

# Bicester Motion Experience Quarter Transport Assessment 

December 2020

## mode

transport planning

# Bicester Motion - Experience Quarter <br> Transport Assessment 

OFFICE ADDRESS:<br>Lombard House<br>PROJECT NO<br>DATE:<br>J323684<br>December 2020<br>145 Great Charles Street<br>Birmingham<br>B3 3LP

| REPORT NO. | PREPARED: | DATE ISSUE: | STATUS: | CHECKED: | AUTHORISED: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | MS/ALF | $16 / 12 / 2020$ | Final | BDF/ALF | BDF |
| CHANGE LOG. |  |  |  |  |  |
| VERSION NO. | DATE: | CHECKED BY: | REASON FOR CHANGE: |  |  |

## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... 1
1 INTRODUCTION ..... 3
1.1 Overview ..... 3
1.2 Pre-Application Scoping with Oxfordshire County Council ..... 4
1.3 Bicester Transport SATURN Model ..... 4
1.4 Bicester Motion Planning Background ..... 4
1.5 Report Structure ..... 6
2 POLICY REVIEW ..... 7
2.1 Overview ..... 7
2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (2019) ..... 7
2.3 Planning Practice Guidance (2019) ..... 8
2.4 Adopted Cherwell Local Plan, 2011-2031 (2015) ..... 9
2.5 Cherwell District Council (CDC) RAF Bicester Planning Brief (Sep 2009) ..... 10
2.6 Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), 2015-2031 (2016)12.7 Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire LTP4, 2015-2031: Active \& Healthy TravelStrategy (2016)13
2.8 Summary ..... 13
3 EXISTING CONDITIONS ..... 15
3.1 Overview ..... 15
3.2 Site Description ..... 15
3.3 Local Highway Network ..... 16
3.4 Existing Baseline (2016) Traffic Flows ..... 17
3.5 Highway Safety (Personal Injury Accident Data) ..... 17
3.6 Walking and Cycling ..... 21
3.7 Public Rights of Way (PRoW) ..... 22
3.8 Bus Services ..... 23
3.9 Rail Services ..... 25
3.10 Summary ..... 26
4 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS ..... 27
4.1 Proposed Development ..... 27
4.2 Vehicular Access ..... 27
4.3 OCC's Infrastructure Improvements ..... 29
4.4 Parking ..... 30
4.5 Sustainable Travel Measures ..... 31
5 TRAVEL DEMAND ..... 33

© Copyright mode transport planning. All rights reserved

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing with mode transport planning, no other party may copy, reproduce, distribute, make use of, or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by mode transport planning for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in this report are on the basis of mode transport planning using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided as to their accuracy. It should be noted and is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to mode transport planning has been made.
5.1 Introduction ..... 33
5.2 Vehicular Trip Rates / Traffic Generation ..... 33
5.3 Multi-Modal Trip Generation ..... 35
5.4 Vehicle Trip Distribution ..... 36
6 HIGHWAY ASSESSMENT ..... 39
6.1 Introduction ..... 39
6.2 OCC's Bicester SATURN Model ..... 39
6.3 Geographical Scope of Assessment ..... 39
6.4 Assessment Scenarios ..... 40
6.5 Junction Capacity Analysis ..... 41
6.6 Mitigation ..... 47
6.7 Summary ..... 50
7 SUMMARY \& CONCLUSION ..... 51
7.1 Summary ..... 51
7.2 Conclusion \& Recommendation ..... 52
APPENDICES
APPENDIXA - OCC HIGHWAYS SCOPING CORRESPONDENCE
APPENDIX B - Traffic Survey Data
APPENDIXC -PERSONAL InJURY Accident Data
APPENDIXD - Indicative Masterplan
APPENDIXE -PreLiminary Access Drawings
APPENDIXF - Parking Accumulation Summary
APPENDIX G - Trip Generation Summary
APPENDIXH -TRICS DATABASE OUTPUTS
APPENDIXI - Gravity Distribution Model
APPENDIXJ - TrafFIC TURNing Flow Diagrams
APPENDIXK - OCC SATURN MOdel OUtputs
APPENDIXL - PreLiminary FAST Mitigation Proposal Drawings
APPENDIXM - Junctions 9 OUtputs - REFERENCE CASE
APPENDIXN -JUNCTIONS 9 OUTPUTS - MITIGATION PROPOSALS
appendix O - Preliminary Mitigation Drawings

[^0]This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing with mode transport planning, no other party may copy, reproduce, distribute, make use of, or rely on the contents of the report. No liability is accepted by mode transport planning for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in this report are on the basis of mode transport planning using due skill, care and diligence in the preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided as to their accuracy. It should be noted and is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to mode transport planning has been made.

## Executive Summary

This Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared on behalf of Bicester Motion. It accompanies an Outline planning application for a specialised and bespoke development consisting of commercial, business and services land uses, Light Industrial (Class B2) and Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F); ultimately the development will comprise an Experience Quarter focused on 'Motion' and all forms of wings and wheel technologies.

This TA includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact and mitigation required in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms, from a highways perspective, The pertinent content and methodologies of the assessment have been subject to detailed discussion and pre-application with relevant Highways Officers within Oxfordshire County Council.

The Experience Quarter site is accessible by sustainable modes of travel; with bus routes offering frequent services, within a short walk of the site. Pedestrian and cycle links surround the site and provide good connections with neighbouring residential areas and links to Bicester Town Centre and major cities, further afield.

The development proposals (inc. the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan) will situate a major employment (and leisure) site of strategic scale within easy walking and cycling distance of the majority of Bicester; including numerous large scale residential housing schemes coming forward throughout the town - this will help to support and facilitate NHS England's 'Healthy New Towns' programme (of which Bicester was awarded 'Healthy New Town' status (2016) and is a Demonstrator Site). Furthermore, the Experience Quarter will also raise the opportunity to provide a substantial level of new employment in the local area; With the significant housing supply within Bicester and in close proximity of the site, this will allow for more local employment, and as such, employees to the development travelling more sustainably.

The Experience Quarter would cater for up to 400,000 visitors per annum and operate 7-days a week for 365-days per year (excluding national closure days); The forecast traffic generation associated with the development is summarised graphically in the Figure below. The methodology/calculations have been shared and agreed with OCC as part of pre-application scoping discussions.


In terms of staff, it is anticipated that the development could employ up to c. 200 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) staff members, based on c.120sqm per FTE, as per the HCA's Employment Density Guide 2015. It is expected that there will be approximately two-thirds (66\%) of total FTE staff, (c.132), on duty/on-site, daily, at any given time.

The main access to the Experience Quarter development will be provided from the A4221 Buckingham Road approximately 18 m south of the existing gated access to the airfield; this will be via a new ghost island priority junction; the access junction will allow for all movements entering the site but will prohibit vehicles leaving the site from turning right across Buckingham Road by deflecting traffic using an appropriate splitter island and road markings.

The scope of the network capacity assessment was agreed with OCC Highway Officers and includes an assessment of the cumulative committed development impacts associated with the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan (NTS, Hotel \& FAST 'Innovation Quarter'), as well as other local committed developments included in OCC's strategic SATURN model. The findings of the capacity modelling demonstrated that the development proposals are required to mitigate impact at specific locations on the local highway, in order to provide a 'nil detriment' during the weekday network peak hours (08000900 AM Peak \& 1700-1800 PM Peak).

The capacity analysis and mitigation has demonstrated that the traffic demands placed on the study area by the introduction of the Employment Quarter can be adequately accommodated either by existing or already committed infrastructure or by the introduction of mitigation schemes for three off-site junction locations:

- A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 roundabout;
- B4100/A4095/Banbury Rd roundabout; and,
- A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Road priority junction.

It has been concluded that the impact of development can be appropriately accommodated on the local highway network, subject to providing the necessary improvements aforementioned.

On the basis of the information and mitigation subsequently presented in this report, it is considered that the proposed development can be accommodated within the local area. As such there should be no reason why the application cannot be recommended in terms of highways and transportation.

It is concluded that the proposed development (considering the proposed mitigation) will not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the surrounding highway network and therefore, in accordance with the NPPF, the proposal should be considered acceptable in transport terms.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Overview

1.1.1 mode transport planning (mode) has been appointed by Bicester Motion to prepare a Transport Assessment (TA) to accompany an outline planning application for the Experience Quarter development included as part of the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan development proposals. The description of development is as follows:

Experience Quarter comprising Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2) and Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F).
1.1.2 The proposed site is located to the north of Bicester, approximately 2 km from the Town Centre; with its western boundary extending along Buckingham Road (A4421), Bicester Road along its northern boundary and the proposed wider Bicester Motion masterplan development to the south and east.
1.1.3 The location of the Experience Quarter development site, shown in relation to the Bicester Motion Masterplan is displayed in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: Site Location Plan


