during both weekday peak periods. Development traffic is shown to exacerbate queuing further.

## Mitigation Scheme

6.19 As part of the Welbourne development, the Transport Assessment (prepared by WSP) set out to address queuing at the Kiln Road/Park Lane junction by proposing a ban on right turn movements from North Hill into Kiln Road. Relevant extracts from the Transport Assessment are attached as Appendix K. The report suggests that the junction would operate with less queuing and delay with the ban, even when inclusive of development related traffic flow.
6.20 There are however a number of concerns in respect of the above; the development traffic flow shown within the Transport Assessment (also attached as Appendix $\mathbb{K}$ ) show numerous discrepancies and reductions in traffic flow between the do minimum and do something scenarios that are not accounted for. The WSP traffic flow data also shows significant variations to the observed traffic data recorded in 2018, as shown within Figures 3.6 and 3.7. In many cases, the Welbourne traffic flow data is significantly lower than that observed in 2018.
6.21 Furthermore, the solution of banning right turn movements from North Hill into Kiln Road would severely impact on traffic flow in the wider area; the aforementioned 2018 traffic data shown in Figures 3.6 and 3.7 illustrates a total of 178 right turn movements in the morning peak hour, and 475 right turn movements in the evening peak hour. The WSP Transport Assessment does not show traffic flow anywhere near these levels, and fails to address the impact re-routing these vehicles would have on the wider road network. This is a significant concern to wider congestion.
6.22 What is however apparent from reviewing Figures 3.6 and 3.7 is the potential to ban right turn movements out of both Kiln Road and Old Turnpike. Both roads show limited right turn movements, principally because of alternative routes that drivers can take to avoid this junction.
6.23 The assessment below assumes that right turn movements out of both Kiln Road and Old Turnpike are banned, which enables both arms to operate within the same phase (as opposed to separate stages as occurs at present). This significantly reduces lost time at the junction by removing a stage in the overall phasing of the junction. Alternative traffic flow diagrams are shown within Figures 6.5-6.8 to reflect the rerouting of right turn movements.
6.24 This assumes that $50 \%$ of vehicles previously turning right out of Kiln Road would instead head south before reaching the junction, via Highlands Road or Miller Drive. The remaining 50\% would turn left out of Kiln Road, carry out a u-turn at the roundabout to the north before heading south on Park Lane. Very few vehicles are observed turning right out of Old Turnpike, as they would already be routing north along the A32. Therefore, the potential for delay at other junctions is negligible.
6.25 The resultant junction capacity assessment is shown within Table 6.8 below, with the outputs attached as Appendix L.

| Arm | 2025 with Development AM |  | 2025 with Development PM |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) | Degree of <br> Saturation (\%) | MMQ (PCU) |
| North Hill | $89.9 \%$ | 14 | $91.0 \%$ | 28 |
| Old Turnpike | $19.8 \%$ | 3 | $65.1 \%$ | 9 |
| Park Lane | $101.3 \%$ | 20 | $96.1 \%$ | 15 |
| Kiln Road | $97.2 \%$ | 34 | $86.4 \%$ | 13 |

Table 6.8: 2025 Weekday Morning and Evening Peak Hour LinSig Results Summary
6.26 Table 6.8 above demonstrates how the junction would operate with significantly less delay by removing right turn movements on Kiln Road and Old Turnpike, even with the additional development related traffic flow. Whilst queuing would still occur, it is below that of the 2020 baseline assessment even without 2025 growth and development related traffic flow.
6.27 The above alterations could be secured by way of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), alongside appropriate directional signage. The applicant would fund the cost of the works, which could be secured by way of a Section 106 agreement with HCC (who manage the signal junction).

## Summary

6.28 The above assessment has shown that development related traffic can be accommodated on the surrounding road network without causing additional queuing or driver delay. This can be achieved at the Kiln Road/Park Lane junction by way of banning right turn movements to improve the overall operation of the junction.
6.29 Therefore, the impact of the development proposal can be adequately addressed by way of appropriate mitigation.

### 7.0 Mitigation Measures

7.1 The highway network impacts associated with the proposed residential development have been shown not to have a material impact on the operation of the local highway network. This accounts for improvements to the Kiln Lane junction to ban specific turning movements, which could be secured by way of a contribution to HCC alongside an appropriate TRO.
7.2 In addition to the above, other mitigation measures are also proposed as part of the development proposals to reduce the impacts of the development, including a Travel Plan and footway improvements, as detailed below.

## Promoting Smarter Choices via Travel Planning

7.3 A Travel Plan (TP) has been prepared and is included as a standalone document within the application submission documentation. HCC guidance for Travel Plans is contained in 'A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans' adopted in January 2009. The guidance states:
"The main objectives of a residential travel plan are to:

- address residents' need for access to a full range of facilities and activities;
- reduce the traffic generated by the development; and
- encourage good design principles and support the local community."
7.4 The inclusion of travel planning principles at an early stage can also provide an opportunity to make a fundamental shift towards the provision of streets for people and social activity rather than purely a means of car access to properties."
7.5 The Travel Plan provides details of a range of initiatives to reduce the need for travel and to encourage the use of sustainable modes. It comprises a package of site-specific measures aimed at improving the available choices and to raise awareness of those choices.
7.6 It is anticipated that, over time, the Travel Plan will help to reduce the number of car-borne trips to and from the application site and thus reduce peak period congestion on the local highway network.
7.7 One incentive to encourage sustainable travel is the provision of travel vouchers, subsidising the cost of local bus travel. This will be provided for the first occupants of the units and will be valid for one year after occupation.
7.8 The developer will also provide a financial contribution towards the production of school travel plans in the area ( $£ 15,000$ ), as agreed as part of the previous planning consent.


## Foot/Cycleway Improvements

7.9 There is an existing footway to the east of the access on the southern side of Funtley Road which the site will connect with. It is proposed to widen the footway for a small section to tie in with the existing bus stop. This will also allow an opportunity to provide a crossing point so that pedestrians can connect with the northern footway and bus stop. This replicates the improvements proposed as part of the previous 55 unit scheme.
7.10 A further crossing point will be provided on Funtley Road centrally to connect with residential dwellings on the northern side of Funtley Road. This will provide existing residents with safe crossing points into the site to make use of the proposed community/retail facility.
7.11 The proposals will make use of the new footpath/cycle route across an existing bridge over the M27. This route has recently been introduced through extensive dialogue with HE and HCC.
7.12 The creation of the route will not only benefit new residents, but also existing residents within Funtley. This could assist in reducing existing car driver trips on the surrounding road network.

## Encouraging Cycle Trips

7.13 There is potential to make use of cycle trips as an important sustainable mode of travel from the site. This could be especially pertinent if combined with rail services, which are relatively frequent and within close proximity of the site for cyclists. There are also local amenities that can comfortably be accessed by cycle.
7.14 In order to encourage residents of the development to cycle to local amenities, residents will be provided with $£ 100$ vouchers (per dwelling) to assist towards the cost of purchasing new bicycles.

## Speed Limit Alterations

7.15 The previous consent on this site provided a financial contribution toward the revision of the existing traffic regulation order (TRO) to allow the speed limit restrictions on Funtley Road to be amended. This was at a cost of $£ 5,000$.
7.16 As this scheme would replace the previous consent, it is proposed to offer the same contribution again.

### 8.0 Summary and Conclusions

8.1 Motion has been instructed by Reside Developments Ltd to prepare this TA to accompany a planning application for a 125-dwelling residential development on land to the south of Funtley Road, Funtley.
8.2 In summary, this report has identified the following:

- The site is located adjacent to Funtley Road with access taken via a priority junction (design as per a previous consent on site);
- The development proposes additional footway links on Funtley Road to improve access from the site to the wider footway network;
- The development will make use of a pedestrian and cycle route which has recently been created, which links to amenities and bus services south of the M27;
- Fareham railway station is located within cycle distance of the site, providing links to Southampton, Portsmouth, Brighton, London Victoria and London Waterloo;
- Car and cycle parking for the development will be provided in accordance with the Fareham Residential Parking Standards SPD, with numbers and layout to be confirmed at the reserved matters stage;
- Servicing will be undertaken within the site, with the site able to accommodate the movements of a refuse vehicle entering and leaving the site in a forward gear;
$\Rightarrow$ The development would generate additional vehicular trips in the morning and evening peak hours, equivalent to less than two vehicles every minute;
- Capacity analysis indicates that the Kiln Road signal junction will operate in excess of capacity in the 2025 baseline scenarios. There is however scope to improve the operation of the junction through banning right turn movements on Kiln Lane and Old Turnpike. This has the effect of not only mitigating the development proposals, but would enable the junction to operate with greater capacity in 2025 than the observed scenarios; and
$\Rightarrow$ A Travel Plan has been developed for the site, promoting measures to encourage sustainable travel.


## Conclusion

8.3 In view of the above, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in transport policy terms and meets with national and local policy criteria. The assessment work undertaken has indicated that there would be no demonstrable harm arising from the proposed scheme and there are no identifiable severe impacts. Therefore, there are no traffic and transport related reasons why the development should not be granted planning consent.
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Appendix A
Officers Report Associated with Previous Planning Consent

Following demolition of existing buildings, residential development of up to 55 dwellings (including 3 custom-build homes) (Use Class C3), community building incorporating a local shop 250 sqm (Use Classes A1, A3, D1 \& D2), accesses and associated landscaping, infrastructure and development works

## OFFICER REPORT

### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 A report assessing the merits of this application and making an Officer recommendation was placed before the Council's Planning Committee at their meeting held on $10^{\text {th }}$ October 2018. Members of the Committee resolved to grant outline planning permission subject to a list of conditions and the applicant entering into a Section 106 legal agreement to secure various specified matters.
1.2 A further report was considered at a full Council meeting held on Thursday $5^{\text {th }}$ December 2019 concerning the annual review of the Council's constitution. Members resolved, amongst other things, to agree to an amendment to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers. The inserted wording at paragraph 2.17 of the scheme of delegation grants the following authority to the Head of Development Management:

Authority to determine planning applications, following due consideration of any further material planning considerations, and amendments to and/ or additional planning conditions and amendments to and/ or additional heads of terms in related planning obligations where necessary, to address any likely significant effects identified through appropriate assessments where:
i. The application has already been considered by the Planning Committee; ii. The Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission; and iii. An appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 has been carried out and concluded that the proposed development will not have an adverse effect on European designated sites subject to mitigation where identified.
1.3 A total of fifteen further objections have been received to the application since the committee meeting in 2018. The material planning considerations raised in those comments have been taken into account either at the time of the
previous recommendation to the Planning Committee in October 2018 or in the following report.

### 2.0 Application Proposal

2.1 The proposed development remains the same as considered by Members in October 2018 when it was resolved that planning permission be granted. The necessary Section 106 legal agreement covering the obligations agreed by members has been drafted.
2.2 There are several material changes to the planning considerations set out in the previous report to the Planning Committee.
2.3 The first of these changes is that the applicant has provided update ecological survey information. Secondly, there have been changes to the bus service to the village. A new access point to the site has been created from Funtley Road.
2.4 The Council's housing land supply position is marginally different to that at the time of Members considering the application in October 2018. Another material change is that, since the resolution to grant planning permission was passed by the Committee, Natural England have raised the issue of the adverse effects arising from new residential development on the water quality of the protected waters of the Solent. Finally, revised national guidance has been issued through the NPPF as published in February 2019 which in turn has a bearing on the correct approach to decision making.
2.5 Each of these changes is discussed in turn below.

## Ecology

2.6 The applicant has submitted an updated Ecological Assessment (prepared by Ecology Solutions in August 2020). The updated assessment has been considered by the Council's Ecologist who acknowledges that the site conditions remain broadly similar to that previously surveyed on the site, and as such the recommended condition remains relevant. That condition requires the submission of additional survey work and appropriate mitigation measures to be provided at the Reserved Matters stage. It is therefore considered that the proposed development will not have a harmful impact on protected species, subject to the submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan being provided with the Reserved Matters Applications.
2.7 The bus operator First Group recently announced that the No. 20 service between Fareham and Knowle has been permanently rerouted so that it does not pass through Funtley village. As a result there is no bus service to Funtley at present.
2.8 The report to the Planning Committee acknowledged that, whilst bus stops are located close to the site on Funtley Road, the service did not start particularly early or finish late and did not run at all on Sundays. Notwithstanding the already noted shortcomings in the bus service which was previously in place, it was considered that the overall package of measures proposed by the applicant, in particular the proposed improvements to pedestrian and cycle connectivity, would materially improve the sustainability of the location. The cessation of the bus service is therefore not considered to amount to a material change which would alter the conclusions reached on this matter.

## New vehicular access from Funtley Road

2.9 A new vehicular access to the land from Funtley Road was created during May 2020. Notwithstanding, a planning condition relating to the approved vehicular access (which reuses the existing access) has been revised to ensure that will be the only vehicular access to the site. This means that, should the development be carried out, the only vehicular access to the site will be as approved and as previously considered by Members of the Planning Committee in 2018.

## Housing land supply

2.10 The 2018 Planning Committee report set out the Council's five year housing land supply (5YHLS) position to be at 4.95 years.
2.11 The most recent assessment of the Council's 5YHLS was reported to Members of the Planning Committee on $24^{\text {th }}$ June 2020. That report sets out that the Council can currently demonstrate a housing supply of 4.03 years (a shortfall of 522 dwellings). The housing land supply position in terms of years is substantially the same as were previously reported to Members of the Planning Committee in October 2018.