### 1.2 Pre-Application Scoping with Oxfordshire County Council

1.2.1 Consultation regarding the scope of the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan was undertaken with highways officers from Oxfordshire County Council (OCC). A Transport Assessment scoping note (dated February 2019) was submitted to OCC in February 2019 and this was followed by a meeting, on $19^{\text {th }}$ February 2019, in order to discuss the development parameters and modelling methodology. OCC has formally responded to the scoping exercise via email dated $7^{\text {th }}$ March 2019 and subsequent email correspondence between mode and OCC dated $27^{\text {th }}$ March, $9^{\text {th }}$ April and $7^{\text {th }}$ May 2019.
1.2.2 The full scoping/technical notes and pre-application highways comments/correspondences for the wider masterplan are provided in Appendix A, for reference.
1.2.3 Subsequent to the initial scoping exercise it was decided that the proposals for the Experience Quarter and FAST 'Innovation Quarter' elements of the wider masterplan will come forward as separate and individual applications.
1.2.4 Following a meeting on July $24^{\text {th }}$, regarding the FAST Future Technology Hub and submission of the draft wider Bicester Motion Masterplan TA, OCC Highway's response was received (dated $4^{\text {th }}$ September 2019) - this is also provided at Appendix A, for reference.
1.2.5 Specific Brand Experience pre-application workshop meetings were held on $7^{\text {th }}$ November and $18^{\text {th }}$ December 2019; the salient items that have been discussed and agreed with OCC, as part of the entire pre-application process includes:

- Tailored interim application assessment for each element of the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan;
- Trip rates \& traffic generation - first principles traffic generation methodology for the Experience Quarter;
- Capacity assessments and scope of off-site junctions;
- Use and commission of the Saturn model;
- Access proposals and preliminary junction location and layout plans; and,
- Parking.
1.2.6 A subsequent wider prep-application response to the Brand Experience proposals was subsequently received from Cherwell District Council (CDC) dated 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ February 2020, again a copy is included in Appendix A.
1.2.7 It should be noted that this TA covers the proposals and impact associated with the Brand Experience element of the wider Masterplan proposals.


### 1.3 Bicester Transport SATURN Model

1.3.1 As agreed with OCC, the highway assessment undertaken within this report is based on the outputs from the Bicester SATURN model.

### 1.4 Bicester Motion Planning Background

1.4.1 The overall Bicester Motion Airfield development site, currently has recent/historic planning permissions for the following development/applications:

- Application Ref. 16/01805/F- for the change of land use of buildings from sui generis MOD use to various commercial (B1c/Light Industry / B8) uses;
- Application Ref. 18/01253/F - for the erection of a hotel and conference facility with associated access, parking and landscaping;
- Application Ref. 18/01333/F - for an extension to the existing Technical Site, to provide new employment units comprising flexible B1(c) light industrial, B2 general industrial , B8 storage distribution uses, with ancillary office, storage, display/sales, with associated access, parking and landscaping; and,
- Application Ref. 19/02708/OUT - resolution to grant for new employment units comprising B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial), B8 (Storage) and D1 (Education) uses with ancillary offices, storage, display and sales, with all matters reserved except for access.
1.4.2 The above planning permissions for the Hotel and Technical Site are subject to various (ongoing) Section 278 and Section 106 Planning Obligations, which include the following highways/transport infrastructure contributions/improvements:

Hotel Application (18/01253/F):

- Buckingham Road/Skimmingdish Lane/A4095 Roundabout - Offsite junction improvements and kerb realignments to allow for increased flare capacity (across all four arms) - mode drawing ref. J32-3569-PS110_RevF;
- Skimmingdish Lane/Launton Road Roundabout - Offsite junction improvements and kerb/footway realignment to allow for increased flare capacity (on the Skimmingdish Lane arm) - mode drawing ref. J32-3569-PS-112_RevD;
- New ghost right priority access junction (left out only); Inc. 3m wide (maximum) footway/cycleway on the eastern side of Buckingham Road from the access junction down to the proposed toucan along the eastern side of Buckingham Road (subject to constraints); A new toucan crossing to the south of priority junction with Skimmingdish Lane, including 3m footway/cycleway to tie in with bus shelter provision on eastern side of Buckingham Road (to be provided by either hotel or technical site application - whichever comes forward first) - mode drawing ref. J32-3569-PS-100_RevE;
- Public Transport Infrastructure - various contributions towards the provision of two new flagpole bus stops on Buckingham Road in the vicinity of the new hotel access; and improvements to the existing bus stops on Buckingham Road in the vicinity of the existing Bicester Motion access, to include one new bus stop shelter and two Real-Time Information displays at both stops.


## New Technical Site Application (18/01333/F):

- Provision of 3 m wide footway/cycleway along eastern side of Buckingham Road southbound towards Skimmingdish Lane; new dropped kerb crossings at Buckingham Road and Skimmingdish Lane (Inc. splitter island refuges);
- New 3m wide footway/cycleway from the existing (already constructed) footway provision at the northern side of the main BH access to tie in with the bus stop; A new toucan crossing to the south of priority junction with Skimmingdish Lane, including 3m footway/cycleway to tie in with bus shelter provision on eastern side of Buckingham Road (to be provided by either hotel or technical site application - whichever comes forward first) - mode drawing ref. J32-3568-PS-001_RevE.
- Legal agreements have now been resolved for the above items and BM is awaiting agreement and confirmation to commence the works in Q1 2021.


## FAST 'Innovation Quarter' Application (19/02708/OUT) - Resolution to Grant:

- Buckingham Road/Skimmingdish Lane/A4095 Roundabout - Offsite junction improvements and kerb realignments to allow for increased capacity - mode drawing ref. J32-3684-PS-105_RevA;
- Skimmingdish Lane/Launton Road Roundabout - Offsite junction improvements and kerb/footway realignment to allow for capacity - mode drawing ref. J32-3684-PS-107_RevA;
- New ghost right priority access junction (left out only); formed with Skimmingdish Lane including uncontrolled crossing point and refuge to link the site with existing foot/cycle infrastructure on Skimmingdish Lane - mode drawing ref. J32-3684-PS-101_RevB;
- Improvements to existing site access junction formed between Skimmingdish Lane and the Gliding Club Access to incorporate a ghost island right turn lane, restriction to allow only left turns on egress and an uncontrolled pedestrian/cycle crossing with refuge to link the site with existing cycle infrastructure mode drawing ref. J32-3684-PS-102_RevA;
- S106 contribution (to be confirmed) towards highway works at the B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane roundabout. It is understood that OCC are currently undertaking a preliminary mitigation scheme / feasibility study at this location.


### 1.5 Report Structure

1.5.1 This TA will consider the impact of the proposed development on the local highway network utilising outputs from the SATURN model. It will also consider the suitability of access to the development for sustainable modes of transport alongside private vehicles and service vehicles. It will also determine the level of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed development during peak hours.
1.5.2 A separate Framework Travel Plan (FTP) (dated December 2020) has also been prepared by mode which accompanies the planning application for the proposed development. This TA should be read in conjunction with the FTP.
1.5.3 Following this introduction, the TA will be structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 Sets out the relevant national and local transport policy context;
- Chapter 3 Describes the existing situation, including a description of the surrounding transport facilities;
- Chapter 4 Outlines the development proposals;
- Chapter 5 Considers the trip generation and travel demand of the development; identifies modelling scenarios; SATURN model outputs;
- Chapter 6 Summarises the highway capacity assessment for the proposals; and,
- Chapter 7 Summarises and concludes the findings of the report.


## 2 Policy Review

### 2.1 Overview

2.1.1 This chapter considers the adopted transport and land use planning policies that relate to the development proposals. This chapter will review the following documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2019);
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (2012);
- Adopted Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031);
- Cherwell District Council RAF Bicester Planning Brief (Sep 2009);
- Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (2015-2031); and,
- Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire LTP4 (2015-2031): Active \& Healthy Travel Strategy.


### 2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

2.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's key objectives for achieving sustainable development. The NPPF was published in March 2012 and revised in February 2019 in order to streamline the national planning policies set out in previous policy guidance and a number of related circulars. These have been combined into a single document to make the planning system more accessible, whilst still protecting the environment and promoting sustainable growth.
2.2.2 The NPPF sets out the government's planning policies for England, and how these are expected to be applied, stating that all developments generating significant amounts of movement should be supported by a TA or Transport Statement (TS), alongside a Travel Plan (TP). Within the NPPF it also sets out that in order to achieve sustainable development, the planning system has three overarching objectives; economic, social and environmental (paragraph 8). A presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of the NPPF (paragraph 10).
2.2.3 Under Chapter 9 'Promoting Sustainable Transport', it is stated that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals. By doing this the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed and the appropriate transport infrastructure can be implemented. By considering transport at the earliest stages, it allows the opportunity to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and mitigate any problems.
2.2.4 Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states that significant developments should be focused on being sustainable, this can be done through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.
2.2.5 The NPPF (paragraph 104) states that planning policies should:

- "Support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities;
- Be prepared with the active involvement of local highway authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils, so that strategies and investments for supporting sustainable transport and development patterns are aligned;
- Provide high quality walking and cycling networks, supporting facilities such as cycle parking, local cycling and walking infrastructure."
2.2.6 Within this context, new developments should:
"...give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas... facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use" (paragraph 110).
"...create places that are safe, secure and attractive - which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street c/utter, and respond to local character and design standards" (paragraph 110).
2.2.7 The NPPF also recognises that "opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decisionmaking" (paragraph 103).
2.2.8 The NPPF highlights that for developments that generate "...significant amounts of movement", a TA and TP should be developed to support the application so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed (paragraph 111). When assessing applications, it should be ensured that:
- "the opportunity for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limits the significant impacts of the development." (Paragraph 108).
2.2.9 Paragraph 109 states that:
"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."
2.2.10 The proposed development has been designed in accordance with NPPF guidelines and this TA and accompanying FTP demonstrate that the above objectives would be satisfied by the development proposals.


### 2.3 Planning Practice Guidance (2019)

2.3.1 The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) was published in 2012 and most recently revised in February 2019. The updated guidance aims to facilitate the development of a robust and well thought out site, enabling an assessment of the transport impacts of both existing and proposed developments. The guidance can inform sustainable approaches to transport. A strong assessment will establish evidence that may be useful in:

- Improving the sustainability of transport provision;
- Enhancing the levels of accessibility;
- Creating a choice amongst different modes of transport;
- Improving health and well-being;
- Supporting economic vitality;
- Improving public understanding of the transport implications of development;
- Enabling other highway and transport authority's/service providers to support and deliver the transport infrastructure that conforms to the Local Plan; and
- Supporting local businesses and the regional economy.
2.3.2 This TA and the accompanying FTP demonstrate that the PPG objectives will be fulfilled.


### 2.4 Adopted Cherwell Local Plan, 2011-2031 (2015)

2.4.1 The adopted 'Cherwell Local Plan, 2011-2031: Part 1' provides the strategic planning policy framework and sets out site allocations for the District to 2031. The Plan forms part of the Statutory Development Plan and is intended to provide the basis for decisions on land use planning within Cherwell District. The policies of relevance are summarised below:
2.4.2 Policy PSD 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development:

- "When considering development proposals, the Council will take a proactive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. The Council will always work proactively with applicants to jointly find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.
- Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (or other part of the statutory Development Plan) will be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise - taking into account whether:
- Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole; or,
- Specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. "
2.4.3 Policy SLE4: Improved Transport and Connections:
- "The Council will support the implementation of the proposals of the Movement Strategies and the Local Transport Plan to deliver key connections, to support modal shift and to support more sustainable locations for employment and housing growth.
- We will support key transport proposals including:
- Transport Improvements at Banbury, Bicester and at the Former RAF Upper Heyford in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Plan and Movement Strategies;
- Projects associated with East-West rail including new stations at Bicester Town and Water Eaton;
- Rail freight associated development at Graven Hill, Bicester; and,
- Improvements to M40 junctions.
- New Development in the District will be required to provide financial and/or in-kind contribution to mitigate the transport impacts of development.
- All development where reasonable to do so, should facilitate the use of sustainable modes of transport to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. Encouragement will be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Development which is not suitable for the roads that serve the development, and which have severe traffic impact will not be supported."
2.4.4 Policy Bicester 8: Former RAF Bicester:
- "The Council will encourage conservation-led proposals to secure a long-lasting, economically viable future for the Former RAF Bicester technical site and flying field.
- It will support heritage tourism uses, leisure, recreation, employment and community use. The development of hotel and conference facilities will also be supported as part of a wider package of employment uses.
- All proposals will be required to accord with the approved Planning Brief for the site and take into account the Bicester Masterplan."
2.4.5 The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Local Plan and this TA and accompanying FTP demonstrate that the objectives can be met.


### 2.5 Cherwell District Council (CDC) RAF Bicester Planning Brief (Sep 2009)

2.5.1 The RAF Bicester Planning Brief sets out the planning parameters and guidance for the future redevelopment of the Bicester Airfield site. This document was subject to a public consultation, amended as appropriate and approved by CDC's Executive. It is generally considered within the determination of planning applications on the airfield site. Whilst the RAF Bicester Planning Brief predates the Local Plan 2031, the advice and guidance within the document is recommended to be referred to in this context. The key guidance in relation to transport, and in particular, this application, includes:

- Para 3.9.1 Access to the flying field - "The existing (main) access to the flying field from Skimmingdish Lane (A4421) which is currently used by the Gliding Club will meet the required visibility standards of $4.5 \mathrm{~m} \times 160 \mathrm{~m}$ (50mph speed limit)... Assuming the number of vehicles using this access remains similar, no alterations may be required. However, a right turn lane will be desirable if the traffic movements increase to over 500 movements per 12-hour period."
- Para 3.9.2 Vehicular Access to the Technical Site - "The existing (gated) access serving the technical site is located just off the roundabout of the A4421/A4095 \& Skimmingdish and is unsuitable for any significant increase in traffic movements... Access to the north of the site from the Bicester Road (towards Stratton Audley village), will not be supported by the Local Highway Authority because the Bicester Road/A4421 junction has its poor visibility and geometry." - the proposed accesses on Bicester Road and subsequent mitigation measures at the Bicester Road junction with the A4421 (considered within Chapters 5 \& 7) provide necessary improvements and required visibility which now ensures the safe and appropriate operation at the priority junction and site accesses.
- Para 3.9.3 Access to the domestic site - "The majority of the existing accesses serving the site appear acceptable off Skimmingdish Lane but may require visibility improvements. Use of the existing, disused and proposed but not implemented access points from Skimmingdish Lane will be acceptable in highway terms subject to keeping the sight lines clear of vegetation."
- Para 3.9.4 Pedestrian, cycle and public transport linkages - "The location of this site is away from the majority of Bicester and is in need of significant improvements in terms pedestrian and cycle links and public transport to reach the closest local infrastructure and services. Another area of concern is the how pedestrians etc will cross the A4095 and the A4421 (to reach Technical site) and the type of measures required i.e., controlled crossing, reduction of speed limit etc. To address these concerns the Highway Authority will be seeking:
- a bus stop on the east side of A4421 Buckingham Road within the existing deceleration lane;
- a pedestrian crossing with a central refuge to enable pedestrians to cross both east west and north south to this point;
- a controlled pedestrian crossing, subject to a safety audit, but the preference would be that signalisation at this roundabout be avoided;

Links within the site (and improved transport links) should also be taken into consideration as well the existing routes the community of Caversfield currently enjoy.

Depending on the type of development that comes on in the future a Travel Plan will be appropriate to reduce the reliance on the private car and developer contributions will be sought towards improvements to public transport. It is unlikely the roads within the site would be offered for adoption so a private road agreement will be sought."

- Para 5.8 Transport Assessment - "Oxfordshire County Council will require a robust Transport Assessment to accompany a Planning application for development, which must consider the following:
- Detailed information of the level of traffic generated by the site's existing uses,
- Site history;
- Traffic generation for the proposed development(s);
- Assessment of existing public transport, pedestrian and cycle links;
- Accident records (previous 5 years)
- Provisions of off-site infrastructure and financial contributions towards enhancing local services; and,
- Travel Plan for site."
2.5.2 The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Planning Brief and this TA and accompanying FTP demonstrate that the measures are considered, and the appropriate objectives can be met.


### 2.6 Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), 20152031 (2016)

2.6.1 Since the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2030 was adopted in 2011, the ways in which transport can be funded in Oxfordshire has changed. To ensure the county's transport systems are fit to support the population and economic growth, OCC has developed a $4^{\text {th }}$ Local Transport Plan: Connecting Oxfordshire (2015-2031). The Plan was updated in 2016 in order to strengthen the emphasis on improving air quality and making better provision for walking and cycling. The following policies are of relevance to the development proposal:

### 2.6.2 Policy 03:

- "Oxfordshire County Council will support measures and innovation that make more efficient use of transport network capacity by reducing the proportion of single occupancy car journeys and encouraging a greater proportion of journeys to be made on foot, by bicycle, and/or by public transport."


### 2.6.3 Policy 04:

- "Oxfordshire County Council will prioritise the needs of different types of users in developing transport schemes or considering development proposals, taking into account road classification and function/purpose, the characteristics and function of the place and the need to make efficient use of transport network capacity. "


### 2.6.4 Policy 17:

- "Oxfordshire County Council will seek to ensure through cooperation with the districts and city councils, that the location of development makes the best use of existing and planned infrastructure, provides new or improved infrastructure and reduces the need to travel and supports walking, cycling and public transport."


### 2.6.5 Policy 34:

- "Oxfordshire County Council will require the layout and design of new developments to proactively encourage walking and cycling, especially for local trips, and allow developments to be served by frequent, reliable and efficient public transport. To do this, we will:
- Secure transport improvements to mitigate the cumulative adverse transport impacts from new developments in the locality and/or wider area, through effective Travel Plans, financial contributions from developers or direct works carried out by developers;
- Identify the requirement for passenger transport services to service the development and negotiate the provision of these passenger transport services with the developer;
- Ensure that developers promote and enable cycling and walking for journeys associated with the new development, including through the provision of effective travel plans;
- Require that all infrastructure associated with the developments is provided to appropriate design standards and to appropriate timescales;
- Set local routing agreements where appropriate to protect environmentally sensitive locations from traffic generated by new developments;
- Seek support towards the long-term operation and maintenance of facilities, services and selected highway infrastructure from appropriate developments, normally through the payment of commuted sums;
- Secure works to achieve suitable access to and mitigate against the impact of new developments in the immediate area, generally through direct works carried out by the developer."
2.6.6 The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Local Transport Plan and this TA and accompanying FTP demonstrate that the objectives can be met. This is demonstrated within Chapters $4,5 \& 6$, which consider the existing conditions, development proposals (Inc. sustainable travel) and impact of the site on the local highway network.