## The impact upon European Protected Sites

2.12 Core Strategy Policy CS4 sets out the strategic approach to Biodiversity in respect of sensitive European sites and mitigation impacts on air quality. Policy DSP13: Nature Conservation of the Local Plan Part 2 confirms the requirement to ensure that designated sites, sites of nature conservation
value, protected and priority species populations and associated habitats are protected and where appropriate enhanced.
2.13 The Solent is internationally important for its wildlife. Each winter, it hosts over 90,000 waders and wildfowl including 10 per cent of the global population of Brent geese. These birds come from as far as Siberia to feed and roost before returning to their summer habitats to breed. There are also plants, habitats and other animals within the Solent which are of both national and international importance.
2.14 In light of their importance, areas within the Solent have been specially designated under UK/ European law. Amongst the most significant designations are Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). These are often referred to as 'European Protected Sites' (EPS).
2.15 Regulation 63 of the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 provides that planning permission can only be granted by a 'competent authority' if it can be shown that the proposed development will either not have a likely significant effect on designated EPS or, if it will have a likely significant effect, that effect can be mitigated so that it will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated EPS. This is done following a process known as an Appropriate Assessment. The competent authority is responsible for carrying out this process, although they must consult with Natural England and have regard to their representations. The competent authority is either the local planning authority or the Planning Inspectorate, depending on who is determining the application.
2.16 Natural England has highlighted that there is existing evidence of high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus in parts of The Solent with evidence of eutrophication. Natural England has further highlighted that increased levels of nitrates entering the Solent (because of increased amounts of wastewater from new dwellings) will have a likely significant effect upon the EPS through a deterioration in the water environment.
2.17 Achieving nutrient neutrality is one way to address the existing uncertainty surrounding the impact of new development on designated sites. Natural England have provided a methodology for calculating nutrient budgets and options for mitigation should this be necessary. The nutrient neutrality calculation includes key inputs and assumptions that are based on the bestavailable scientific evidence and research, however for each input there is a degree of uncertainty. Natural England advise local planning authorities to take a precautionary approach when addressing uncertainty and calculating nutrient budgets.
2.18 An Appropriate Assessment (AA) has been carried out by Officers and concludes that there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of European protected sites subject to mitigation measures. To inform the assessment the applicant has provided a nutrient budget of the development site and an updated parameter plan (secured by condition) to ensure that the assumptions made in the budget are accurate.
2.19 The applicant has proposed taking agricultural land, currently used as lowland grazing land adjacent to the site out of agricultural use, and converting the land into open space, which would be secured through the S106 legal agreement. By converting grazing land to open space by creating the Community Park would ensure there will be no additional nutrients reaching the European protected sites as a result of the development, and so would mitigate the adverse effects of the development. Details of this are set out in the AA and are shown on the Nitrogen Mitigation Plan (Drawing: D2546-037, prepared by Fabrik). The statutory consultee on nature conservation matters Natural England have commented on the AA advising that they consider the scheme acceptable, subject to it being secured by a S106 agreement.

## Changes to the NPPF and the proper approach to decision making

2.20 The starting point for the determination of this planning application is section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004:
"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise".
2.21 In determining planning applications there is a presumption in favour of the policies of the extant Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include the planning policies set out in the NPPF.
2.22 Paragraph 59 of the NPPF seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.
2.23 Paragraph 73 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement including a buffer. Where a local planning authority cannot do so, and when faced with applications involving the provision of housing, the policies of the local plan which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date.
2.24 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF then clarifies what is meant by the presumption in favour of sustainable development for decision-taking, including where relevant policies are "out-of-date". It states:
2.25 "For decision-taking this means:

- Approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting planning permission unless:
i. The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed ${ }^{6}$; or
ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole."
2.26 Footnote 6 to Paragraph 11 reads:
2.27 "The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 176) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 63); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change."
2.28 The key judgement is therefore whether the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies taken as a whole.
2.29 At the time of the Planning Committee considering the application in October 2018, the wording of paragraph 177 in the previous version of the NPPF read as follows:
2.30 "The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment because of its potential impact on a habitats site is being planned or determined".
2.31 This led to Officers advising that the presumption of favour of sustainable development in paragraph 11 of the NPPF should not be applied.
2.32 The publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in February 2019 included amended wording to paragraph 177. The revised wording of NPPF paragraph 177 in February 2019 reads:
"The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site."
2.33 In this instance an appropriate assessment has been carried out and has concluded no adverse effects on the integrity of European protected sites. With that in mind the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF should apply.
2.34 The Officer Report to the Planning Committee in October 2018 sets out the advice to Members in the event that government policy is subsequently clarified as then happened. Officers considered that:
(i) there are no policies within the National Planning Policy Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance which provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, particularly when taking into account that any significant effect upon Special Protection Areas can be mitigated through a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy; and
(ii) any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole.
2.35 The advice to Members was that even if paragraph 11 of the NPPF were a relevant consideration, Officers found that having applied the so-called 'tilted balance' of paragraph 11, they would have similarly concluded that planning permission should be granted for the proposals.


### 3.0 Summary

3.1 In summary, this application has previously received a resolution to grant planning permission by the Council's Planning Committee. An Appropriate

Assessment has been carried out concluding that the proposed development would not have any adverse effects on European protected sites subject to mitigation. There are no material changes to the relevant planning considerations since the time of the Committee resolution which alter the Officer recommendation which remains that planning permission should be granted.

## 1. Recommendation

Subject to:
(i) the applicant/owner first entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on terms drafted by the Solicitor to the Council in respect of the following:
a. To secure the delivery of $40 \%$ of the permitted dwellings as affordable housing;
b. To secure three of the permitted dwellings as custom-built properties;
c. To secure provision of a pedestrian and cycle public right of way through the site from Funtley Road (north) to Thames Drive (south); associated works to upgrade the bridge over the M27 motorway (including structural survey) and commuted sum for future maintenance;
d. To secure provision of, layout out (including provision of capital equipment required to establish the park) and transfer of community park land to Fareham Borough Council and a financial contribution of $£ 802,000$ towards the associated ongoing maintenance costs of operating the community park;
e. To secure the on-site provision of public open space including local equipped area of play (LEAP) in accordance with the Council's adopted Planning Obligations SPD, a financial contribution towards associated maintenance costs and transfer of the public open space to Fareham Borough Council;
f. To secure a financial contribution towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) in order to mitigate the 'in combination' effects that an increase in residential units on the site would cause through increased recreational disturbance on the Solent Coastal Special Protection Areas;
g. To secure a financial contribution towards the production of school travel plans in the area ( $£ 15,000$ );
h. To secure a financial contribution toward the revision of the existing traffic regulation order (TRO) to allow the speed limit restrictions on Funtley Road to be amended ( $£ 5,000$ );
i. To secure submission and implementation of a travel plan;
j. To secure details of the delivery of the community building, the transfer of land 0.1 hectares in size on the application site and funding on a pro-rata
basis of $£ 2,000$ per sqm of community use floorspace (to a maximum of $£ 500,000$ ) for provision of community/shop building and associated management arrangements for community use element along with pedestrian and vehicular access rights between the site of the community building and Funtley Road, or at the request of the Local Planning Authority the same sum for the provision or improvement of community facilities within Funtley calculated on a pro-rata basis minus the floor space of any remaining shop use on the application site.
(ii) and the conditions below.

## GRANT OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION

Conditions:

1) Application for approval of details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the development (referred to as the 'reserved matters') shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of twenty-four months from the date of this permission. Work shall be commenced in pursuance of this permission no later than twelve months from the approval of the final reserved matter.
REASON: To allow a reasonable time period for work to start, to comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and to enable the Council to review the position if a fresh application is made after that time.
2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following drawings/documents:
a) D2546_509-Revised Application Site Boundary Received 21 May 2018;
b) Drawing no. D2546_032_REVI - Parameters Plan - received 6th June 2018;
c) Technical Note - Potential Mitigation Measures for Bridge Over M27received 20th April 2018;
d) Drawing no. 1712047 SK01D - Access Arrangements - received 20th April 2018;
e) 1712047 SK03B - Pedestrian_Cycle Improvements Received 21 May 2018;
f) Drawing no. 1712047 SK05A - Pedestrian and Cycle Improvements south section -received 31st May 2018;
g) Ecological Assessment - Ecology Solutions - May 2018 and Ecological Baseline Note - Ecology Solutions - August 2020.
REASON: To avoid any doubt over what has been permitted.
3) No development hereby permitted shall commence until a surface water drainage strategy has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The strategy shall include the following elements:
a) Full details of the means of surface water drainage from the site;
b) The detailed design of Sustainable Urban Development Systems (SUDS) to be used on the site as well as details on the delivery, maintenance and adoption of SUDS features.
c) Assessment of surface water drainage discharge from the site in combination with the development site to the north of Funtley Road (planning application reference $\mathrm{P} / 17 / 1135 / \mathrm{OA}$ ) to demonstrate that: i. the greenfield runoff rate will not exceed $13.1 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{s}$ during the 1 in 100 year storm +(40\%CC);
ii. the surface water discharged to the Funtley Road ditch will comply with CIRIA C753 2015Table 26.2 \& Table 26.3.
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority in writing.
REASON: To ensure satisfactory disposal of surface water.
4) No development hereby permitted shall commence until details of the means of foul water drainage from the site have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority in writing.
REASON: To ensure satisfactory disposal of foul water.
5) No development hereby permitted shall take place until a Biodiversity Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The submitted plan shall be devised fully in accordance with the outline ecological mitigation and enhancements measures contained within the approved "Ecological Assessment - May 2018 - Ecology Solutions". The submitted plan shall include the following:
a) A Reptile and Dormouse Mitigation Strategy;
b) A Japanese Knotweed Eradication Scheme;
c) A Badger Protection Strategy;
d) Details of the timing of clearance works;
e) A detailed scheme of biodiversity enhancements;
f) Details of a soft landscaping scheme including provisions for buffer planting associated with the adjacent areas of Ancient Woodland;
g) Details of darkened corridors for foraging/commuting bats;
h) A Landscape/Ecology Management Plan including details of the maintenance of mitigation and enhancement measures.

The development shall be carried out fully in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Mitigation, Enhancement and Management Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To provide ecological compensation, management and enhancements.
6) No development shall commence until an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement for tree/hedgerow protection has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and the approved scheme has been implemented. The tree/hedgerow protection shall be retained throughout the development period until such time as all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. REASON: To ensure that the trees, shrubs and other natural features to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability during the construction period.
7) No development hereby permitted shall commence until an intrusive site investigation and risk assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The intrusive site investigation and risk assessment shall include assessment of the risks posed to human health, the building fabric and the wider environment such as water resources, and where the site investigation and risk assessment reveal a risk to receptors, it shall include a detailed scheme for remedial works to address these risks and ensure the site is suitable for the proposed use.

The presence of any unsuspected contamination that becomes evident during the development of the site shall be bought to the attention of the LPA. This shall be investigated to assess the risks to human health and the wider environment and a remediation scheme implemented following written approval by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme for remediation works shall be fully implemented before the permitted development is first occupied or brought into use.

On completion of the remediation works and prior to the occupation of any properties on the development, an independent competent person shall confirm in writing that the works have been completed in full and in accordance with the approved scheme. Such confirmation shall include photographic evidence and, if considered necessary by the local planning authority, as built drawings of the development.
REASON: To ensure that any contamination of the site is properly taken into account before development takes place.
8) No development hereby permitted shall commence on site until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) setting out how provision is to be
made on site for the parking and turning of operatives' vehicles, wheel cleaning, the areas to be used for the storage of building materials, plant, excavated materials and huts associated with the implementation of the approved development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The development shall be carried out in accordance with the CMP and areas identified in the CMP for specified purposes shall thereafter be kept available for those uses at all times during the construction period, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA. REASON: In the interests of highway safety and/or in order to secure the health and wellbeing of the trees and vegetation which are to be retained at the site and/or to ensure that the occupiers of nearby residential properties are not subjected to unacceptable noise and disturbance during the construction period.
9) No development hereby permitted shall commence until details of the width, alignment, gradient and type of construction proposed for any roads, footways and access, including all relevant horizontal and longitudinal cross sections showing the existing and proposed ground levels, together with details of street lighting (where appropriate), the method of disposing of surface water, and details of a programme for the making up of roads and footways, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To ensure that the roads are constructed to a satisfactory standard.
10) No development hereby permitted shall commence until details of the internal finished floor levels of all of the proposed buildings in relation to the existing and finished ground levels on the site and the adjacent land have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area and to assess the impact on nearby residential properties.
11) No development hereby permitted shall commence until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include proposed mitigation measures in relation to any archaeological remains found as necessary. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. REASON: In order to ensure that the site, which is located in an area where there is potential for archaeological discovery, is adequately investigated prior to development.
12) No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until a scheme for sound attenuation against traffic and railway noise has been
submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in writing. The scheme shall assess the impact of noise from vehicles and trains and identify the measures necessary to attenuate against noise nuisance to future occupants. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To prevent avoidable disturbance to residents from noise.
13) No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until details of secure cycle storage have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing. The approved secure cycle stores shall be provided before any dwelling is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained and kept available for use at all times.
REASON: To encourage cycling as an alternative mode of transport.
14) No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until details of the proposed bin storage areas (including bin collection points) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the siting, design and the materials to be used in construction. The approved bin storage and collection areas shall be provided before any dwelling is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained and kept available for use at all times.
REASON: To ensure that the character and appearance of the development and the locality are not harmed.
15) No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until details (including samples where requested by the Local Planning Authority) of all proposed external facing and hardsurfacing materials have been submitted to and approved by the LPA in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
REASON: To secure the satisfactory appearance of the development.
16) No work on site relating to the construction of any of the development hereby permitted (Including works of demolition or preparation prior to operations) shall take place before the hours of 0800 or after 1800 Monday to Friday, before the hours of 0800 or after 1300 Saturdays or at all on Sundays or recognised public holidays, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To protect the occupiers of nearby residential properties against noise and disturbance during the construction period.
17) None of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the pedestrian crossing points and means of vehicular access shown on the approved drawing "Drawing no. 1712047 SK01D - Access Arrangements received 20th April 2018" has been provided. The access shall be
subsequently retained and no other means of vehicular access to the site shall be provided at any time.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
18) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the visibility splays at the junction of the estate road/access with existing highway have been provided in accordance with the approved drawing "Drawing no. 1712047 SK01D - Access Arrangements - received 20th April 2018". The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept clear of obstruction (nothing over 0.6 m in height) at all times.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety
19) None of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until a plan of the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected to all boundaries has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved boundary treatment has been fully implemented. It shall thereafter be retained at all times unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

If boundary hedge planting is proposed details shall be provided of planting sizes, planting distances, density, and numbers and provisions for future maintenance. Any plants which, within a period of five years from first planting, are removed, die or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced, within the next available planting season, with others of the same species, size and number as originally approved.
REASON: To protect the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, to prevent overlooking, and to ensure that the development harmonises well with its surroundings.
20) The landscaping scheme, submitted under Condition 1 shall be implemented and completed within the first planting season following the commencement of the development or as otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed schedule. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from first planting, are removed, die or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced, within the next available planting season, with others of the same species, size and number as originally approved.
REASON: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a standard of landscaping.
21) No development shall proceed beyond damp proof course level until a scheme detailing the relocation of the existing bus stop on the south side of

Funtley Road adjacent to the vehicular entrance to the site has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. No dwelling hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the bus stop has been relocated in accordance with the approved scheme.
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
22) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of water efficiency measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These water efficiency measures should be designed to ensure potable water consumption does not exceed an average of 1101 per person per day. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of preserving water quality and resources

## Notes for Information

a) The applicant is advised to contact Southern Water to discuss the need for a formal application for connection to the public sewerage system. Please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 330303 0119) or visit www.southernwater.co.uk.