### 2.7 Connecting Oxfordshire: Oxfordshire LTP4, 2015-2031: Active \& Healthy Travel Strategy (2016)

2.7.1 This updated plan has brought active and healthy travel modes together as an Active \& Healthy Travel Strategy. This builds on what was already in the original LTP4. It updates the LTP4 cycling strategy and adds new sections on walking and Door to Door integrated journeys, which covers longer journeys undertaken by cycling or walking in combination with bus or rail.
2.7.2 The Active \& Healthy Travel Strategy aims to contribute to reducing pressure on the road network, contribute to economic growth and the reduction of emissions, quality of life and health, and link active travel with bus and rail options by enabling sustainable door to door journeys combining cycling or walking with public transport.
2.7.3 In terms of new development, the report states that: "It is essential that new developments are planned with cycling in mind and with facilities to make cycling both convenient and safe. Designing new developments so that cycling is the most convenient transport method for the majority of trips will naturally increase the proportion of journeys made in this way."
2.7.4 The proposed development has been designed in accordance with the Active \& Healthy Travel Strategy and this TA and in particular the accompanying FTP will ensure that sustainable travel and healthy travel options will be considered by all users to/from the development site.

### 2.8 Summary

2.8.1 In summary, the national and local planning policy aforementioned, aims to ensure that sustainable development takes place throughout the county of Oxfordshire and in Cherwell District. More specifically, a fundamental theme within transport policy is for new developments to be as sustainable as possible, in terms of pedestrian and cycle movements and public transport accessibility.
2.8.2 Development sites should evolve to integrate with existing and proposed transport infrastructure; encouraging the use of sustainable modes of travel to ensure that all occupants and visitors are provided with genuine modal choice.
2.8.3 Furthermore, the planning policy considered, requires that sites are completed within appropriate timescales and compliant with design standards.
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Transport Assessment
2.8.4 This TA has been prepared in line with current best practice guidance and methodology, and as such, the development proposals are compliant and accord with the local and national planning policy prescribed above.

## 3 Existing Conditions

### 3.1 Overview

3.1.1 This chapter describes the existing site and the existing local transport network for all modes of travel/transport in order to assess the current accessibility of the site.

### 3.2 Site Description

3.2.1 The site is located at Bicester Motion, Bicester, OX26 5HA, situated on the northern edge of Bicester, approximately 2 km north of the Town Centre. The development site proposes an Experience Quarter, the 'Experience Quarter', which will be encompassed within the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan development on land at the existing Bicester Motion Airfield site.
3.2.2 The Experience Quarter will be located at the northern extent of the Bicester Motion Masterplan and will comprise c.24,000 sqm of Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2) and Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F). The site is located to the north of the consented 344-bedroom hotel/aparthotel and extension to the existing technical site comprising flexible light industrial, general industrial and storage/distribution units, as part of the wider Bicester Motion masterplan.
3.2.3 Primary vehicular access is proposed from the A4221 Buckingham Road using a historic/existing gated access to the airfield, via a new ghost island priority junction set c. 50 m to the south of Thompson Drive. The access is located c. 240 metres north of the proposed main site access to the consented hotel aspect of the Bicester Motion masterplan.
3.2.4 A secondary access for servicing and emergency vehicles is proposed onto Bicester Road, utilising a historic/existing access, located c. 90 metres from the Bicester Road/Buckingham Road priority junction.
3.2.5 For context and reference, Figure 3.1 illustrates the site location in relation to the wider Masterplan site and highlights the existing and proposed site access.

Figure 3.1: Site Location


### 3.3 Local Highway Network

3.3.1 To the west and southwest of the site, the A4421 Buckingham Road provides a route for vehicles travelling between the town centre of Bicester and the Bicester Motion site.
3.3.2 West and north from the site, the A4421 Buckingham Road provides a link from Bicester's local highway network past the site, towards the villages of Stratton Audley, Fringford, Finmere and into Buckinghamshire.
3.3.3 Approximately 650 m to the southwest of the proposed site main access on the A4421 Buckingham Road, the A4421 Buckingham Road joins with Skimmingdish Lane and the A4095 Southwold Lane in the form of a 4-arm roundabout.
3.3.4 The roundabout facilitates southwest (Buckingham Road), southeast (Skimmingdish Lane) and west (Southwold Lane) bound vehicle movements from the site to the centre of Bicester and around its northern perimeter roads.
3.3.5 The local highway network within the vicinity of the site; including the A4421 Buckingham Road, the A4095 Southwold Lane and the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane are all subject to a 50mph speed limit and incorporate street lighting.
3.3.6 From the southwest arm of the roundabout junction, Buckingham Road (towards Bicester Town Centre) is subject to a 40 mph speed limit and a 7.5 tonne weight restriction.
3.3.7 The A4095 (Southwold Lane) to the west and south provides strategic access to the M40; northbound and southbound access to the M40 is achieved via both the B4100 (J10) and the A41 (J9). The M40 provides routes towards Banbury, Leamington Spa and Birmingham to the north and High Wycombe and greater London to the southeast.
3.3.8 The A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (eastbound), via both Blackthorn Road and Charbridge Lane, provides access to the A41; the A41 links with Waddesdon and Aylesbury to the southeast and the M40 and A34 to the southwest.

### 3.4 Existing Baseline (2016) Traffic Flows

3.4.1 In order to establish and understand the current traffic levels and speed data on the local road network, a number of Automatic Traffic Counters (ATCs) were installed along the A4421 Buckingham Road and Skimmingdish Lane, for a one-week period during July 2016; furthermore, an ATC was also installed on Bicester Road during May 2019.
3.4.2 The traffic surveys demonstrate that the 24-hour AADT two-way traffic flows are c. 15,480 vehicles along Buckingham Road, c.16,650 vehicles along Skimmingdish Lane and c.1,040 vehicles along Bicester Road.
3.4.3 The average speeds in both directions were recorded at c. 45 mph , with a worst directional $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of c.53mph (northbound) along Buckingham Road. Along Skimmingdish Lane the average speeds were recorded at c.43mph, with a worst directional $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of c.50mph (eastbound). Bicester Road average speeds were recorded at c.45mph, with a worst directional $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile speed of c.54mph (eastbound).
3.4.4 Full traffic count data is contained in Appendix B, for reference.
3.4.5 It should be noted that the weekday AM and PM peak hours are considerably higher than any peak hour recorded over the weekend (on a Saturday/Sunday); as a result, this TA will only assess the weekday peak hours (as agreed with OCC during scoping), as a worst-case scenario. The traffic flow differences between weekdays and weekends can be seen from the traffic survey data contained in Appendix B.

### 3.5 Highway Safety (Personal Injury Accident Data)

3.5.1 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data has been obtained from OCC; for the most recent five-year period available, between 31/08/15 and 31/08/20, and for the study area comprising of the following main links and junctions:

- A4421 Buckingham Road;
- Bicester Road;
- A4421 Buckingham Road/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/A4095 Southwold Lane/Buckingham Road Roundabout;
- Skimmingdish Lane;
- A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Launton Road/A4421 Roundabout;
- A4095 Southwold Road; and,
- B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane Roundabout.
3.5.2 Broader details of the PIA study area, including plot map and full outputs of the accident data/reports are attached at Appendix C, for reference. The study area assessed is illustrated in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.2: PIA Study Area

3.5.3 To analyse the PIA data, accidents within the study area have been classified in terms of their location, severity and impact on sensitive highway users; e.g., pedestrians and cyclists.

### 3.5.4 An overall accident summary is provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: PIA Summary

| Junction (J) / Link (L) | Accident Severity |  |  | Sensitive Users |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (J) A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Launton Rd/A4421 <br> Charbridge Ln R'bout | Slight | Serious | Fatal | Peds | Cyclists |
| $(\mathrm{J}$ Vulcan View / A4421 Skimmingdish Ln | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


| Junction (J) / Link (L) | Accident Severity |  |  | Sensitive Users |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Slight | Serious | Fatal | Peds | Cyclists |
| (J) A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 Southwold Ln R'bout | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (J) A4421 Buckingham Road/Churchill Road MiniDumbbell R'bouts | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (L) Buckingham Rd (Between Coopers Green and Southwold) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (L) A4421 Buckingham Rd (Between A4095 and Skimmingdish Lane) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (J) A4421 Buckingham Rd J/W Skimmingdish Lane (Priority) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (J) Skimmingdish Lane J/W Turnpike Road (Priority) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (J) A4421 Buckingham Road JNW Thompson Drive (Priority) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (J) A4421 Buckingham Road J/W Bicester Road (Priority) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (L) Bicester Road (Between Buckingham Rd and Stratton Audley) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (J) A4095 Southwold Lane J/W Hornbeam Road (Priority) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| (J) A4095 Southwold Lane J/W Heather Road (Priority) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| (L) A4095 Southwold Lane (Between Banbury Rd and Buckingham Rd) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| (J) A4095 Lords Ln/B4100 Banbury Rd/A4095 Southwold Ln R'bout | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 26 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 |

3.5.5 As summarised above, 31 accidents were reported in the study area, between 31/08/2015 and 31/08/2020 of which 26 were classified as 'slight' in severity, 5 were classified as 'serious' in severity and there were zero fatalities.
3.5.6 The highest number of PIAs recorded within the study area occurred at the A4421 Buckingham Road/Skimmingdish Lane/Southwold Lane roundabout (5), the A4095 Lords Lane/B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane roundabout (4), the A4421 Skimmingdish.Lane/Launton Road/A4421 Charbridge Lane Roundabout (3), A4421 Buckingham Road/Churchill Road Mini-Dumbbell Roundabouts (3) and the A4095 Southwold Lane between Banbury Road and Buckingham Road)
3.5.7 The contributory factors for the majority of accidents, within the aforementioned clusters, were the result of neglectful/erroneous driving; none of the incidents at these locations were directly attributed to the road or junction layout.
3.5.8 Figure 3.3 illustrates the locations and severity of the PIAs within the study area.

Figure 3.3: PIA Location Map

3.5.9 As demonstrated above, all PIAs were dispersed throughout the study area. In total, seven cyclists were involved in PIAs over the most recent five-year period, and also, three incidents impacted on pedestrians.
3.5.10 Additionally, no more than one PIA involving a sensitive user (pedestrian/cyclist) was reported at any individual junction and/or road link throughout the study area.

## Summary

3.5.11 Overall, the PIA data suggests that there is no strong correlation in how incidents occurred or were distributed throughout the study area, over the most recent five-year period. The majority of accidents recorded were 'slight' in severity (26) and there were no fatal accidents.
3.5.12 The majority of accidents were the result of driver error/neglectful driving, such as; failing to look properly, poor turn manoeuvres, careless/reckless driving and/or travelling too fast.
3.5.13 It is considered that given the low level of accidents recorded over the study period and lack of a common design cause for accidents that are clustered or within the vicinity of the site (i.e., no accidents were attributable to the existing layout/design of the junctions and/or highway); there will be no requirement for any specific road safety issues to be addressed or mitigated as a part of the development proposals.

### 3.6 Walking and Cycling

3.6.1 The surrounding local highway network offers pedestrian connectivity to the neighbouring residential areas (Thompson Drive/Turnpike Road/Skimmingdish Lane/Sunderland Drive) and amenities, including the wider Bicester Motion site, and Bicester Town Centre.
3.6.2 A 2.5 m shared use footway/cycleway runs on the western side of Buckingham Road from Thompson Drive towards the A4421 Buckingham Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road roundabout and further onto Bicester Town Centre to the south.
3.6.3 The existing footway network follows the key pedestrian desire line and includes uncontrolled crossings with dropped kerbs at the Skimmingdish Lane and Thompson Drive priority junctions along the western side of Buckingham Road; however, there is currently no footway provision along the eastern side of the carriageway, along the frontage boundary of the development site.
3.6.4 The previous Bicester Motion (formerly Heritage) Hotel and Technical Site development applications which currently have planning permission (Chapter 1.4), propose to provide a new section of footway along the eastern side of Buckingham Road (from the main Bicester Motion access), along the northern side of Skimmingdish Lane, and incorporate dropped kerb tactile crossings (across the Buckingham Road and Skimmingdish Lane splitter islands), to connect with the provision on the western side of Buckingham Road and southern side of Skimmingdish Lane (mode drawing J32-3568-PS-001_RevE associated with the previous new technical site planning consent (and on-going S106 Agreements) illustrate these proposals).
3.6.5 At the A4421 Buckingham Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road roundabout, existing pedestrian crossing points are provided via splitter islands on the southern (Buckingham Road) and western (A4095) arms. At the A4095 arm of the junction, there is a controlled toucan crossing that provides a link to the existing shared footway and cycleway infrastructure that abuts the southern side of the A4095 carriageway, to provide a convenient walking/cycling route westbound in the direction of Southwold.
3.6.6 At the Buckingham Road (southern) arm of the roundabout, the splitter island provides an informal crossing with dropped kerbs and tactile paving to enable pedestrian travel along the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane, the A4095 Southwold Lane and Buckingham Road, towards Bicester Town Centre.
3.6.7 From the southwest arm of the roundabout, Buckingham Road benefits from footways on both sides of the carriageway which provide a convenient walking route to the wider local area and towards Bicester Town Centre.
3.6.8 Approximately 550 metres south of the proposed site access ( 60 m to the north of the Bicester Motion main access) on Buckingham Road, sheltered cycle parking is provided on the western and eastern side of the carriageway. Four Sheffield cycle stands (eight spaces) are on the western side of the carriageway and three Sheffield cycle stands (six spaces) are on the eastern side; immediately next to the southbound sheltered bus stop.
3.6.9 There are street-lit shared cycleway/footways both east and west of the A4421 Buckingham Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road roundabout along Skimmingdish Lane and the A4095 Southwold Lane, respectively. The cycleway/footway is provided on the southern side of Skimmingdish Lane adjacent to the carriageway for approximately 250 metres to the east of the Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road roundabout, before becoming segregated from the main road
along the historic alignment of Skimmingdish Lane. This provides local access to the residential areas of Sunderland Drive and continues towards Launton Road. To the west, a cycleway/footway runs adjacent to the carriageway on the southern side of the A4095 Southwold Lane, providing local access to the residential areas accessible via Hornbeam Road and Heather Road, and further onto Banbury Road.
3.6.10 Footways will be provided throughout the wider Bicester Motion site which will connect the Brand Experience development site with Buckingham Road. The internal footways will also connect the Brand Experience site with the already consented hotel and new technical site and its main site access (c. 240 metres south of the proposed Brand Experience access), from which two new bus stops associated with those developments can be accessed (more details in Section 3.8). Internal links will also provide access to Skimmingdish Lane to the south of the site.

### 3.7 Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

3.7.1 There are several PRoWs located within close proximity of the development site. To the northwest of the site is a public footpath (route code 153/1) which runs along the north of Caversfield to Fringford Road. The footpath provides access to countryside to the northwest of the development. The PRoW is remote from the application site and will not be directly impacted on by development proposals.
3.7.2 Three further PRoW's are located at the northern extent of the site. Public footpath $371 / 7$ (which joins $371 / 12$ ) and $371 / 10$ run to north of Bicester Road to the A4421 Buckingham Road. To the south of Bicester Road, the 371/7 also appears within the redline boundary of the site, according to OCC's online definitive map. The 371/7 continues in a north easterly alignment, parallel to Bicester Road, towards Stratton Audley.
3.7.3 Figure 3.4 shows the location of the local PRoW's in relation to the site.

Figure 3.4: Local PRoWs


### 3.8 Bus Services

3.8.1 The 'Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments' (Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, 1999), states that "generally walking distances to bus stops in urban areas should be a maximum of 400 m and preferably no more than 300 m ".
3.8.2 The nearest existing bus stops (serving both northbound and southbound directions) are situated c.550m (c.6-7-min walk) to the south of the proposed site access on Buckingham Road (c.50m south of Thompson Drive) and are accessible via the existing footways along the western side of the A4421 Buckingham Road.
3.8.3 The southbound bus stop is in the form of a lay-by, shelter with a hard-standing waiting area, a flag, pole and timetable display cabinet. There are no footways or formal crossing points along this side of the A4421. The northbound bus stop benefits from a lay-by, flag, pole and timetabling information.
3.8.4 The bus stops detailed on Buckingham Road are served by the Stagecoach X5 service. Table 3.2 provides a summary of its route and typical frequency.
3.8.5 Table 3.2 provides a summary of the typical frequencies of bus services aforementioned that route near to the site and serve the local area and bus stops along Buckingham Road.

Table 3.2: Local Bus Services and Frequency*

| Bus No. | Bus Route |  | Typical Daytime Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

*Bus service frequencies may be affected as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic - times correct as of 26/11/20
3.8.6 The X 5 service detailed in Table 3.2 provides a regular public transport connection between the site, Bicester Village and Bicester town centre, and also links the development to key towns and cities such as Oxford, Cambridge, Milton Keynes and Buckingham.
3.8.7 The previous Bicester Motion (formerly Heritage) Hotel and Technical Site development applications which currently have planning permission (aforementioned in Chapter 1.4), propose to provide public transport infrastructure contributions/improvements; including new bus stops on Buckingham Road in the vicinity of the new hotel access; and improvements to the existing bus stops on Buckingham Road in the vicinity of (opposite and north of) the existing Bicester Motion access, to include a shelter (at the northbound stop) and two Real-Time Information displays at both stops. Furthermore, the developments will also provide new footway/cycleway connections providing convenient and safe access to these facilities.
3.8.8 As such, this new public transport infrastructure (Inc. new bus stops in the vicinity of the hotel access) will result in the proposed access to the Experience Quarter on Buckingham Road being located within c.230m (c.3-min walk) of public transport services.
3.8.9 The location of the existing and proposed (indicative) bus stops are illustrated on Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.5: Local Bus Stops


### 3.9 Rail Services

3.9.1 Bicester North Railway Station is situated $c .2 \mathrm{~km}$ to the south of the site and is within a range of sustainable travel modes; such as walking, cycling and via bus services into Bicester Town Centre.
3.9.2 The station can be reached by bus (via the X5 route, including a short walk) within approximately 15minutes from Buckingham Road. The station can also be reached within an approximate 9-minute cycle or 20-25-minute walk from the main site access along Buckingham Road.
3.9.3 Bicester North Station is located on the Chiltern Main Line which provides frequent direct services to and from key destinations around the country including Birmingham Moor Street, Banbury and London Marylebone.
3.9.4 The typical frequency of train services that serve Bicester North Station are summarised in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Bicester North Railway Station Services and Frequency*
Destination Fastest Journey Time (approx.) Typical Frequency

| Destination | Fastest Journey Time (approx.) | Typical Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banbury | 12 minutes | Every 20-40 minutes |
| London Marylebone | 53 minutes | Every 20-45-minutes |

*Train service frequencies may be affected as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic - times correct as of 26/11/20
3.9.5 As aforementioned, the railway station is also accessible from the A4421 Buckingham Road via the X5 direct bus service which routes along the A4421 (within a 2-5-minute bus journey), effectively acting as an 'interchange' between sustainable bus and rail travel modes.
3.9.6 Platforms 1 and 2 at the station are accessible for mobility impaired users via a lift which operates Monday to Friday from 0600 to 2300 (assistance can also be requested outside these hours).
3.9.7 There are 65 secure and sheltered bicycle storage spaces near the station, by the Bicester North Railway Station bus stop and also on the opposite side of the station approach.
3.9.8 Car parking provision at the station has capacity for c. 673 cars (with 6 accessible spaces) and operates 24 -hours a day. The weekday daily rate of parking is c.£8.00 and the off-peak rate is c.£5.00. Monthly and annual tickets can be purchased at reduced rates.