Appendix B
Personal Injury Accident (PIA) Data

## Accidents between dates 01/10/2012 and 30/09/2017 (60) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Pre-defined Query : ; Refined using Accidents
within selected Polygons -HC - RPU Statistics Request ("AW FUNTLEY ROAD, FUNTLEY CHQ/SR/0118/006")


|  | Factor: | Casation | Participant: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Slippery road (due to weather) | Confidence: |  |
| 2nd: |  |  | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

VEH 1 (M/CYCLE) TRAVELLING E ALONG FUNTLEY ROAD LOST CONTROL ON ICE CAUSING THE RIDER TO FALL.
Occurred on FUNTLEY ROAD OUTSIDE NUMBER 130, FAREHAM, HAMPSHIRE


## Accidents between dates $\quad \mathbf{0 1 / 1 0 / 2 0 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 9 / 2 0 1 7}$ (60) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Pre-defined Query : ; Refined using Accidents within selected Polygons -HC - RPU Statistics Request ("AW FUNTLEY ROAD, FUNTLEY CHQ/SR/0118/006")
150356194 13/10/2015 Time 1917 Vehicles $2 \quad$ Casualties $1 \quad$ Slight

E:456240 N: 108251 First Road: U Road Type Single carriageway
Speed limit: 30 Junction Detail: Not within 20 m of junction

Crossing: Control None
Darkness: street lights present and lit
Special Conditions at Site None
Place accident reported: Elsewhere

Facilities: None within 50m Road surface Dry
Fine without high winds
Carriageway Hazards: None
DfT Special Projects:

Causation

|  | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Sudden braking | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 2nd: |  |  |  |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

VEH 1 (CAR) TRAVELLING NW ALONG FUNTLEY ROAD OVERTOOK VEH 2 (P/CYCLE) AND THEN BRAKED SHARPLY, CAUSING VEH 2 TO COLLIDE WITH THE REAR OF VEH 1.
Occurred on FUNTLEY ROAD OUTSIDE NUMBER 116, FAREHAM, HAMPSHIRE


## Accidents between dates $\quad \mathbf{0 1 / 1 0 / 2 0 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 9 / 2 0 1 7}$ (60) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Pre-defined Query : ; Refined using Accidents within selected Polygons -HC - RPU Statistics Request ("AW FUNTLEY ROAD, FUNTLEY CHQ/SR/0118/006")


| Causation | Participant: | Confidence: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Junction restart | Vehicle 1 |
| 2nd: | Stationary or parked vehicle | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 3rd: | Stationary or parked vehicle | Vehicle 2 | Very Likely |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

VEH 1 (CAR) TRAVELLING NE ALONG LAKESIDE INTENDING TO TURN RIGHT ONTO FUNTLEY ROAD MOVING FORWARD DUE TO RESTRICTED VIEW FROM PARKED VEH'S, SUDDENLY STOPS AS VEH 2 (M/CYCLE) TRAVELLING NW ALONG FUNTLEY ROAD AND COLLIDES. Occurred on FUNTLEY ROAD AT JUNCTION WITH LAKESIDE, FAREHAM, HAMPSHIRE


## Accidents between dates $\quad \mathbf{0 1 / 1 0 / 2 0 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 9 / 2 0 1 7}$ (60) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Pre-defined Query : ; Refined using Accidents within selected Polygons -HC - RPU Statistics Request ("AW FUNTLEY ROAD, FUNTLEY CHQ/SR/0118/006")

| 140021249 | 18/01/2014 | Time | 2245 | Vehicles | 3 | Casualties | 2 | Slight |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E:456291 N: 1 | 08229 | First Road: | U | Road Type |  | - Single carr |  |  |
| Speed limit: 30 | Junction Detail: | T \& Stag |  | Give way or controlled |  |  |  | Unclassified |
| Crossing: Control | None |  | Facilities: | None with | 50m |  | Road surface | Wet/Damp |
| Darkness: street lights present and lit |  |  |  | Fine without high winds |  |  |  |  |
| Special Conditions at Site None |  |  |  | Carriageway Hazards: None |  |  |  |  |
| Place accident reported: At scent |  | ene |  | DfT Special Projects: |  |  |  |  |


| Causation |  |  |  |  |  |  | Participant: | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st: | Factor: | Poor turn or manoevre | Vehicle 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

## VEH 1 (CAR) TRAVELLING SE ALONG FUNTLEY ROAD LOSES CONTROL FOR UNKNOWN REASON AND COLLIDES WITH PARKED VEH 2 (CAR) WHICH WAS PUSHED INTO PARKED VEH 3 (VAN). Occurred on FUNTLEY ROAD AT JUNCTION WITH LAKESIDE, FAREHAM, HAMPSHIRE




For more information about the data please visit: www.crashmap.co.uk/home/Faq
To subscribe to unlimited reports using CrashMap Pro visit www.crashmap.co.uk/Home/Premium_Services

Vehicles involved

| Vehicle Ref | Vehicle Type | Vehicle Age | Driver Gender | Driver Age Band | Vehicle Maneouvre | First Point of Impact | Journey Purpose | Hit Object - On Carriageway | Hit Object - Off Carriageway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pedal cycle | -1 | Female | 26-35 | Vehicle proceeding normally along the carriageway, on a left hand bend | Did not impact | Other | None | None |

## Casualties

| Vehicle Ref | Casualty Ref | Injury Severity | Casualty Class | Gender | Age Band | Pedestrian Location | Pedestrian Movement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | Serious | Driver or rider | Female | 26-35 | Unknown or other | Unknown or other |

For more information about the data please visit: www.crashmap.co.uk/home/Faq
To subscribe to unlimited reports using CrashMap Pro visit www.crashmap.co.uk/Home/Premium_Services

Appendix C
Traffic Survey Data

## SS|reetwise

## Fareham: Queue Length Survey - Tuesday, 09 January 20

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

## Junction:

| CLASSIFICATION | PCU |
| :---: | :---: |
| P/CYCLE | 0.2 |
| M/CYCLE | 0.4 |
| CAR | 1.0 |
| LGV | 1.0 |
| OGV1 | 1.5 |
| OGV2 | 2.3 |
| BUS | 2.0 |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - Titchfield Lane / B - River Lane / C - Fontley Road

Approach: A - Titchfield Lane

| TIME |  |  | A to B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 07:00-07:15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15-07:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30-07:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45-08:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 08:15-08:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30-08:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:15 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:15-09:30 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:30-09:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:45-10:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 |
| Session Total | 0 | 0 | 34 | 5 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| 16:45-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 2 | 0 |
| 17:30-17:45 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:45-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 54 | 4 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:15-18:30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:30-18:45 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:45-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 |
| Session Total | 0 | 1 | 114 | 8 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 15 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 37 |
| 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 110 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 44 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 169 |
| 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 0 | 0 | 8.0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 110 |
| 0 | 0 | 39 | 39 | 2 | 5 | 389 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 0 | 1 | 5.0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 48 |
| 0 | 0 | 9.0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 56 |
| 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 47 |
| 0 | 1 | 31 | 30 | 1 | 3 | 182 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| 0 | 0 | 19.4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 64 |
| 0 | 0 | 58 | 59 | 1 | 0 | 300 |
| 0 | 0 | 10.0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 67 |
| 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| 0 | 0 | 8.0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 1 | 200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 124 | 124 | 2 | 4 | 682 |


| A to C |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17.4 | 18 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 30 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.4 | 35 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40.4 | 41 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 124 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 48 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.0 | 52 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51.0 | 51 | 0 |
| 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 43.5 | 42 | 0 |
| 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 193 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 44.5 | 44 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30.5 | 30 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34.5 | 34 | 0 |
| 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31.2 | 31 | 0 |
| 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 139 | 0 |
| 52 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 456 | 456 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44.0 | 44 | 0 |
| 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 68.6 | 69 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 68.4 | 68 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60.4 | 61 | 0 |
| 52 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 242 | 0 |
| 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 78.0 | 77 | 0 |
| 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 95.5 | 95 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94.0 | 94 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65.2 | 66 | 0 |
| 28 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 332 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72.4 | 73 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 62.5 | 62 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 43.5 | 43 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 35 | 0 |
| 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 213 | 0 |
| 88 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 788 | 787 | 0 |



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| Session Total | 2 | 5 | 423 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 1 | 1 | 50 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 0 | 1 | 62 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 0 | 1 | 62 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | 207 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 0 | 1 | 100 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 77 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 4}$ |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 0 | 1 | 77 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ |


| Session Total | 2 | 5 | 796 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| From A |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.4 | 19 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.0 | 32 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.4 | 38 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42.4 | 43 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 132 | 1 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.0 | 52 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.0 | 54 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 54 | 1 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 50.5 | 49 | 0 |
| 20 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 209 | 1 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 49.5 | 49 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 38.5 | 38 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34.5 | 34 | 0 |
| 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33.2 | 33 | 1 |
| 25 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 154 | 1 |
| 57 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 495 | 495 | 3 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46.0 | 46 | 0 |
| 18 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 73.6 | 73 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 77.4 | 77 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75.4 | 76 | 0 |
| 56 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 272 | 272 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 91.0 | 90 | 0 |
| 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 114.9 | 115 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107.0 | 107 | 2 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78.2 | 79 | 0 |
| 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 391 | 391 | 2 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82.4 | 83 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 67.5 | 67 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 51.5 | 51 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 47 | 0 |
| 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 248 | 5 |
| 96 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 912 | 911 | 7 |


| To A |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS |
| 0 | 80 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 106 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 116 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 122 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 424 | 58 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 104 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 94 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 67 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 78 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 343 | 55 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 62 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 45 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 38 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 25 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 170 | 38 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 937 | 151 | 20 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 46 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 50 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 52 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 55 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 203 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 44 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 68 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 37 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 40 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 189 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 99 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 491 | 42 | 9 | 0 | 0 |


| PCU | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: |
| 90.0 | 90 |
| 124.6 | 124 |
| 132.0 | 131 |
| 148.9 | 148 |
| 496 | 493 |
| 125.5 | 125 |
| 110.7 | 110 |
| 86.6 | 86 |
| 86.0 | 86 |
| 409 | 407 |
| 75.5 | 75 |
| 60.0 | 59 |
| 51.5 | 50 |
| 33.6 | 34 |
| 220 | 218 |


| 1125 | 1118 |
| :--- | :--- |


| 52.0 | 51 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 58.5 | 57 |
| 56.5 | 56 |
| 65.9 | 66 |
| 233 | 230 |
| 51.7 | 53 |
| 72.0 | 72 |
| 45.4 | 47 |
| 43.5 | 43 |
| 212 | 215 |
| 33.0 | 33 |
| 32.4 | 37 |
| 24.0 | 24 |
| 15.0 | 15 |
| 104 | 109 |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - Titchfield Lane / B - River Lane / C - Fontley Road

Approach: B - River Lane


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 14.5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| 0 | 0 | 26.9 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 0 | 0 | 31.2 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 0 | 0 | 93 | 94 | 1 | 0 | 58 |
| 0 | 0 | 30.4 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 1 | 0 | 33.2 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 0 | 0 | 30.9 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 27.5 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 1 | 0 | 122 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| 0 | 0 | 17.4 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 | 17.6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 17.0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 17.5 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 70 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 1 | 0 | 285 | 290 | 1 | 0 | 138 |
| 0 | 0 | 11.0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 27.2 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 0 | 74 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 0 | 0 | 37.9 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 27.0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 18.2 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 103 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 14.0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 57 | 57 | 5 | 0 | 13 |
| 0 | 0 | 234 | 235 | 5 | 0 | 40 |



| B to B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 |


| 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |


| 0.0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{6 8}$ |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 19 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 5 | 0 | 17 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{6 7}$ |


| Session Total | 7 | 1 | 240 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| From B |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27.5 | 27 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 41.2 | 41 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 40.9 | 42 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.2 | 53 | 0 |
| 17 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 162 | 163 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 50.4 | 51 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 48.2 | 48 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 39.4 | 40 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 42.5 | 42 | 0 |
| 18 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 180 | 181 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.4 | 27 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.6 | 27 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30.5 | 30 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22.5 | 22 | 0 |
| 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 106 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 445 | 450 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.0 | 25 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16.5 | 16 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.2 | 34 | 1 |
| 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 88 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 44.4 | 44 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 30 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.0 | 25 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.2 | 20 | 1 |
| 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 119 | 3 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 22 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 15 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.0 | 16 | 2 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 75 | 4 |
| 31 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 277 | 282 | 9 |


| To B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS |
| 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 60 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 26 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 106 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 79 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 245 | 48 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 32 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 43 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 51 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 157 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 65 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 33 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 199 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 111 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 467 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL |
| 11.5 | 11 |
| 11.0 | 11 |
| 24.7 | 25 |
| 31.0 | 31 |
| 78 | 78 |
| 36.5 | 36 |
| 36.7 | 37 |
| 29.4 | 31 |
| 26.0 | 26 |
| 129 | 130 |
| 29.2 | 30 |
| 28.5 | 28 |
| 21.0 | 20 |
| 20.5 | 20 |
| 99 | 98 |

306 306

| 42.5 | 43 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 38.4 | 38 |
| 52.0 | 52 |
| 54.9 | 57 |
| 187 | 190 |
| 67.2 | 68 |
| 60.6 | 62 |
| 37.0 | 37 |
| 47.2 | 48 |
| 212 | 215 |
| 36.2 | 37 |
| 27.2 | 28 |
| 21.0 | 21 |
| 30.9 | 32 |
| 116 | 118 |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - Titchfield Lane / B - River Lane / C - Fontley Road