### 3.10 Summary

3.10.1 A review of the existing transport infrastructure within the vicinity of the site has demonstrated that the site is accessible by car and via the local highway network, with good links to the strategic road network.
3.10.2 The site is also accessible by sustainable modes of travel; with bus routes offering frequent services, within a short walk of the site. Pedestrian and cycle links surround the site and provide good connections with neighbouring residential areas and links to Bicester Town Centre.
3.10.3 In addition, analysis of the local highway network in the vicinity of the site has demonstrated that there are no existing safety concerns, and therefore, no highway safety issues that are likely to be exacerbated by the development proposals.
3.10.4 The Experience Quarter (including the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan) development proposals will situate a major employment (and leisure) site of strategic scale within easy walking and cycling distance of the majority of Bicester; including numerous large scale residential housing schemes coming forward throughout the town - this is in accordance with and will help to support and facilitate NHS England's 'Healthy New Towns' programme (of which Bicester was awarded 'Healthy New Town' status (2016) and is a Demonstrator Site).
3.10.5 Furthermore, the Experience Quarter (and wider Bicester Motion Masterplan) will also raise the opportunity to provide a substantial level of new jobs/employment in the local area; With the significant housing supply within Bicester and in close proximity of the site, this will allow for more local employment, and as such, employees to the development travelling more sustainably (i.e., walking/cycling).

## 4 Development Proposals

### 4.1 Proposed Development

4.1.1 The development proposals for the site are for the development of an Experience Quarter, accompanying the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan development on land at the existing Bicester Motion site.
4.1.2 The description of the development is as follows:
"Experience Quarter comprising Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2) and Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F)."
4.1.3 The proposed site is located to the north of Bicester, approximately 2 km from the Town Centre; with its western boundary extending along Buckingham Road (A4421), Bicester Road along its northern boundary and the proposed wider Bicester Motion masterplan development to the south and east.
4.1.4 An indicative layout plan and area schedule (Ridge's Bicester Motion Experience Quarter Layout Plan, Ref No. 5002854-RDG-Z01-ST-PL-A-0030 Rev G, illustrating the general layout, location and schedule of the development is appended to this report, for reference (at Appendix D). The full range of masterplan layout and parameters plans are included within the suite of documents that accompany the planning application submission.

### 4.2 Vehicular Access

4.2.1 The main access to the Experience Quarter development will be provided from the A4221 Buckingham Road approximately 18 m south of the existing gated access to the airfield; this will be via a new ghost island priority junction appropriately spaced c .50 m to the south of Thompson Drive. The access is located c. 240 metres north of the proposed site access to the consented hotel aspect of the Bicester Motion masterplan. The access proposals are illustrated on Drawing J32-3684-PS-201 (Rev A), included at Appendix E.
4.2.2 The access will form a ghost island priority junction with a 6.0 m wide access carriageway and incorporate compound curve corner kerb radii with Buckingham Road. The access junction will allow for all movements entering the site but will prohibit vehicles leaving the site from turning right across Buckingham Road by deflecting traffic using an appropriate splitter island and road markings (this will also require a TRO, to enforce the banned right turn movement). Localised widening/realignment will be carried out on Buckingham Road in order to facilitate a right-turn lane (provided at 3.5 m wide) for vehicles entering the site. It should be noted that this access is consistent with the approved access as part of the hotel application (18/01253/F).
4.2.3 Visibility splays of $2.4 \mathrm{~m} \times 160 \mathrm{~m}$ are achievable (subject to cutting back/removal/setting back of trees/hedgerow/foliage), in accordance with DMRB 85kmph speed limit roads and the recorded 85 ${ }^{\text {th\% }}$ 'ile speeds of 53 mph along Buckingham Road.
4.2.4 A 3.0m wide shared cycle/footway will be provided on the northern side of the proposed internal access road. The new pedestrian footway/cycleway will route around the northern corner of the access junction, and continue for approximately $130-140 \mathrm{~m}$ north, where a new dropped kerb crossing point (with tactile paving and a central refuge island) will be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to connect with the existing provision on the western side of Buckingham Road.
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4.2.5 In addition to the above main site access, an existing/historic gated access located on Bicester Road at the northern site boundary (c.90m east of the junction with Buckingham Road) is intended to be reinstated, improved and used as secondary access to the site, for the purposes of emergency and service access.
4.2.6 Maximum visibility splays of $2.4 \mathrm{~m} \times 100 \mathrm{~m}$ to the west (covering the full extent to Buckingham Road junction) and $2.4 \mathrm{~m} \times 162 \mathrm{~m}$ to the east are achievable (subject to cutting back/removal/setting back of trees/hedgerow/foliage), which accord to recorded $85^{\text {th }}$ \%'ile traffic speeds of c.53mph along Bicester Road - this level of visibility is also considered appropriate and suitable given the existing and proposed nature of the secondary access.
4.2.7 An existing access located c.200m east of the proposed secondary access (as above) is intended to be retained, as this access is currently utilised by lake users. This access is not heavily trafficked and does not form a major/formal access to the development proposals.
4.2.8 Drawing no. J32-3684-PS-006 (Rev F) contained in Appendix E, illustrates the proposed secondary access (Inc. visibility splays) at Bicester Road (90m east of Buckingham Road), including the existing access, retained for the lake users.
4.2.9 Figure 4.1 shows the proposed location of the development site accesses in relation to the development.

Bicester Motion - Experience Quarter

Figure 4.1: Proposed Access Locations


### 4.3 OCC's Infrastructure Improvements

4.3.1 It is acknowledged that OCC's LTP 4 Bicester Area Strategy includes aspirational proposals for improvements to the eastern peripheral corridor to which the Experience Quarter and wider Bicester Motion site lies to the north of; i.e. along the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane. Stating:
4.3.2 "Eastern peripheral corridor: upgrade to dual carriageway on the A4421 between the Buckingham Road and Gavray Drive to complement the transport solution at the railway level crossing at Charbridge Lane and facilitate development in the area. This scheme will improve the operation of this section of the eastern perimeter road and enhance the integration of the North-East Bicester Business Park site with the rest of the town. This will include improvements to the Buckingham Road / A4221 junction to provide the necessary capacity for the additional trips generated from nearby employment and residential development, as well as support the heritage tourism development of the neighbouring Former RAF Bicester site."
4.3.3 Furthermore, Cherwell District Council's (CDC) Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) supporting the Cherwell Local Plan states that, for Skimmingdish Lane, dualling and signalisation of various junctions along the corridor, including improvements to the strategic highway capacity are prioritised as critical in the medium to long term.
4.3.4 OCC are unable at present to indicate precisely when these improvements are likely to come forward; and as such, it is considered that this will be sometime within the local plan period to 2031. In addition, it is understood that there are currently no route alignment options or proposal plans, which would inform the impact on surrounding land/local development; therefore, it is considered that the planned infrastructure improvements cannot preclude or notably determine the outcome of any development planning application.
4.3.5 In addition, and as aforementioned, it is understood that OCC is currently undertaking a preliminary mitigation scheme / feasibility study at the B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane roundabout.
4.3.6 It is considered that the impact of the proposed development in terms of OCC's infrastructure aspirations along Skimmingdish Lane and Banbury Road/Southwold Lane/Lords Lane roundabout are not significant and/or material.

### 4.4 Parking

## Car Parking

4.4.1 There is no specific OCC parking standard covering the proposed development land uses and consequently a first principles approach has been adopted in order to determine the required level of parking provision for the site; this is summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Maximum Car Parking Standards

| Development Schedule | Area/Units | OCC (Max) Parking Standard | Parking Level Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experience Quarter | 24,030 sqm | No relevant OCC standard for this <br> bespoke use. (D2 closest land use $=1$ <br> space per 22sqm) | First Principles Approach <br> Adopted |

4.4.2 In order to determine the highest level of parking required for the development, a parking accumulation profile has been run, based on an annual visitor numbers of up to c.400,000 (and including proposed staff, assuming all drive to the site for robustness). The highest level of parking requirement is c. 300 spaces during the weekdays and c. 350 spaces at weekends, when the demand is forecast to be typically higher. The parking accumulation profile is contained within Appendix $F$, for reference.
4.4.3 In light of the above, it is considered that providing a total of c. 400 spaces would be a suitable provision of parking to serve the development proposals - this is in accordance with the maximum OCC standards for the former D2 land use class (closest comparison to the development proposals) and is sufficient to accommodate the proposed traffic/parking demand for 400,000 visitors during the worst-case weekend accumulation peaks (350); including an additional c. 50 spaces to accommodate some seasonal excess demand/overflow parking.
4.4.4 As the application is in Outline the parking standards and associated provision will be fully specified and agreed (Inc. proposed phased delivery of parking provision on a demand basis, if applicable and appropriate) during the reserved matters/detailed design stages (subject to further consultation, discussion and agreement with OCC).
4.4.5 Within the overall total car parking layouts for each land use, $10 \%$ of the total spaces will be allocated as disabled parking bays, in order to meet the required OCC parking standard.
4.4.6 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points will also be provided within the car parking areas throughout the site; the level of provision will be provided at $\mathrm{c} .3 \%$ of total parking spaces (as agreed as part of the hotel application); in the absence of specific OCC and CDC policy/guidance, this is considered to be an appropriate level in order to accommodate sustainable EV provision. Furthermore, underground ducting/space can also be safeguarded, which will allow the retrofitting of additional equipment and charging units if considered necessary in the future and if the EV charging spaces were observed to be highly utilised. The uptake and usage of EV parking bays will be monitored as part of the Travel Plan process; the provision of bays can then be adjusted accordingly, in order to ensure they are providing for the required demand.
4.4.7 The overall provision of car parking, as detailed above is considered to be an adequate and appropriate level for the development proposals.

## Cycle Parking

4.4.8 Cycle parking will be provided at the Experience Quarter development site; which will be provided in accordance with the estimated levels summarised in Table 4.2.
4.4.9 As the planning application is in Outline, the cycle parking will be specified in more detail during the reserved matters/detailed design stages (subject to further consultation/agreement with OCC). However, it should be noted that cycle parking will be provided in the form of covered Sheffield stands and will be located close to the main building entrances.

Table 4.2: Cycle Parking Standards

| Development Schedule | Area/Units | OCC / First Principles Standard | Proposed Cycle Parking Level |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experience Quarter | 24,030sqm | No relevant OCC standard for this <br> bespoke use. Closest is D2-1 <br> stand per 12 staff $\&$ c.15\% of <br> forecast daily visitor numbers <br> (average weekday Mon-Fri) | c. 6 stands (c.12 spaces) for <br> staff $\&$ c. 42 stands (c. 84 for <br> visitors) |
|  |  |  |  |

4.4.10 Cycle parking will be monitored, as part of the Travel Planning for the site, and should it transpire that the demand exceeds supply - additional levels of cycle parking storage can be supplied/provided in future.
4.4.11 Furthermore, shower changing, and locker facilities will be provided for staff within specific land use buildings (as appropriate), in order to encourage sustainable travel by bicycle to/from the site.

### 4.5 Sustainable Travel Measures

4.5.1 The proposed Bicester Motion scheme will provide a suite of measures to increase the sustainability of the Experience Quarter and increase non-car travel. These include the following:

- Adequate footway and cycle links will be provided within the site that will link with the existing provision in the vicinity of the site and across the wider Bicester Motion Masterplan (internally), including the existing technical site and recently approved Hotel and Technical Site planning applications once delivered; the intention is that this will connect the four Quarters of the site (Heritage, Innovation, Wilderness and Experience) via sustainable modes of travel.
- A new 3 m shared footway/cycleway will be provided on the northern side of the proposed internal access road from Buckingham Road. Footways will be introduced internally within the site providing safe and permeable routes towards the main buildings and guest facilities;
- The 3 m wide shared cycle/footway will continue around the northern corner of the Buckingham Road access junction, and continue for approximately $130-140 \mathrm{~m}$ north, where a new dropped kerb crossing point (with tactile paving and a central refuge island) will be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to connect with the existing provision on the western side of Buckingham Road;
- Secure and sheltered guest/visitor and staff cycle parking will be provided close to the main building entrances; and,
- The site layout will include pedestrian and cycle friendly infrastructure; landscaping, signage, areas for social exchange, recreation and seating.
4.5.2 The measures detailed above will increase the permeability of the development for site users and will improve accessibility to local facilities and public transport services to provide guests, visitors and staff with attractive non-car options for their travel.
4.5.3 The proposed sustainable accessibility movement strategy, which incorporates the above measures (including the existing infrastructure and proposals as part of the consented Hotel/Technical Site/FAST 'Innovation Quarter' applications) is indicatively illustrated on Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2: Sustainable Access Strategy Plan


## 5 Travel Demand

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section provides an overview of the methodology used to calculate the travel demand associated with the development proposals; including vehicle trip generation, multi-modal trip generation and vehicle trip distribution.

### 5.2 Vehicular Trip Rates / Traffic Generation

5.2.1 The forecast traffic generation associated with the Experience Quarter is summarised in Table 5.1 with a summary of calculations included at Appendix G , for reference. This methodology/calculation was shared and agreed with OCC as part of pre-application scoping discussions.
5.2.2 The individual trip rates/traffic generation calculation methodologies are summarised and described in the following paragraphs, tables and graphics.

Table 5.1: Development Traffic Generation Summary (Network Peak Hours)

|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | 2-Way | In | Out | 2-Way |
| Traffic Generation <br> (First Principles <br> per annum) 400,000 visitors | 191 | 10 | 201 | 2 | 193 | 195 |

5.2.3 The Experience Quarter if forecast to generate 201 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 195 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. This is the equivalent of c .3 vehicles entering or leaving the site every minute, during the weekday peak hours.

## Experience Quarter - First Principles Traffic Generation Methodology

5.2.4 To determine the Experience Quarter traffic generation, a first principles approach has been adopted using the projected visitor and staff numbers for the proposal, as described in the following section.
5.2.5 It is anticipated that the centre will be open 7 -days per week for c .365 days per annum (excluding national closure days) and will attract a total of $\mathrm{c} .400,000$ visitors per annum (based on client forecast figures).
5.2.6 In terms of staff, it is anticipated that the development could employ up to c. 200 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) staff members (24,030 / 120), based on c.120sqm per FTE, as per the HCA's Employment Density Guide 2015. It is expected that as a worst case, there will be approximately two-thirds ( $66 \%$ ) of total staff, 132 ( $128 \times 0.66$ ), on duty/on-site, daily, at any given time.
5.2.7 The latest available National Travel Survey (NTS) Table NTSO504 (2014-2018) indicates that 65\% of leisure trips (sport/entertainment \& holiday/day trips) occur between Monday to Friday, with $35 \%$ of trips occurring at the weekend (Saturday/Sunday). Furthermore, 2018 NTS Table NTS0905 indicates that the combined average car occupancy levels for 'leisure' and 'holiday/day trips' is 1.80 persons per vehicle.
5.2.8 Using the NTS figures above and assuming that all visitors will arrive by car, for robustness; of the 400,000 annual visitors, it is anticipated that 222,222 ( $400,000 / 1.80$ ) will arrive by car (vehicular trips),
with $144,444(222,222 \times 0.65)$ arriving during the weekdays (Mon-Fri) and $77,778(222,222 \times 0.35)$ arriving at the weekend (Sat-Sun).
5.2.9 In terms of daily two-way vehicular movements during the weekday, this would equate to approximately 1,111 ((144,444 / 52 weeks / 5 weekdays) x 2) trips. Applying the same methodology, it is anticipated that there would be 1,495 (( $77,778 / 52$ weeks / 2 days) $\times 2$ ) daily two-way vehicular trips each day at the weekend (Sat \& Sun).
5.2.10 In order to profile the Experience Quarter arriving and departing vehicular traffic patterns throughout the weekday (08:00-18:00), a traffic survey of the British Motor Heritage Museum in Gaydon was sourced from the TRICS (v.7.5.4) database; the proportions of in and out traffic movements across the day were extrapolated and applied to the proposed weekday for the 1,111 two-way vehicle trips.
5.2.11 The specific details of this is included within the electronic spreadsheet previously submitted to OCC, and as summarised within the PDF copies of the specific sheets, contained in Appendix $G$; the TRICS output reports are also contained in Appendix H , for reference.
5.2.12 The forecast staff trips are also included within the AM and PM peak hours; for a robust assessment, it will be considered that all staff (c.132) drive to the site, arriving in the AM (08:00-09:00) and departing in the PM (17:00-18:00). This is considered a robust and worst-case assessment, as staff members are anticipated to be employed locally and therefore more inclined to travel sustainably.
5.2.13 Figure 5.1 graphically represents the first principles methodology prescribed above for calculating the total vehicle trips and Table 5.2 summarises the weekday (Mon-Fri) daily profile of development trips generated by the development proposals.

Figure 5.1: First Principles Traffic Generation Infographic
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Table 5.2: Weekday Development Traffic Generation Profile

| Time Period | In | Out | 2-Way |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0800-0900 | 191 (nc. 132 staff) | 10 | 201 |
| $0900-1000$ | 83 | 17 | 100 |
| $1000-1100$ | 73 | 39 | 112 |
| $1100-1200$ | 60 | 47 | 108 |
| $1200-1300$ | 60 | 88 | 148 |
| $1300-1400$ | 96 | 66 | 162 |
| $1400-1500$ | 66 | 78 | 143 |
| $1500-1600$ | 34 | 78 | 111 |
| $1600-1700$ | 23 | 71 | 94 |
| $1700-1800$ | 2 | 193 (Inc. 132 staff) | 687 |
| Total 12-Hour | 687 |  | 195 |

### 5.3 Multi-Modal Trip Generation

5.3.1 Indicative multi-modal percentages have been sourced from the 2018 NTS Average number of trips by main purpose and mode (Table NTS0409) - using the modal splits for the combined journey purposes including, 'Leisure', 'Personal Business', 'Other Escort', and 'Shopping'. These average modal splits have been applied to the two-way peak hour vehicle trips in Table 5.1 in order to generate a forecast multi-modal assessment for the development proposals.
5.3.2 The forecast multi-modal trip generation at the development for journeys to the site is summarised in Table 5.3 below.