Approach: C - Fontley Road

|  |  |  |  | C to A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 07:00-07:15 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 7 | 0 |
| 07:15-07:30 | 0 | 1 | 88 | 12 | 2 |
| 07:30-07:45 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 12 | 2 |
| 07:45-08:00 | 0 | 1 | 105 | 18 | 3 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 2 | 366 | 49 | 7 |
| 08:00-08:15 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 17 | 1 |
| 08:15-08:30 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 14 | 0 |
| 08:30-08:45 | 1 | 1 | 61 | 12 | 3 |
| 08:45-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 8 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 2 | 290 | 51 | 4 |
| 09:00-09:15 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 11 | 1 |
| 09:15-09:30 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 10 | 2 |
| 09:30-09:45 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 9 | 2 |
| 09:45-10:00 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 4 | 2 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 1 | 143 | 34 | 7 |
| Session Total | 2 | 5 | 799 | 134 | 18 |
| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 3 | 2 |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 4 | 3 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 3 | 1 |
| 16:45-17:00 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 9 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 189 | 19 | 7 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 3 | 39 | 5 | 0 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 4 | 0 |
| 17:30-17:45 | 2 | 0 | 33 | 7 | 0 |
| 17:45-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 3 | 176 | 18 | 1 |
| 18:00-18:15 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 2 | 0 |
| 18:15-18:30 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:30-18:45 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:45-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 86 | 4 | 0 |
| Session Total | 2 | 5 | 451 | 41 | 8 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 77.0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 0 | 103.4 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 0 | 0 | 118.0 | 117 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| 0 | 0 | 127.9 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 427 | 424 | 1 | 0 | 53 |
| 0 | 0 | 105.5 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 1 | 0 | 95.7 | 95 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| 0 | 0 | 78.1 | 78 | 2 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 71.0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 1 | 0 | 350 | 349 | 3 | 0 | 92 |
| 0 | 0 | 67.5 | 67 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| 0 | 0 | 53.0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 0 | 0 | 28.6 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 0 | 0 | 188 | 186 | 1 | 0 | 66 |
| 1 | 0 | 965 | 959 | 5 | 0 | 211 |
| 0 | 0 | 50.0 | 49 | 1 | 2 | 29 |
| 0 | 0 | 55.5 | 54 | 0 | 1 | 30 |
| 0 | 0 | 53.5 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 0 | 0 | 59.9 | 60 | 1 | 3 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 219 | 216 | 2 | 6 | 132 |
| 0 | 0 | 45.2 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 53 |
| 0 | 0 | 69.0 | 69 | 1 | 0 | 38 |
| 0 | 0 | 40.4 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 42.5 | 42 | 1 | 0 | 33 |
| 0 | 0 | 197 | 200 | 3 | 0 | 145 |
| 0 | 0 | 29.0 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 0 | 26.4 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 17 |
| 0 | 0 | 90 | 91 | 4 | 0 | 76 |
| 0 | 0 | 506 | 507 | 9 | 6 | 353 |


| C to B |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10.5 | 10 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9.0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 21.7 | 22 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.0 | 29 | 0 |
| 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 70 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32.5 | 32 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 34.7 | 35 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26.4 | 28 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.0 | 19 | 0 |
| 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 114 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.2 | 25 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20.5 | 20 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 19 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18.5 | 18 | 0 |
| 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 82 | 0 |
| 42 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 266 | 0 |
| 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40.5 | 41 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33.4 | 34 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43.0 | 43 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 39.9 | 42 | 0 |
| 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 160 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.2 | 55 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41.2 | 42 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 24 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.2 | 35 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 156 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26.2 | 27 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.2 | 23 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18.9 | 20 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 83 | 0 |
| 26 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 391 | 399 | 0 |



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 5.0 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 |


| 5 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |


| 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |


|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| $07: 00-07: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| $07: 15-07: 30$ | 0 | 1 | 97 |
| $07: 30-07: 45$ | 1 | 0 | 119 |
| $07: 45-08: 00$ | 0 | 1 | 126 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | 419 |
| $08: 00-08: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 113 |
| $08: 15-08: 30$ | 1 | 1 | 103 |
| $08: 30-08: 45$ | 3 | 1 | 84 |
| $08: 45-09: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 2}$ |
| $09: 00-09: 15$ | 1 | 0 | 73 |
| $09: 15-09: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| $09: 30-09: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| $09: 45-10: 00$ | 1 | 1 | 35 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 9}$ |


| Session Total | 7 | 5 | 1010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 1 | 2 | 73 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 0 | 1 | 77 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 1 | 4 | 85 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | 321 |
| $17: 00-17: 15$ | 1 | 3 | 92 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 1 | 0 | 103 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 2 | 0 | 54 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 72 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 1}$ |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 1 | 0 | 53 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 1 | 1 | 48 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 2 | 0 | 29 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2}$ |


| Session Total | 11 | 11 | 804 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL |
| 31.9 | 32 |
| 50.0 | 50 |
| 61.3 | 63 |
| 71.6 | 73 |
| 215 | 218 |
| 78.4 | 79 |
| 83.2 | 85 |
| 81.9 | 83 |
| 71.0 | 69 |
| 314 | 316 |
| 61.9 | 63 |
| 48.1 | 50 |
| 51.5 | 51 |
| 53.7 | 53 |
| 215 | 217 |


| 744 | 751 |
| :--- | :--- |


| 55.0 | 55 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 90.6 | 91 |
| 81.9 | 81 |
| 87.6 | 89 |
| 315 | 316 |
| 115.9 | 115 |
| 122.5 | 122 |
| 114.0 | 114 |
| 83.4 | 85 |
| 435 | 436 |
| 90.4 | 91 |
| 74.5 | 74 |
| 56.5 | 56 |
| 50.0 | 49 |
| 271 | 270 |

## Shlreetwise

## Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - Titchfield Lane / B - River Lane / C - Fontley Road


Arm Destination

|  | A | B | C | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 0 | 163 | 1243 | 1406 |
| B | 206 | 1 | 525 | 732 |
| C | 1466 | 665 | 5 | 2136 |
| Total | 1672 | 829 | 1773 |  |

## SS|reetwise

## Fareham: Queue Length Survey - Tuesday, 09 January 20

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

## Junction:

| CLASSIFICATION | PCU |
| :---: | :---: |
| P/CYCLE | 0.2 |
| M/CYCLE | 0.4 |
| CAR | 1.0 |
| LGV | 1.0 |
| OGV1 | 1.5 |
| OGV2 | 2.3 |
| BUS | 2.0 |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road

Approach: A - North Hill

| TIME |  |  | A to B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 07:00-07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15-07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30-07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45-08:00 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:15-08:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30-08:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:15-09:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:30-09:45 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:45-10:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Session Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30-17:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:15-18:30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:30-18:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:45-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Session Total | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 47 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 84 |
| 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 231 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 145 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 423 |


| A to C |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7.9 | 8 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 56 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27.0 | 27 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30.0 | 29 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.0 | 29 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 26.5 | 26 | 0 |
| 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 113 | 111 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30.4 | 31 | 1 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.0 | 38 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 27.5 | 27 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.0 | 16 | 0 |
| 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 112 | 1 |
| 41 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 279 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 39 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47.0 | 47 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36.0 | 36 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34.0 | 34 | 0 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 156 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48.9 | 49 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32.0 | 32 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 39 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46.0 | 46 | 0 |
| 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 166 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 35 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 39 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.0 | 37 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45.0 | 45 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 156 | 0 |
| 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 478 | 478 | 1 |



|  |  |  |  | A to A |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 22.9 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.5 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29.5 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 35.5 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31.0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36.3 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 47.0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 142 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.2 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23.0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19.0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22.5 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 91 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 346 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 97.8 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 110.9 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 119.9 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 130.0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 459 | 458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 114.0 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 113.0 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 116.6 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 103.4 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 447 | 448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81.8 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 97.0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 108.8 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 68.0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 356 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1262 | 1264 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE |
| $07: 00-07: 15$ | 0 |
| $07: 15-07: 30$ | 0 |
| $07: 30-07: 45$ | 0 |
| $07: 45-08: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 |
| $08: 00-08: 15$ | 0 |
| $08: 15-08: 30$ | 0 |
| $08: 30-08: 45$ | 0 |
| $08: 45-09: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 |
| $09: 00-09: 15$ | 1 |
| $09: 15-09: 30$ | 0 |
| $09: 30-09: 45$ | 0 |
| $09: 45-10: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Session Total | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 0 |
| :---: | :--- |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 0 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 0 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 |
| $17: 00-17: 15$ | 0 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 0 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 1 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 0 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 0 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{0}$ |

Session Total $\quad 1$


|  |  |  |  |  | To A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 30.8 | 30 | 0 | 5 | 160 | 24 | 1 |
| 38.5 | 38 | 0 | 2 | 147 | 17 | 1 |
| 51.5 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 22 | 1 |
| 49.5 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 18 | 2 |
| 171 | 168 | 0 | 7 | 628 | 81 | 5 |
| 60.0 | 60 | 1 | 3 | 177 | 9 | 1 |
| 67.3 | 65 | 0 | 1 | 153 | 12 | 2 |
| 76.0 | 76 | 1 | 0 | 128 | 18 | 1 |
| 56.5 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 15 | 0 |
| 260 | 257 | 2 | 4 | 585 | 54 | 4 |
| 56.6 | 58 | 0 | 2 | 82 | 11 | 1 |
| 62.0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 14 | 2 |
| 48.5 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 65 | 12 | 0 |
| 38.5 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 15 | 2 |
| 205 | 206 | 1 | 2 | 281 | 52 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 636 | 631 | 3 | 13 | 1494 | 187 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 138.8 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 14 | 1 |
| 157.9 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 9 | 0 |
| 157.9 | 156 | 1 | 1 | 57 | 9 | 0 |
| 164.0 | 164 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 9 | 0 |
| 619 | 618 | 2 | 1 | 222 | 41 | 1 |
| 163.9 | 164 | 0 | 1 | 83 | 6 | 0 |
| 146.0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 6 | 1 |
| 155.6 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 6 | 0 |
| 151.4 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 7 | 1 |
| 617 | 618 | 0 | 1 | 277 | 25 | 2 |
| 116.8 | 118 | 1 | 1 | 50 | 4 | 0 |
| 137.0 | 137 | 0 | 1 | 52 | 5 | 0 |
| 146.8 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 7 | 0 |
| 113.0 | 113 | 2 | 1 | 68 | 3 | 1 |
| 514 | 516 | 3 | 3 | 218 | 19 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1750 | 1752 | 5 | 5 | 717 | 85 | 4 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 187.5 | 190 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 166.3 | 167 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 185.5 | 184 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 182.0 | 181 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 722 | 722 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 188.9 | 191 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 170.4 | 169 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 147.7 | 148 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 144.0 | 143 |  |
| 0 | 2 | 651 | 651 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 95.3 | 96 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 95.0 | 94 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 77.2 | 78 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 76.0 | 74 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 344 | 342 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 4 | 1717 | 1715 |  |


| 1 | 0 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 67.0 | 67 |
| 1 | 1 | 70.9 | $\mathbf{7 0}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 62.2 | 63 |
| 2 | 1 | 272 | 270 |
| 0 | 0 | 89.4 | 90 |
| 0 | 0 | 87.5 | 87 |
| 0 | 0 | 66.0 | 66 |
| 0 | 0 | 62.5 | 62 |
| 0 | 0 | 305 | 305 |
| 0 | 0 | 54.6 | 56 |
| 0 | 0 | 57.4 | 58 |
| 0 | 0 | 55.0 | 55 |
| 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ |
| 0 |  | 241 | $\mathbf{2 4 4}$ |


| 2 | 1 | 818 | 819 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road

Approach: B - Old Turnpike

| TIME |  |  | B to C |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 07:00-07:15 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15-07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 07:30-07:45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45-08:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 |
| 08:00-08:15 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 08:15-08:30 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30-08:45 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:45-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 09:15-09:30 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30-09:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:45-10:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 1 |
| Session Total | 1 | 0 | 35 | 6 | 1 |
| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:45-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:30-17:45 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 17:45-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:15 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:15-18:30 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:30-18:45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 18:45-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 |
| Session Total | 0 | 0 | 39 | 5 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 3.2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 54 |
| 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 30 |
| 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 27 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 34 |
| 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 116 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 106 |
| 0 | 0 | 43 | 43 | 7 | 0 | 276 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 42 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 55 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 189 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 46 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 48 |
| 0 | 0 | 8.0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 44 |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 192 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 48 |
| 0 | 0 | 7.0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 0 | 0 | 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 36 |
| 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 165 |
| 0 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 9 | 6 | 546 |


| $B$ to D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.2 | 11 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 12 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17.0 | 17 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 28.7 | 28 | 0 |
| 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 68 | 68 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.2 | 30 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36.7 | 37 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31.2 | 31 | 0 |
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 42.2 | 42 | 0 |
| 16 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 140 | 140 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 35 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 31.7 | 32 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 32.0 | 31 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.0 | 25 | 0 |
| 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 123 | 0 |
| 38 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 332 | 331 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46.0 | 46 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 48.4 | 49 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 63.5 | 66 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55.0 | 55 | 0 |
| 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 213 | 216 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.2 | 51 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56.0 | 56 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52.8 | 55 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48.4 | 49 | 0 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 211 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51.0 | 53 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48.0 | 48 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.0 | 38 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37.4 | 38 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 177 | 0 |
| 41 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 595 | 604 | 0 |



|  |  |  |  | $B$ to $B$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE |
| $07: 00-07: 15$ | 2 |
| $07: 15-07: 30$ | 0 |
| $07: 30-07: 45$ | 0 |
| $07: 45-08: 00$ | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 3 |
| $08: 00-08: 15$ | 1 |
| $08: 15-08: 30$ | 1 |
| $08: 30-08: 45$ | 1 |
| $08: 45-09: 00$ | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 4 |
| $09: 00-09: 15$ | 0 |
| $09: 15-09: 30$ | 1 |
| $09: 30-09: 45$ | 0 |
| $09: 45-10: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 |


| Session Total | 8 |
| :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 2 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 3 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 5 |
| $17: 00-17: 15$ | 1 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 0 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 2 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 3 |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 1 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 0 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |

Session Total $\quad 9$


|  |  |  |  |  | To B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 16.4 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 |
| 16.5 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 0 |
| 22.0 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 5 | 1 |
| 35.7 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 6 | 1 |
| 91 | 91 | 4 | 2 | 109 | 16 | 2 |
| 37.2 | 38 | 1 | 2 | 39 | 4 | 0 |
| 43.7 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 7 | 0 |
| 38.2 | 38 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 5 | 0 |
| 45.2 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 0 |
| 165 | 165 | 3 | 2 | 158 | 17 | 0 |
| 39.0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 5 | 0 |
| 38.7 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 4 | 0 |
| 36.0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 4 | 0 |
| 31.5 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 |
| 145 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 17 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 401 | 400 | 7 | 4 | 374 | 50 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50.0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 51.4 | 52 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 0 |
| 67.5 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5 | 0 |
| 60.0 | 60 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 229 | 232 | 1 | 1 | 73 | 10 | 0 |
| 54.2 | 55 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 60.0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 |
| 57.8 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 |
| 56.4 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| 229 | 232 | 1 | 1 | 81 | 3 | 0 |
| 57.0 | 59 | 2 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 0 |
| 57.0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 44.0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 |
| 40.4 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 198 | 201 | 2 | 0 | 80 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 656 | 665 | 4 | 2 | 234 | 16 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 17.8 | 20 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 27.2 | 28 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 33.1 | 34 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 51.5 | 51 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 130 | 133 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 44.0 | 46 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 54 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 36.4 | 38 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 42.0 | 42 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 177 | 180 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 28 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 33.0 | 33 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 35 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 28 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 124 | 124 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 431 | 437 |  |


| 0 | 0 | 17.0 | 17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 23.2 | 24 |
| 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 21.4 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 83 | 85 |
| 0 | 0 | 20.4 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 19.2 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 | 23.0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 84 | 86 |
| 0 | 0 | 23.4 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 21.0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 18 |
| 0 | 0 | 21.0 | 21 |
| 0 |  | 83 | 85 |


| 0 | 0 | 250 | 256 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road

Approach: C - Park Lane

| TIME |  |  | C to D |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 07:00-07:15 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15-07:30 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:30-07:45 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:45-08:00 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 1 |
| 08:00-08:15 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| 08:15-08:30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30-08:45 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 |
| 08:45-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 39 | 4 | 0 |
| 09:00-09:15 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:15-09:30 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| 09:30-09:45 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 |
| 09:45-10:00 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 48 | 6 | 1 |
| Session Total | 1 | 0 | 115 | 10 | 2 |
| 16:00-16:15 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:15-16:30 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 0 |
| 16:45-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 71 | 5 | 0 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 0 |
| 17:15-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:30-17:45 | 1 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 0 |
| 17:45-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 0 | 113 | 7 | 0 |
| 18:00-18:15 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 2 | 0 |
| 18:15-18:30 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:30-18:45 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 |
| 18:45-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 2 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 69 | 6 | 0 |
| Session Total | 1 | 1 | 253 | 18 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 52 |
| 0 | 0 | 11.5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 0 | 0 | 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 0 | 0 | 8.2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 57 |
| 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 2 | 202 |
| 0 | 0 | 11.0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 59 |
| 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 0 | 0 | 16.0 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 46 |
| 0 | 0 | 11.0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 0 | 0 | 43 | 43 | 1 | 1 | 195 |
| 0 | 0 | 13.0 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| 0 | 0 | 12.0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 14.0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| 0 | 0 | 16.5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 0 | 0 | 56 | 55 | 1 | 1 | 88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 129 | 128 | 2 | 4 | 485 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 19.0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| 0 | 1 | 78 | 77 | 2 | 0 | 85 |
| 0 | 0 | 26.0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| 0 | 0 | 28.2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 0 | 0 | 31.0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 120 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| 0 | 0 | 19.4 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 14.0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 24.0 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 25 |
| 0 | 0 | 75 | 76 | 1 | 2 | 90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 273 | 274 | 3 | 2 | 284 |


| C to A |  |  |  |  |  | P/CYCLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 63.3 | 64 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 53.5 | 53 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 58.5 | 58 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 67.5 | 67 | 0 |
| 34 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 242 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 64.9 | 65 | 0 |
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 50.0 | 49 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50.2 | 51 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54.0 | 54 | 0 |
| 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 219 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29.4 | 30 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27.2 | 28 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20.5 | 20 | 0 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 100 | 0 |
| 62 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 561 | 561 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26.0 | 26 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26.0 | 26 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 30.5 | 30 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23.2 | 24 | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 105 | 106 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35.0 | 35 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39.0 | 39 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 20 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28.0 | 28 | 0 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 122 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23.6 | 25 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 22 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.0 | 25 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25.4 | 26 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 98 | 0 |
| 36 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 323 | 326 | 0 |


| C to B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 | OGV2 | BUS |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |  |  | C to C |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE |
| $07: 00-07: 15$ | 0 |
| $07: 15-07: 30$ | 0 |
| $07: 30-07: 45$ | 0 |
| $07: 45-08: 00$ | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 1 |
| $08: 00-08: 15$ | 0 |
| $08: 15-08: 30$ | 0 |
| $08: 30-08: 45$ | 1 |
| $08: 45-09: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 |
| $09: 00-09: 15$ | 0 |
| $09: 15-09: 30$ | 0 |
| $09: 30-09: 45$ | 1 |
| $09: 45-10: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Session Total | 3 |
| :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 0 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 1 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 2 |
| $17: 00-17: 15$ | 0 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 0 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 1 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 1 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 0 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| Session Total | 4 |
| :---: | :---: |



|  |  |  |  | To C |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 69.3 | 70 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 1 |
| 65.0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 |
| 62.5 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 |
| 75.7 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 3 | 1 |
| 273 | 272 | 1 | 1 | 76 | 9 | 2 |
| 75.9 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 4 | 0 |
| 55.0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 2 | 2 |
| 66.2 | 67 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 4 | 0 |
| 65.0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 1 |
| 262 | 262 | 1 | 0 | 179 | 11 | 3 |
| 42.4 | 43 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 9 | 0 |
| 34.0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 12 | 0 |
| 41.2 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 8 | 1 |
| 38.0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 2 | 1 |
| 155 | 156 | 0 | 1 | 164 | 31 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 690 | 690 | 2 | 2 | 419 | 51 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45.0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 10 | 0 |
| 41.0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 5 | 0 |
| 50.5 | 50 | 2 | 0 | 43 | 8 | 0 |
| 47.2 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 8 | 0 |
| 183 | 183 | 3 | 0 | 177 | 31 | 0 |
| 61.0 | 61 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 8 | 1 |
| 74.0 | 74 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 4 | 0 |
| 48.2 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 4 | 0 |
| 59.0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 5 | 0 |
| 242 | 243 | 0 | 2 | 204 | 21 | 1 |
| 43.0 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 3 | 0 |
| 36.0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 4 | 0 |
| 43.0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 2 | 0 |
| 49.4 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 5 | 0 |
| 171 | 174 | 0 | 1 | 212 | 14 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 596 | 600 | 3 | 3 | 593 | 66 | 1 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 15.1 | 16 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 18.0 | 18 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 29.0 | 29 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 26.5 | 26 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 88 | 89 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 42.0 | 42 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 43.0 | 42 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 57.2 | 58 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 52.5 | 52 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 195 | 194 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 53.4 | 54 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 63.0 | 63 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 45.5 | 45 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 36.5 | 36 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 198 | 198 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 481 | 481 |  |


| 0 | 0 | 53.0 | 53 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 63.0 | 63 |
| 0 | 1 | 53.4 | 54 |
| 0 | 0 | 41.2 | 42 |
| 0 | 1 | 211 | 212 |
| 0 | 0 | 62.9 | 63 |
| 0 | 0 | 43.4 | 44 |
| 0 | 0 | 49.0 | 49 |
| 0 | 0 | 72.0 | 72 |
| 0 | 0 | 228 | 228 |
| 0 | 0 | 48.4 | 49 |
| 0 | 0 | 58.0 | 58 |
| 0 | 0 | 52.0 | 52 |
| 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 0}$ | 68 |
| 0 |  | 226 | 227 |


| 0 | 1 | 665 | 667 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## S streetwise

Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

## Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.

Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road

Approach: D-Kiln Road


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 121.2 | 123 | 2 | 1 | 16 |
| 0 | 0 | 109.8 | 111 | 1 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 1 | 124.0 | 123 | 1 | 1 | 26 |
| 0 | 0 | 111.5 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 0 | 1 | 467 | 468 | 4 | 2 | 108 |
| 0 | 0 | 123.0 | 125 | 1 | 2 | 37 |
| 0 | 1 | 116.4 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 0 | 0 | 95.5 | 95 | 2 | 0 | 31 |
| 0 | 1 | 90.0 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 0 | 2 | 425 | 425 | 3 | 2 | 153 |
| 0 | 0 | 63.9 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 0 | 70.0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 0 | 0 | 50.0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 0 | 1 | 53.5 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 1 | 237 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 105 |
| 0 | 4 | 1129 | 1128 | 7 | 4 | 366 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0 | 45.8 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 0 | 0 | 40.0 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| 0 | 1 | 39.4 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 0 | 0 | 38.0 | 38 | 0 | 1 | 21 |
| 1 | 1 | 163 | 161 | 1 | 1 | 69 |
| 0 | 0 | 52.4 | 53 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| 0 | 0 | 46.5 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| 0 | 0 | 44.0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 34.5 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 | 177 | 177 | 1 | 1 | 77 |
| 0 | 0 | 29.0 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 0 | 33.4 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 0 | 0 | 26.0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 0 | 0 | 47.9 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 0 | 0 | 136 | 138 | 2 | 0 | 79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 476 | 476 | 4 | 2 | 225 |




|  |  |  |  |  | D to D |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9.5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8.0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23.2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23.0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 64 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21.0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21.0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16.0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 72 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 159 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.4 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 42 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12.0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9.4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7.0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9.4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12.0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13.0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20.0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 54 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 142 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TIME | P/CYCLE |
| $07: 00-07: 15$ | 2 |
| $07: 15-07: 30$ | 1 |
| $07: 30-07: 45$ | 1 |
| $07: 45-08: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 4 |
| $08: 00-08: 15$ | 2 |
| $08: 15-08: 30$ | 0 |
| $08: 30-08: 45$ | 3 |
| $08: 45-09: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 5 |
| $09: 00-09: 15$ | 0 |
| $09: 15-09: 30$ | 0 |
| $09: 30-09: 45$ | 0 |
| $09: 45-10: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 0 |


| Session Total | 9 |
| :---: | :---: |


| $16: 00-16: 15$ | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 1 |
| $16: 30-16: 45$ | 2 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 4 |
| $17: 00-17: 15$ | 0 |
| $17: 15-17: 30$ | 1 |
| $17: 30-17: 45$ | 0 |
| $17: 45-18: 00$ | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 1 |
| $18: 00-18: 15$ | 2 |
| $18: 15-18: 30$ | 0 |
| $18: 30-18: 45$ | 0 |
| $18: 45-19: 00$ | 2 |
| Hourly Total | 4 |

Session Total $\quad 9$


|  |  |  |  |  | To D |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCU | TOTAL | P/CYCLE | M/CYCLE | CAR | LGV | OGV1 |
| 143.0 | 147 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 4 | 1 |
| 141.0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 7 | 3 |
| 162.1 | 162 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 5 | 1 |
| 171.5 | 170 | 2 | 0 | 62 | 5 | 2 |
| 618 | 622 | 3 | 1 | 175 | 21 | 7 |
| 173.0 | 177 | 1 | 0 | 56 | 15 | 0 |
| 179.4 | 179 | 1 | 0 | 65 | 9 | 1 |
| 155.1 | 157 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 9 | 0 |
| 153.0 | 152 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 7 | 2 |
| 661 | 665 | 4 | 0 | 275 | 40 | 3 |
| 112.9 | 113 | 1 | 0 | 67 | 7 | 0 |
| 123.0 | 122 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 8 | 1 |
| 97.0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 5 | 2 |
| 96.5 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 14 | 2 |
| 429 | 427 | 2 | 0 | 228 | 34 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1708 | 1714 | 9 | 1 | 678 | 95 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70.8 | 69 | 0 | 2 | 141 | 19 | 0 |
| 77.2 | 78 | 2 | 1 | 155 | 15 | 1 |
| 73.8 | 74 | 3 | 2 | 164 | 29 | 6 |
| 62.6 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 20 | 0 |
| 285 | 285 | 5 | 5 | 649 | 83 | 7 |
| 83.8 | 85 | 1 | 0 | 168 | 22 | 0 |
| 74.1 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 184 | 20 | 0 |
| 74.0 | 74 | 4 | 2 | 182 | 14 | 0 |
| 72.5 | 72 | 0 | 2 | 166 | 14 | 0 |
| 304 | 306 | 5 | 4 | 700 | 70 | 0 |
| 61.8 | 64 | 1 | 5 | 143 | 7 | 0 |
| 65.4 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 10 | 0 |
| 56.0 | 56 | 0 | 2 | 154 | 10 | 0 |
| 88.9 | 90 | 0 | 1 | 123 | 6 | 0 |
| 273 | 276 | 1 | 8 | 569 | 33 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 862 | 867 | 11 | 17 | 1918 | 186 | 7 |


| OGV2 | BUS | PCU | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 39.1 | 39 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 49.5 | 48 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 50.5 | 50 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 72.4 | 72 |  |
| 0 | 2 | 212 | 209 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 71.2 | 72 |  |
| 1 | 0 | 78.0 | 77 |  |
| 0 | 1 | 94.2 | 94 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 81.2 | 81 |  |
| 1 | 1 | 325 | 324 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 74.2 | 75 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 66.7 | 67 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 65.0 | 64 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 64.0 | 63 |  |
| 0 | 3 | 270 | 269 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 807 | 802 |  |  |


| 0 | 1 | 162.8 | 163 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 1 | 174.3 | 175 |
| 0 | 0 | 203.4 | 204 |
| 0 | 0 | 209.0 | 209 |
| 0 | 2 | 750 | 751 |
| 0 | 0 | 190.2 | 191 |
| 0 | 0 | 204.0 | 204 |
| 0 | 0 | 197.6 | 202 |
| 0 | 1 | 182.8 | 183 |
| 0 | 0 | 775 | 780 |
| 0 | 0 | 152.2 | 156 |
| 0 | 0 | 159.0 | 159 |
| 0 | 0 | 164.8 | 166 |
| 0 | 129.4 | 130 |  |
| 0 |  | 605 | 611 |


| 0 | 3 | 2130 | 2142 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## STlreetwise

## Fareham - Manual Traffic Survey: Tuesday, 09 January 2018

Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.
Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road


Arm Destination

|  | A | B | C | D | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | 0 | 19 | 757 | 1607 | 2383 |
| B | 43 | 0 | 87 | 935 | 1065 |
| C | 887 | 1 | 0 | 402 | 1290 |
| D | 1604 | 673 | 304 | 0 | 2581 |
| Total | 2534 | 693 | 1148 | 2944 |  |

Fareham: Queue Length Survey - Tuesday, 09 January 2018
Produced by Streetwise Services Ltd.
Junction: A - North Hill / B - Old Turnpike / C - Park Lane / D - Kiln Road

|  |  | $\frac{\text { A - North Hill }}{} \frac{\text { Lane } 1}{}$ | B - Old Turnpike |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { C - Park Lane } \\ \hline \text { Lane } 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D - Kiln Road } \\ \hline \text { Lane } 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lane 1 | Lane 2 |  |  |
| Survey Period |  |  | Max | Max | Max | Max | Max |
| 07:00 | - 07:05 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 |
| 07:05 | - 07:10 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| 07:10 | - 07:15 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 18 |
| 07:15 | - 07:20 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 |
| 07:20 | - 07:25 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 |
| 07:25 | - 07:30 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 18 |
| 07:30 | - 07:35 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 19 |
| 07:35 | - 07:40 | 9 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 23 |
| 07:40 | - 07:45 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 22 |
| 07:45 | - 07:50 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 25 |
| 07:50 | - 07:55 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 23 |
| 07:55 | - 08:00 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 20 |
| 08:00 | - 08:05 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 28 |
| 08:05 | - 08:10 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 17 |
| 08:10 | - 08:15 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 25 |
| 08:15 | - 08:20 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 28 |
| 08:20 | - 08:25 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 25 |
| 08:25 | - 08:30 | 12 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 24 |
| 08:30 | - 08:35 | 12 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 22 |
| 08:35 | - 08:40 | 10 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 25 |
| 08:40 | - 08:45 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 23 |
| 08:45 | - 08:50 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 19 |
| 08:50 | - 08:55 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 25 |
| 08:55 | - 09:00 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 22 |
| 09:00 | - 09:05 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 25 |
| 09:05 | - 09:10 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 16 |
| 09:10 | - 09:15 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 17 |
| 09:15 | - 09:20 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 17 |
| 09:20 | - 09:25 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 16 |


| 09:25 | - 09:30 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09:30 | - 09:35 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 8 |
| 09:35 | - 09:40 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 12 |
| 09:40 | - 09:45 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| 09:45 | - 09:50 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 12 |
| 09:50 | - 09:55 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 11 |
| 09:55 | - 10:00 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| 16:00 | - 16:05 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 12 |
| 16:05 | - 16:10 | 16 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| 16:10 | - 16:15 | 26 | 0 | 16 | 7 | 13 |
| 16:15 | - 16:20 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 14 |
| 16:20 | - 16:25 | 27 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 9 |
| 16:25 | - 16:30 | 25 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 13 |
| 16:30 | - 16:35 | 24 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 15 |
| 16:35 | - 16:40 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 6 |
| 16:40 | - 16:45 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 10 |
| 16:45 | - 16:50 | 24 | 0 | 16 | 12 | 13 |
| 16:50 | - 16:55 | 24 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 14 |
| 16:55 | - 17:00 | 25 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| 17:00 | - 17:05 | 23 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 12 |
| 17:05 | - 17:10 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 14 |
| 17:10 | - 17:15 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| 17:15 | - 17:20 | 23 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 13 |
| 17:20 | - 17:25 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 13 |
| 17:25 | - 17:30 | 26 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 15 |
| 17:30 | - 17:35 | 24 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 10 |
| 17:35 | - 17:40 | 25 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 12 |
| 17:40 | - 17:45 | 25 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 13 |
| 17:45 | - 17:50 | 23 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 12 |
| 17:50 | - 17:55 | 22 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 13 |
| 17:55 | - 18:00 | 24 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 14 |
| 18:00 | - 18:05 | 17 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 10 |
| 18:05 | - 18:10 | 19 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 9 |
| 18:10 | - 18:15 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 11 |
| 18:15 | - 18:20 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| 18:20 | - 18:25 | 20 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 11 |
| 18:25 | - 18:30 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 18:30 | - 18:35 | 24 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 11 |
| 18:35 | - 18:40 | 22 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| 18:40 | - 18:45 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 18:45 | - 18:50 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 12 |


| $18: 50-18: 55$ | 17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $18: 55-19: 00$ | 20 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 13 |


| Site No. | Location. | Direction. | Speed Limit (mph) | Start Date. | End Date. | Total Vehicles. | 5 Day Ave. | 7 Day Ave. | No. > <br> Speed Limit. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%. > } \\ \text { Speed } \\ \text { Limit. } \end{gathered}$ | No. > ACPO Limit. | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%. > ACPO } \\ \text { Limit. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. > DfT } \\ & \text { Limit. } \end{aligned}$ | \%. > DfT Limit. | Mean Speed | 85\%ile <br> speed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ATC | Funtley Road, power pole - Att. OSGR: SU 5576308404 | West | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \text { October } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \text { October } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | 9768 | 1524 | 1395 | 1 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 33.4 | 38.5 |
|  |  | East | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \text { October } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \text { October } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | 10222 | 1599 | 1460 | 5 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 39.9 |
|  |  | Two way | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \text { October } \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27 \text { October } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | 19990 | 3123 | 2856 | 6 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 34.2 | 39.3 |
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## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Category : A - HOUSES PRIVATELY OWNED
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL VEHICLES
```

Selected regions and areas:

| 02 | SOUTH EAST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ES EAST SUSSEX | 3 days |
|  | HC HAMPSHIRE | 1 days |
|  | HF HERTFORDSHIRE | 1 days |
|  | KC KENT | 3 days |
|  | SC SURREY | 2 days |
|  | WS WEST SUSSEX | 4 days |
| 03 | SOUTH WEST |  |
|  | DV DEVON | 2 days |
| 04 | EAST ANGLIA |  |
|  | NF NORFOLK | 3 days |
|  | SF SUFFOLK | 1 days |
| 06 | WEST MI DLANDS |  |
|  | SH SHROPSHIRE | 1 days |
|  | ST STAFFORDSHIRE | 1 days |
| 07 | YORKSHIRE \& NORTH LI NCOLNSHIRE |  |
|  | NY NORTH YORKSHIRE | 2 days |
|  | SY SOUTH YORKSHIRE | 1 days |
| 09 | NORTH |  |
|  | DH DURHAM | 2 days |

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

## Primary Filtering selection:

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

| Parameter: | No of Dwellings |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 50 to 288 (units: ) |
| Range Selected by User: | 50 to 300 (units:) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Parking Spaces per Dwelling Range: All Surveys Included
Bedrooms per Dwelling Range: All Surveys Included
Percentage of dwellings privately owned: All Surveys Included
Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $19 / 11 / 19$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Monday | 7 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday | 3 days |
| Wednesday | 6 days |
| Thursday | 7 days |
| Friday | 4 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:
$\begin{array}{lr}\text { Manual count } \\ \text { Directional ATC Count } & 27 \text { days } \\ 0 \text { days }\end{array}$
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) 9
Edge of Town

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
27 days

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

Population within 500m Range:

## All Surveys Included

Population within 1 mile:

| 1,000 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1,01 to 5,000 | 1 days |
| 5,001 to 10,000 | 10 days |
| 10,001 to 15,000 | 8 days |
| 15,001 to 20,000 | 5 days |
| 20,001 to 25,000 | 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 | 4 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25,001 to 50,000 | 3 days |
| 50,001 to 75,000 | 1 days |
| 75,001 to 100,000 | 8 days |
| 100,001 to 125,000 | 1 days |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 9 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 | 3 days |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1.1 to 1.5 | 22 days |
| 1.6 to 2.0 | 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: | 10 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes | 17 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
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

1 DH-03-A-01 SEMI DETACHED
GREENFIELDS ROAD
BISHOP AUCKLAND
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
50 Survey date: TUESDAY 28/03/17
2 DH-03-A-03
SEMI-DETACHED \& TERRACED
PILGRIMS WAY
DURHAM
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 57
Survey date: FRIDAY 19/10/18
3 DV-03-A-02
HOUSES \& BUNGALOWS
MILLHEAD ROAD
HONITON
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
116
Survey date: FRIDAY
25/09/15
4 DV-03-A-03 TERRACED \& SEMI DETACHED
LOWER BRAND LANE
HONITON
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
70
Survey date: MONDAY 28/09/15
5
MI XED HOUSES \& FLATS
SHEPHAM LANE
POLEGATE
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
212
Survey date: MONDAY 11/07/16
6 ES-03-A-04 MI XED HOUSES \& FLATS
NEW LYDD ROAD
CAMBER
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
134
Survey date: FRIDAY 15/07/16
7 ES-03-A-05 MI XED HOUSES \& FLATS
RATTLE ROAD
NEAR EASTBOURNE
STONE CROSS
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 99
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 05/06/19
8 HC-03-A-23 HOUSES \& FLATS
CANADA WAY
LIPHOOK
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
62 Survey date: TUESDAY 19/11/19

## DURHAM

Survey Type: MANUAL DURHAM

Survey Type: MANUAL DEVON

Survey Type: MANUAL DEVON

Survey Type: MANUAL EAST SUSSEX

Survey Type: MANUAL

## EAST SUSSEX

## EAST SUSSEX

Survey Type: MANUAL HAMPSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters (Cont.)

9 HF-03-A-03
MI XED HOUSES
HARE STREET ROAD
BUNTINGFORD
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 160 Survey date: MONDAY 08/07/19
10 KC-03-A-03 MI XED HOUSES \& FLATS
HYTHE ROAD
ASHFORD
WILLESBOROUGH
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 51 Survey date: THURSDAY 14/07/16
11 KC-03-A-04
SEMI-DETACHED \& TERRACED
KILN BARN ROAD
AYLESFORD
DITTON
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
110 Survey date: FRIDAY 22/09/17
12 KC-03-A-07 MI XED HOUSES
RECULVER ROAD
HERNE BAY
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
288
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 27/09/17
13 NF-03-A-02 HOUSES \& FLATS
DEREHAM ROAD
NORWICH
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings
98
Survey date: MONDAY 22/10/12
14 NF-03-A-04 MI XED HOUSES
NORTH WALSHAM ROAD
NORTH WALSHAM
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
70
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 18/09/19
15
NF-03-A-06 MI XED HOUSES
BEAUFORT WAY
GREAT YARMOUTH
BRADWELL
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
275
Survey date: MONDAY 23/09/19
16 NY-03-A-09 MI XED HOUSI NG
GRAMMAR SCHOOL LANE
NORTHALLERTON
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: Survey date: MONDAY 16/09/13

## HERTFORDSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL KENT

Survey Type: MANUAL

## KENT

Survey Type: MANUAL KENT

Survey Type: MANUAL NORFOLK

Survey Type: MANUAL NORFOLK

Survey Type: MANUAL NORFOLK

Survey Type: MANUAL NORTH YORKSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters (Cont.)

17 NY-03-A-10 HOUSES AND FLATS
BOROUGHBRIDGE ROAD
RIPON
Edge of Town
No Sub Category
Total No of Dwellings: Survey date: TUESDAY 17/09/13
18 SC-03-A-04 DETACHED \& TERRACED
HIGH ROAD
BYFLEET
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 71 Survey date: THURSDAY 23/01/14
19 SC-03-A-05
MI XED HOUSES
REIGATE ROAD
HORLEY
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
207
Survey date: MONDAY 01/04/19
20 SF-03-A-07
FOXHALL ROAD
IPSWICH
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
73
Survey date: THURSDAY 09/05/19
21 SH-03-A-05 SEMI-DETACHED/ TERRACED
SANDCROFT
TELFORD
SUTTON HILL
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 54 Survey date: THURSDAY 24/10/13
22 ST-03-A-07 DETACHED \& SEMI-DETACHED
BEACONSIDE
STAFFORD
MARSTON GATE
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings:
248
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 22/11/17
23
SY-03-A-01
A19 BENTLEY ROAD
DONCASTER
BENTLEY RISE
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: 54
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 18/09/13
24 WS-03-A-04 MIXED HOUSES
HILLS FARM LANE
HORSHAM
BROADBRIDGE HEATH
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Survey date: THURSDAY } & 11 / 12 / 14\end{array}$

## NORTH YORKSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL SURREY

Survey Type: MANUAL SURREY

Survey Type: MANUAL

## SUFFOLK

Survey Type: MANUAL SHROPSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL

## STAFFORDSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL SOUTH YORKSHIRE

Survey Type: MANUAL WEST SUSSEX

Survey Type: MANUAL

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters (Cont.)

WS-03-A-08 MI XED HOUSES
ROUNDSTONE LANE
ANGMERING
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings
180
19/04/18
26 WS-03-A-09 MI XED HOUSES \& FLATS
LITTLEHAMPTON ROAD
WORTHING
WEST DURRINGTON
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings
Survey date: THURSDAY
197
05/07/18
27 WS-03-A-10 MI XED HOUSES
TODDINGTON LANE
LITTLEHAMPTON
WICK
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total No of Dwellings: Survey date: WEDNESDAY 07/11/18

## WEST SUSSEX

Survey Type: MANUAL WEST SUSSEX

Survey Type: MANUAL WEST SUSSEX

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/A - HOUSES PRIVATELY OWNED
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL 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 | 27 | 122 | 0.083 | 27 | 122 | 0.300 | 27 | 122 | 0.383 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.133 | 27 | 122 | 0.377 | 27 | 122 | 0.510 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.148 | 27 | 122 | 0.181 | 27 | 122 | 0.329 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.128 | 27 | 122 | 0.164 | 27 | 122 | 0.292 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.137 | 27 | 122 | 0.153 | 27 | 122 | 0.290 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.163 | 27 | 122 | 0.147 | 27 | 122 | 0.310 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.167 | 27 | 122 | 0.160 | 27 | 122 | 0.327 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.170 | 27 | 122 | 0.193 | 27 | 122 | 0.363 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.266 | 27 | 122 | 0.169 | 27 | 122 | 0.435 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.279 | 27 | 122 | 0.164 | 27 | 122 | 0.443 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.344 | 27 | 122 | 0.151 | 27 | 122 | 0.495 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.290 | 27 | 122 | 0.170 | 27 | 122 | 0.460 |
| 19:00-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 2.308 |  |  | 2.329 |  |  | 4.637 |

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

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

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

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

## Parameter summary

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

```
50-288 (units:)
01/01/12 - 19/11/19
27
0
0
3
0
```

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

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/A - HOUSES PRIVATELY OWNED
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 | 27 | 122 | 0.123 | 27 | 122 | 0.538 | 27 | 122 | 0.661 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.224 | 27 | 122 | 0.830 | 27 | 122 | 1.054 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.242 | 27 | 122 | 0.338 | 27 | 122 | 0.580 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.217 | 27 | 122 | 0.305 | 27 | 122 | 0.522 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.230 | 27 | 122 | 0.270 | 27 | 122 | 0.500 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.285 | 27 | 122 | 0.257 | 27 | 122 | 0.542 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.286 | 27 | 122 | 0.272 | 27 | 122 | 0.558 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.284 | 27 | 122 | 0.321 | 27 | 122 | 0.605 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.597 | 27 | 122 | 0.323 | 27 | 122 | 0.920 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.580 | 27 | 122 | 0.319 | 27 | 122 | 0.899 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.651 | 27 | 122 | 0.261 | 27 | 122 | 0.912 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 27 | 122 | 0.539 | 27 | 122 | 0.329 | 27 | 122 | 0.868 |
| 19:00-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 4.258 |  |  | 4.363 |  |  | 8.621 |

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.

## Appendix H

Junction Output - Site Access

## Junctions 9

## PICADY 9 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 9.0.1.4646 []
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2020
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
Tel: +44 (0)1344770758 email: software@trl.co.uk Web: http://www.trlsoftware.co.uk
The users of this computer program for the solution of an engineering problem are in no way relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the solution

Filename: Site Access Junction.j9
Path: N:\Projects\refun3 1908016\Analysis
Report generation date: 30/09/2020 21:32:11

## "Site Access Junction - 2023 With Dev, AM

„Site Access Junction - 2023 With Dev, PM

## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Network Residual Capacity | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | Site Access Junction - 2023 With Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.0 | 7.30 | 0.04 | A | $900 \%$ | 0.0 | 7.06 | 0.01 | A | 900\% |
| Stream B-A | 0.1 | 9.48 | 0.12 | A |  | 0.0 | 9.38 | 0.04 | A |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.0 | 6.18 | 0.01 | A |  | 0.0 | 6.37 | 0.03 | A |  |

Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle. Network Residual Capacity indicates the amount by which network flow could be increased before a user-definable threshold (see Analysis Options) is met.

File summary
File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $19 / 01 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | MOTION Idavidmcmurtary |
| Description |  |

Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate of delay units |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m | kph | PCU | PCU | perTimeSegment | s | -Hour |

## Analysis Options

| Calculate Queue <br> Percentiles | Calculate residual <br> capacity | Residual capacity criteria <br> type | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold <br> (s) | Queue threshold <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | Delay | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time period length (min) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 With Dev | AM | DIRECT | $07: 45$ | $08: 45$ | 60 | 60 |
| D2 | 2023 With Dev | PM | DIRECT | $16: 45$ | $17: 45$ | 60 | 60 |

## Analysis Set Details

| ID | Name | Network flow scaling factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1 | Site Access Junction | 100.000 |

## Site Access Junction - 2023 With Dev, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 1.54 | A |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Funtley Road East |  | Major |
| B | Site Access |  | Minor |
| C | Funtley Road West |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right turn bay | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 6.00 |  |  | 120.0 | $\checkmark$ | 1.00 |

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

| Arm | Minor arm <br> type | Width at give- <br> way $(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{2 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Estimate flare <br> length | Flare length <br> $\mathbf{( P C U})$ | Visibility to <br> left $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility to <br> right $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | One lane plus <br> flare | 6.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 |  | 1.00 | 16 |  |

Slope / Intercept / Capacity
Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/TS) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 503.764 | 0.092 | 0.232 | 0.146 | 0.331 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 581.473 | 0.089 | 0.225 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 643.457 | 0.249 | 0.249 | - | - |

The slopes and intercepts shown above do NOT include any corrections or adjustments.
Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.
Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time period length (min) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 With Dev | AM | DIRECT | $07: 45$ | $08: 45$ | 60 | 60 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

07:45-08:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 14.00 | 212.00 |
|  | B | 51.00 | 0.00 | 23.00 |
|  | C | 141.00 | 6.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.04 | 7.30 | 0.0 | A |
| B-A | 0.12 | 9.48 | 0.1 | A |
| C-AB | 0.01 | 6.18 | 0.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

## 07:45-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 23.00 | 515.94 | 0.045 | 22.95 | 0.0 | 7.302 | A |
| B-A | 51.00 | 430.66 | 0.118 | 50.87 | 0.1 | 9.476 | A |
| C-AB | 6.01 | 588.55 | 0.010 | 6.00 | 0.0 | 6.179 | A |
| C-A | 140.99 |  |  | 140.99 |  |  |  |
| AB | 14.00 |  |  | 14.00 |  |  |  |
| AC | 212.00 |  |  | 212.00 |  |  |  |

## Site Access Junction - 2023 With Dev, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 0.53 | A |

Junction Network Options

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

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time period length (min) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2023 With Dev | PM | DIRECT | $16: 45$ | $17: 45$ | 60 | 60 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

Origin-Destination Data

16:45-17:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | A | B |
|  | 0.00 | C |  |  |
|  | B | 16.00 | 236.00 |  |
|  | C | 275.00 | 18.00 | 7.00 |

Vehicle Mix
Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |  |
|  | A | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |
|  | B | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | C | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.01 | 7.06 | 0.0 | A |
| B-A | 0.04 | 9.38 | 0.0 | A |
| C-AB | 0.03 | 6.37 | 0.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 7.00 | 517.03 | 0.014 | 6.99 | 0.0 | 7.057 |  |
| B-A | 16.00 | 399.60 | 0.040 | 15.96 | 0.0 | 9.382 |  |
| C-AB | 18.27 | 583.26 | 0.031 | 18.24 | 0.0 | 6.372 |  |
| C-A | 274.73 |  |  | 274.73 |  |  |  |
| AB | 40.00 |  | 40.00 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 236.00 |  | 236.00 |  |  |  |  |

Appendix I<br>Junction Output - River Lane

## Junctions 9

## PICADY 9 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 9.0.1.4646 []
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2020

## For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL: <br> Tel: +44 (0)1344770758 email: software@trl.co.uk Web: http://www.trlsoftware.co.uk

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

Filename: Fontley Lane junction.j9
Path: N:|Projects\refun3 1908016\Analysis
Report generation date: 30/09/2020 21:40:37

## „2023 Without Dev, AM <br> „2023 Without Dev, PM <br> "2023 With Dev, AM <br> "2023 With Dev, PM

## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Network Residual Capacity | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Network Residual Capacity |
|  | 2023 Without Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.3 | 8.02 | 0.24 | A | 63 \% <br> [Stream B-A] | 0.3 | 8.05 | 0.22 | A | 900\% |
| Stream B-A | 0.3 | 14.02 | 0.22 | B |  | 0.1 | 12.72 | 0.08 | B |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.3 | 6.71 | 0.22 | A |  | 0.5 | 8.62 | 0.33 | A |  |
|  | 2023 With Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.4 | 8.57 | 0.28 | A | $57 \%$ <br> [Stream B-A] | 0.3 | 8.20 | 0.23 | A | 900\% |
| Stream B-A | 0.3 | 14.38 | 0.22 | B |  | 0.1 | 13.03 | 0.08 | B |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.4 | 6.76 | 0.24 | A |  | 0.7 | 9.01 | 0.36 | A |  |

There are warnings associated with one or more model runs - see the 'Data Errors and Warnings' tables for each Analysis or Demand Set.
Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle. Network Residual Capacity indicates the amount by which network flow could be increased before a user-definable threshold (see Analysis Options) is met.

File summary
File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $19 / 01 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | MOTIONIdavidmcmurtary |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

Analysis Options

| Calculate Queue <br> Percentiles | Calculate residual <br> capacity | Residual capacity criteria <br> type | RFC Threshold | Average Delay threshold <br> (s) | Queue threshold <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | Delay | 0.85 | 36.00 | 20.00 |

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time period length <br> (min) | Time segment length <br> (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 Without Dev | AM | DIRECT | $07: 45$ | $08: 45$ | 60 |  |
| D2 | 2023 Without Dev | PM | DIRECT | $16: 45$ | $17: 45$ |  |  |
| D3 | 2023 With Dev | AM | DIRECT | $07: 45$ | 60 |  |  |
| D4 | 2023 With Dev | PM | DIRECT | $16: 45$ | $60: 45$ | 6 |  |

Analysis Set Details

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

## 2023 Without Dev, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Vehicle Mix | HV\% is zero for all movements / time segments. Vehicle Mix matrix should be completed whether working in <br> PCUs or Vehs. |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 3.08 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 63 | Stream B-A |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Ttitchfield Lane |  | Major |
| B | River Lane |  | Minor |
| C | Fontley Lane |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right turn bay | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 6.75 |  |  | 120.0 | $\checkmark$ | 1.00 |

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

## Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm <br> type | Width at give- <br> way $(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{1 5 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Width at <br> $\mathbf{2 0 m}(\mathbf{m})$ | Estimate flare <br> length | Flare length <br> $\mathbf{( P C U})$ | Visibility to <br> left $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility to <br> right $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{B}$ | One lane plus <br> flare | 7.50 | 3.50 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |  | 1.00 | 30 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/TS) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 479.327 | 0.084 | 0.213 | 0.134 | 0.305 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 682.108 | 0.101 | 0.256 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 643.457 | 0.241 | 0.241 | - | - |

The slopes and intercepts shown above do NOT include any corrections or adjustments.
Streams may be combined, in which case capacity will be adjusted.
Values are shown for the first time segment only; they may differ for subsequent time segments.

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time period length <br> (min) | Time segment length <br> (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2023 Without Dev | AM | DIRECT | $07: 45$ | $08: 45$ | 60 |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

07:45-08:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 12.00 | 213.00 |
|  | B | 71.00 | 0.00 | 138.00 |
|  | C | 453.00 | 132.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.24 | 8.02 | 0.3 | A |
| B-A | 0.22 | 14.02 | 0.3 | B |
| C-AB | 0.22 | 6.71 | 0.3 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 138.00 | 586.09 | 0.235 | 137.69 | 0.3 | 8.024 | A |
| B-A | 71.00 | 327.23 | 0.217 | 70.72 | 0.3 | 14.021 | B |
| C-AB | 154.74 | 690.68 | 0.224 | 154.40 | 0.3 | 6.711 | A |
| C-A | 430.26 |  |  | 430.26 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12.00 |  |  | 12.00 |  |  |  |
| AC | 213.00 |  | 213.00 |  |  |  |  |

## 2023 Without Dev, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Vehicle Mix | HV\% is zero for all movements / time segments. Vehicle Mix matrix should be completed whether working in <br> PCUs or Vehs. |  |

## Junction Network

Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 3.08 | A |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time period length <br> (min) | Time segment length <br> (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2023 Without Dev | PM | DIRECT | $16: 45$ | $17: 45$ | 60 |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

16:45-17:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 67.00 | 360.00 |
|  | B | 24.00 | 0.00 | 125.00 |
|  | C | 237.00 | 176.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.22 | 8.05 | 0.3 | A |
| B-A | 0.08 | 12.72 | 0.1 | B |
| C-AB | 0.33 | 8.62 | 0.5 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 125.00 | 571.85 | 0.219 | 124.72 | 0.3 | 8.046 |  |
| B-A | 24.00 | 306.92 | 0.078 | 23.92 | 0.1 | 12.716 |  |
| C-AB | 201.13 | 617.65 | 0.326 | 200.58 | 0.5 | 8.624 |  |
| C-A | 211.87 |  |  | 211.87 |  |  |  |
| AB | 67.00 |  | 67.00 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 360.00 |  |  | 360.00 |  |  |  |

## 2023 With Dev, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Vehicle Mix | HV\% is zero for all movements / time segments. Vehicle Mix matrix should be completed whether working in <br> PCUs or Vehs. |  |

## Junction Network

Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 3.37 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting | Network residual capacity (\%) | First arm reaching threshold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown | 57 | Stream B-A |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time period length (min) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2023 With Dev | AM | DIRECT | 07:45 | 08:45 | 60 | 60 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

07:45-08:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 12.00 | 213.00 |
|  | B | 71.00 | 0.00 | 166.00 |
|  | C | 453.00 | 139.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.28 | 8.57 | 0.4 | A |
| B-A | 0.22 | 14.38 | 0.3 | B |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 6.76 | 0.4 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 166.00 | 585.22 | 0.284 | 165.61 | 0.4 | 8.571 |  |
| B-A | 71.00 | 320.71 | 0.221 | 70.72 | 0.3 | 14.384 |  |
| C-AB | 164.21 | 696.06 | 0.236 | 163.85 | 0.4 | 6.762 |  |
| C-A | 427.79 |  |  | 427.79 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12.00 |  | 12.00 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 213.00 |  | 213.00 |  |  |  |  |

## 2023 With Dev, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Vehicle Mix | HV\% is zero for all movements / time segments. Vehicle Mix matrix should be completed whether working in <br> PCUs or Vehs. |  |

## Junction Network

Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major road direction | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | T-Junction | Two-way | 3.40 | A |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time period length (min) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2023 With Dev | PM | DIRECT | 16:45 | 17:45 | 60 | 60 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) | O-D data varies over time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 | $\checkmark$ |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| B |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |
| C |  | $\checkmark$ | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

16:45-17:45
Demand (PCU/TS)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 67.00 | 360.00 |
|  | B | 24.00 | 0.00 | 133.00 |
|  | C | 237.00 | 197.00 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

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

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.23 | 8.20 | 0.3 | A |
| B-A | 0.08 | 13.03 | 0.1 | B |
| C-AB | 0.36 | 9.01 | 0.7 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (PCU/TS) | Capacity <br> (PCU/TS) | RFC | Throughput <br> (PCU/TS) | End queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 133.00 | 571.54 | 0.233 | 132.70 | 0.3 | 8.197 |  |
| B-A | 24.00 | 300.03 | 0.080 | 23.91 | 0.1 | 13.033 |  |
| C-AB | 228.49 | 626.86 | 0.364 | 227.83 | 0.7 | 9.011 |  |
| C-A | 205.51 |  |  | 205.51 |  |  |  |
| AB | 67.00 |  | 67.00 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 360.00 |  | 360.00 |  |  |  |  |

Appendix J
Junction Output - Kiln Road/Park Lane

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

User and Project Details

| Project: | North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction, Fareham |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title: |  |
| Location: |  |
| Additional detail: |  |
| File name: | M01 - Kiln Lane-Old Turnpike-North Hill-Park Lane Linsig.lsg3x |
| Author: |  |
| Company: |  |
| Address: |  |

Scenario 1: '2018 Baseline AM' (FG1: '2020 Baseline AM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2') Network Layout Diagram


North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> Sat <br> (\%) | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 99.0\% | 5 | 14 | 0 | 41.1 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/OId Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 99.0\% | 5 | 14 | 0 | 41.1 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 36 | - | 260 | 1837 | 275 | 94.6\% | - | - | - | 9.0 | 125.3 | 14.8 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 19 | - | 158 | 1851:1750 | 164 | 96.2\% | 5 | 14 | 0 | 7.2 | 164.8 | 10.2 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 36 | - | 282 | 1904 | 285 | 99.0\% | - | - | - | 11.9 | 152.4 | 17.7 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 103 | - | 702 | 1813 | 749 | 93.7\% | - | - | - | 12.9 | 66.0 | 30.1 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 2 | 36 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 22 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -10.0 \\ & -10.0 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 41.09 \\ & 41.09 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 254 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 2: '2018 Baseline PM' (FG2: '2020 Baseline PM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2')
Network Layout Diagram


North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> Sat <br> (\%) | 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97.6\% | 1 | 10 | 0 | 45.0 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/OId Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97.6\% | 1 | 10 | 0 | 45.0 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 96 | - | 645 | 1821 | 661 | 97.6\% | - | - | - | 17.1 | 95.4 | 34.4 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 34 | - | 236 | 1850:1750 | 252 | 93.8\% | 1 | 10 | 0 | 8.4 | 128.3 | 13.6 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 35 | - | 235 | 1842 | 252 | 93.1\% | - | - | - | 8.5 | 130.2 | 13.7 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 45 | - | 304 | 1813 | 316 | 96.3\% | - | - | - | 11.0 | 129.8 | 17.8 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 2 | 35 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 37 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -8.4 \\ -8.4 \end{gathered}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 44.95 \\ & 44.95 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 270 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 3: '2023 Baseline AM' (FG3: '2025 Baseline AM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2')
Network Layout Diagram


## North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane <br> Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 106.4\% | 2 | 18 | 0 | 69.5 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 106.4\% | 2 | 18 | 0 | 69.5 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 36 | - | 278 | 1837 | 275 | 101.2\% | - | - | - | 14.1 | 182.5 | 20.0 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 19 | - | 169 | 1851:1750 | 164 | 103.0\% | 2 | 18 | 0 | 11.0 | 233.6 | 14.3 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 36 | - | 303 | 1904 | 285 | 106.4\% | - | - | - | 21.5 | 255.5 | 27.7 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 103 | - | 753 | 1813 | 749 | 100.5\% | - | - | - | 23.0 | 109.8 | 41.9 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Old Turnpike } \\ & \text { Peds } \end{aligned}$ | - | F |  | 2 | 36 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 22 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -18.2 \\ & -18.2 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 69.54 \\ & 69.54 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 254 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 4: '2023 Baseline PM' (FG4: '2025 Baseline PM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2')
Network Layout Diagram


## North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane <br> Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 104.4\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 78.5 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 104.4\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 78.5 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 96 | - | 690 | 1821 | 661 | 104.4\% | - | - | - | 35.6 | 185.8 | 53.5 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 34 | - | 252 | 1850:1750 | 252 | 100.1\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12.1 | 173.5 | 17.9 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 35 | - | 251 | 1842 | 252 | 99.4\% | - | - | - | 12.2 | 175.0 | 18.1 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 45 | - | 325 | 1813 | 316 | 103.0\% | - | - | - | 18.5 | 205.1 | 26.1 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 2 | 35 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 37 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -16.0 \\ & -16.0 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 78.49 \\ & 78.49 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 270 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 5: '2023 + Development AM' (FG7: '2025 with Development AM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2')
Network Layout Diagram


## North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane <br> Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 109.4\% | 1 | 18 | 0 | 113.4 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 109.4\% | 1 | 18 | 0 | 113.4 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 36 | - | 285 | 1836 | 275 | 103.8\% | - | - | - | 17.5 | 221.6 | 23.5 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 19 | - | 170 | 1851:1750 | 164 | 103.6\% | 1 | 18 | 0 | 11.4 | 242.2 | 14.8 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 36 | - | 311 | 1900 | 284 | 109.4\% | - | - | - | 26.2 | 303.8 | 32.6 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 103 | - | 816 | 1812 | 749 | 108.9\% | - | - | - | 58.2 | 256.6 | 78.9 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 2 | 36 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 22 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -21.6 \\ & -21.6 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 113.39 \\ & 113.39 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 254 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 6: '2023 + Development PM' (FG8: '2025 with Development PM', Plan 2: 'Network Control Plan 2')
Network Layout Diagram


## North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane <br> Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg <br> 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 109.4\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 113.2 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 109.4\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 113.2 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 2 | 96 | - | 710 | 1820 | 661 | 107.5\% | - | - | - | 47.4 | 240.2 | 65.5 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead Right | U+O | D - |  | 2 | 34 | - | 254 | 1850:1750 | 252 | 100.9\% | 0 | 12 | 0 | 13.0 | 184.7 | 18.8 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 2 | 35 | - | 275 | 1835 | 251 | 109.4\% | - | - | - | 23.5 | 308.1 | 30.3 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Right Left Ahead | U | B |  | 2 | 45 | - | 344 | 1812 | 315 | 109.1\% | - | - | - | 29.3 | 306.5 | 37.6 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 2 | 35 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 2 | 37 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -21.5 \\ & -21.5 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 113.22 \\ & 113.22 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 270 |  |  |  |  |

Appendix K
Welbourne TA Extract

### 4.4 A32 SIGNALISED CROSSINGS

4.4.1. Further to the modelling results, each of the proposed signalised crossings will be subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and any concerns identified will be dealt with via a Designers Response, in agreement with HCC.

### 4.5 A32 / FURZE COURT / NORTH HILL

4.5.1. Following on from discussions with HCC it has been agreed that consideration will be given to providing an additional bus stop on the A32 Wickham Road northbound, south of the proposed traffic signal junction. This proposal will remove the need for buses to access the A32 northbound bus stop immediately north of the junction, which would have required crossing of the bypass lane from North Hill. This proposal is currently under consideration by HCC.
4.5.2. In addition to this amended bus stop provision, the traffic signal junction as a whole will be subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Any concerns raised as part of this audit will be considered and dealt with part of a Designers Response in agreement with HCC.

### 4.6 NORTH HILL / OLD TURNPIKE / PARK LANE / KILN ROAD TRAFFIC SIGNALS

4.6.1. A potential solution for this junction has been identified and BDL are working with HCC to find a preferred approach that will increase the capacity of the junction and reduce traffic congestion during peak periods. These proposals could relate to the implementation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) that will prohibit certain turning movements at the junction.
4.6.2. One option for this junction is the implementation of TRO that prohibits right turns between North Hill and Kiln Road, thereby allowing the North Hill and Park Lane stages to run at the same time. The impacts of implementing this proposal have been assessed using Linsig with the results summarised in Table 4-3. For this assessment it has been assumed that all traffic that would have turned right from North Hill has diverted to Old Turnpike.

Table 4-3 - North Hill / Old Turnpike / Park Lane / Kiln Road Junction Capacity Assessment with Banned Right Turn from North Hill to Kiln Road

|  | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arm | Degree of <br> Saturation <br> $(\%)$ | MMQ <br> (PCU) | Delay <br> S/PCU | Degree of <br> Saturation <br> $(\%)$ | MMQ <br> (PCU) | Delay <br> s/PCU |  |  |  |
|  |  | DM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kiln Road | 100 | 43 | 102 | 97 | 18 | 128 |  |  |  |
| North Hill | 99 | 14 | 160 | 98 | 22 | 117 |  |  |  |

## いゆ|)

| Old <br> Turnpike | 100 | 28 | 140 | 98 | 34 | 88 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Park Lane | 90 | 12 | 89 | 59 | 10 | 42 |
|  | DS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kiln Road | 96 | 28 | 80 | 84 | 15 | 70 |
| North Hill | 94 | 17 | 102 | 83 | 11 | 83 |
| Old <br> Turnpike | 95 | 21 | 97 | 83 | 22 | 47 |
| Park Lane | 45 | 7 | 39 | 68 | 9 | 50 |

4.6.3. As Table $4-3$ shows in the DM in the AM peak the junction operates at capacity in the AM peak with some delay, particularly on Kiln Road, Old Turnpike and Park Lane. In the PM the peak the junction operates at capacity in the 2036 DM scenario. The Kiln Road, North Hill and Old Turnpike arms have the highest Degrees of Saturation, although they are likely to clear with each cycle.
4.6.4. In the DS the junction remains at capacity in the AM and approaches capacity in the PM. In the AM there is an improvement to the Park Lane arm of the junction with a corresponding reduction in MMQ also, while North Hill is shown to be worsened in the AM. In the PM North Hill sees significant improvement as a result of the development with a halving of the MMQ. The junction does not overall see a significant worsening as a result of the development and remains at capacity in both scenarios. However, these potential changes will also need to be considered in the context of any changes at A32 / Old Turnpike, so will need to be discussed further with HCC.

### 4.7 A32 WICKHAM ROAD ON-STREET PARKING PROPOSALS

4.7.1. Comment has been made as to the effect of not removing certain areas of on street car parking that are currently provided on A32 Wickham Road, particularly those which appear to serve existing employment areas. The proposals which accompanied the TA are provided in Appendix E for reference. The effect of leaving these areas of on street parking will be that the width of the A32 will be remain reduced and make it difficult to accommodate two-way traffic flow, particularly in terms of oncoming HGV's. Overall, if these areas of on street parking were retained, this would impact on the free flow of traffic along this important corridor. In terms of consultation, these works have formed the basis of the material that accompanied the original planning application material, so there has been the opportunity for comments on these proposals to be made by businesses and members of the public. The applicant has not been advised of any adverse comments in relation to the removal of these on street bays.





Appendix L
Junction Output - Kiln Road/Park Lane (With Right Turn Ban)

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

User and Project Details

| Project: | North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction, Fareham |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title: |  |
| Location: |  |
| Additional detail: |  |
| File name: | M02 - Kiln Lane 130 Units with Banned RT.lsg3x |
| Author: |  |
| Company: |  |
| Address: |  |

Scenario 1: '2025 + Dev' (FG5: '2025 with Development AM', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')
Network Layout Diagram


North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg } \\ & \text { Sat (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Turners In Gaps (pcu) | Turners When Unopposed (pcu) | Turners In Intergreen (pcu) | Total Delay (pcuHr) | Av. <br> Delay <br> Per PCU <br> (s/pcu) | Mean Max Queue (pcu) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 101.3\% | 4 | 17 | 0 | 39.4 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 101.3\% | 4 | 17 | 0 | 39.4 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 1 | 22 | - | 323 | 1844 | 359 | 89.9\% | - | - | - | 7.8 | 87.5 | 14.0 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead | U+O | D - |  | 1 | 50 | - | 160 | 1849:1750 | 808 | 19.8\% | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0.9 | 20.7 | 3.0 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane Left Ahead | U | C |  | 1 | 18 | - | 310 | 1901 | 306 | 101.3\% | - | - | - | 14.3 | 166.0 | 20.1 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Left Ahead | U | B |  | 1 | 50 | - | 763 | 1816 | 785 | 97.2\% | - | - | - | 16.3 | 77.1 | 33.8 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 8 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 1 | 23 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| C1 |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -12.5 \\ & -12.5 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 39.40 \\ & 39.40 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 118 |  |  |  |  |

North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output
Scenario 2: '2025 + Dev' (FG6: '2025 with Development PM', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')
Network Layout Diagram


## North Hill/Kiln Road/Park Lane/Old Turnpike LinSig Output

Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane <br> Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg } \\ & \text { Sat } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Turners In Gaps (pcu) | Turners When Unopposed (pcu) | Turners In Intergreen (pcu) | Total Delay (pcuHr) | Av. <br> Delay <br> Per PCU <br> (s/pcu) | Mean Max Queue (pcu) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 96.1\% | 3 | 9 | 0 | 31.8 | - | - |
| North Hill/Park Lane/Kiln Road/Old Turnpike Junction | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 96.1\% | 3 | 9 | 0 | 31.8 | - | - |
| 1/1 | North Hill Ahead Right Left | U | A |  | 1 | 53 | - | 728 | 1822 | 800 | 91.0\% | - | - | - | 11.0 | 54.5 | 27.6 |
| 2/2+2/1 | Old Turnpike Left Ahead | U+O | D - |  | 1 | 24 | - | 248 | 1849:1750 | 381 | 65.1\% | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3.9 | 57.0 | 8.5 |
| 3/1 | Park Lane <br> Left Ahead | U | C |  | 1 | 18 | - | 273 | 1839 | 284 | 96.1\% | - | - | - | 9.9 | 130.0 | 15.2 |
| 4/1 | Kiln Road Left Ahead | U | B |  | 1 | 24 | - | 319 | 1817 | 369 | 86.4\% | - | - | - | 7.0 | 79.5 | 13.3 |
| Ped Link: P1 | North Hill Peds | - | E |  | 1 | 8 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P2 | Old Turnpike Peds | - | F |  | 1 | 23 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P3 | Park Lane Peds | - | G |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ped Link: P4 | Kiln Road Peds | - | H |  | 1 | 4 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0.0\% | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  | PRC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -6.8 \\ & -6.8 \end{aligned}$ | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 31.85 \\ & 31.85 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 123 |  |  |  |  |

# Report presented by 
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