Table 5.3: Multi-Modal Development Trips

|  |  | Two-Way Trip Generation |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mode of Travel |  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |
| Train | $2 \%$ | 8 | 7 |
| Bus | $6 \%$ | 23 | 22 |
| Motorcycle | $0 \%$ | 0 | 0 |
| Taxi | $1 \%$ | 4 | 4 |
| Car Driver | $53 \% *$ | 201 | 195 |
| Car Passenger | $26.5 \%$ | 100 | 97 |
| Bicycle | $1.5 \%$ | 6 | 6 |
| Walk | $10 \% *$ | 38 | 37 |
| Total | $100 \%$ | 379 | 368 |

[^1]5.3.3 Table 5.3 indicates that the site is forecast to generate 259 and 248 total person trips during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

### 5.4 Vehicle Trip Distribution

5.4.1 Similarly, as agreed with OCC for the approved Bicester Motion (formerly Heritage) Hotel application, and as prescribed and detailed within the scoping assessment and pre-application communication with OCC Highways, a gravity model has been developed to inform the trip distribution for the Experience Quarter development (given that the site predominantly comprises of leisure/tourism use); this is again based on 2011 Census population data, using the following areas and methodology:

- District Areas, Middle Super Output Areas (MSOA) \& Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) identified within a 50km catchment area of the site; and,
- A distribution proportion has been calculated based on resident populations within the identified catchment areas (Districts, MSOAs \& LSOAs).
5.4.2 Figure 5.2 illustrates the identified weighted centroids of the districts, MSOAs, LSOAs and catchment area used within the gravity model.

Figure 5.2: Distribution Catchment/Methodology

5.4.3 The vehicular trips have been assigned to the local highway network based upon the locations of the above Districts, MSOAs \& LSOAs, and the logical routes taken to and from these areas.
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5.4.4 The distribution percentages are shown graphically in Figure 5.3 and are summarised by route assignment in Table 5.4.

Figure 5.3: Development Traffic Distribution


Table 5.4: Development Traffic Distribution Route Assignment

| Zone | Traffic Distribution Route | Distribution \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | B4100 Banbury Rd, towards M40 / A43 | $13 \%$ |
| B | A4421 Buckingham Rd, towards A421 / A43 | $28 \%$ |
| C | Charbridge Ln, towards A41 | $10 \%$ |
| D | Howes Ln, towards B4030 / A4095 / A41 | $34 \%$ |
| E | Skimmingdish Ln, local access to Caversfield | $1 \%$ |
| F | Fringford Rd, local access to Caversfield | $1 \%$ |
| modetransport.co.uk | December 2020 |  |
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| Zone | Traffic Distribution Route | Distribution \% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| H | Buckingham Rd, local access to Bicester Town Centre | $8 \%$ |
| I | Southwold Lane, local access | $1 \%$ |
| $J$ | Banbury Rd, local access | $1 \%$ |
| K | Launton Rd, local access | $2 \%$ |
| B | Bucknell Rd, local access | $1 \%$ |
| M | A4095, local access | $1 \%$ |

5.4.5 Appendix I contains the full masterplan gravity model data, spreadsheets and outputs, for reference. The distribution percentages and associated development traffic flows can also be seen within the network flow diagrams contained within Appendix J.

## 6 Highway Assessment

### 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This chapter provides a summary of the detailed junction capacity assessments that have been undertaken using outputs from OCC's Bicester SATURN Model, to understand the impact of the development proposals on the operation of the local highway network.

### 6.2 OCC's Bicester SATURN Model

6.2.1 In order to inform the highway assessment presented within this chapter of the report, it was agreed with OCC that the impact of the development proposals should be tested using outputs from the Bicester SATURN model.
6.2.2 The full SATURN outputs/turning flows (provided by OCC) are contained in Appendix K, for reference. The scope of the modelling was agreed with OCC prior to commencing.

### 6.3 Geographical Scope of Assessment

6.3.1 Considering the forecast traffic generation and distribution of the development proposals, as detailed previously in Chapter 5, junction capacity assessments have been undertaken at the off-site junctions summarised in Table 6.1 and illustrated on Figure 6.1.

Table 6.1: Off-Site Junction Assessments

| Junction |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{*}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 * | Type of Junction |
| $2^{*}$ | B4100/A4095/Banbury Rd * | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| $3^{*}$ | A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Wyndham Hall Care Home Access/Launton Rd * | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| 4 | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Road | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| 5 | A4095/Bucknell Rd | Priority |
| 6 | Bucknall Rd/Howes Ln | 3-Arm Roundabout |

* It should be noted that Junctions 1, 2 and 3 have been modelled and assessed as the mitigated junction forms proposed within the approved FAST 'Innovation Quarter' planning application. The mitigated junction arrangement drawings are included in Appendix L for reference.
6.3.1 Junction capacity assessments have also been undertaken at the proposed main Experience Quarter access junction on Buckingham Road. No assessment has been carried out on the reinstated accesses onto Bicester Road as these are only envisaged to be utilised for infrequent servicing and/or emergency use as and when required. Network flow diagrams for the access and off-site junctions have been developed and calculated using the development traffic flow outputs from the SATURN model; these are contained in Appendix J, for reference.
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Figure 6.1: Location of Off-Site (\& Access) Junction Assessments


### 6.4 Assessment Scenarios

6.4.1 Junction capacity assessments have been undertaken at the specified junctions in Table 6.1 for the following scenarios (as per the SATURN). The following scenarios (Inc. future year SATURN model outputs) have been agreed with OCC and subsequently modelled at the aforementioned junctions; the traffic network flow diagrams for each of these scenarios are contained within Appendix J:

- 2026 Future Year + BH’s Committed Hotel, New Technical Site and FAST 'Innovation Quarter’ (collectively referred to as 2026 Reference Case); and,
- 2026 Reference Case + Proposed Development.
- 2031 Future Year + BH's Committed Hotel, New Technical Site and FAST 'Innovation Quarter' (collectively referred to as 2031 Reference Case) + Development; and,
- 2031 Reference Case + Proposed Development inc. SEPR.
6.4.2 Within the latest SATURN model runs (commissioned by OCC), 2026 and 2031 future year baselines have been developed (as above); This TA, however, only reports on the 2026 future year assessment scenarios as this is considered to be the most realistic opening year and appropriate year of assessment for the development (confirmed with OCC); and as such any required mitigation will be undertaken to provide a 'nil detriment' impact to the 2026 + Committed scenario, as the reference case. The 2031
future year scenarios have been run as a sensitivity test and are included within the full modelling output results at Appendix M and N , for reference.
6.4.3 The full SATURN model outputs provided by OCC, including the model's uncertainty logsi/committed developments, are contained in Appendix K, for reference.
6.4.4 It should be noted that the baseline traffic flows within the model already includes traffic generated by the existing Bicester Motion site uses; including the existing technical site and various hangars used for aviation clubs, Historit vehicle storage and events/exhibitions.
6.4.5 Furthermore, and in addition to the development included within the SATURN model's uncertainty log, the Bicester Motion Hotel, New Technical Site and FAST 'Innovation Quarter' developments have also been included within the highways assessment as further committed development. The traffic generation figures have been extracted from the approved and respective TAs and can be seen within the traffic network flow diagrams contained at Appendix J.
6.4.6 The peak hours of 08:00-09:00 for the AM and 17:00-18:00 for the PM have been used for the basis of assessment. As previously mentioned within this report (Section 3.4), the baseline AM and PM peak hours are considerably higher than any peak hour recorded over the weekend (Saturday/Sunday); as a result, this chapter will only assess the weekday peak hours, as a worst-case scenario. Furthermore, it is understood that the SATURN model does not contain any weekend traffic in order to utilise this to undertake these assessments.


### 6.5 Junction Capacity Analysis

6.5.1 Industry standard software package, Junctions 9 (ARCADY \& PICADY modules), have been used to assess the capacity of the junctions. A summary of the modelling results is presented below, with full model outputs provided in Appendix M.
6.5.2 The junction assessments have been based on $100 \%$ of the development generated traffic and do not take into account any Travel Plan mode shift measures and internalised link trips associated with the wider masterplan land uses.
6.5.3 When assessing junction capacity, it is generally accepted that, a Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) value of below 0.85 represents a junction that is considered to be operating satisfactorily (within practical capacity). At junctions operating at or close to zero practical reserve capacity, which equates to an RFC value of approximately 1.00 or above, small reductions in capacity may result in exponential queuing and/or delay results. Therefore, junctions operating close to or above 1.00 should be carefully reviewed to ensure that queueing and delay is not significantly impacted upon, and to ensure that the new development will not have a 'severe' or detrimental impact upon the existing highway infrastructure.

## Junction 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road/A4095

6.5.4 ARCADY assessments have been undertaken for this roundabout junction based upon the approved mitigation layout for the FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application (J32-3684-PS-105 Rev A), included in Appendix L, and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below.

Table 6.2: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | 1 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095-2026 Reference Case |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4421 Buckingham Rd (N) | 0.99 | 56.26 | 24 | 0.54 | 4.07 | 1 |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln (E) | 0.58 | 5.28 | 1 | 0.99 | 52.00 | 26 |
| Buckingham Rd (S) | 0.51 | 7.56 | 1 | 0.83 | 33.21 | 4 |
| A4095 (W) | 0.78 | 9.48 | 3 | 0.83 | 14.64 | 5 |

Table 6.3: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| J1 - A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 - 2026 SATURN + Comm + Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4421 Buckingham Rd (N) | 1.00 | 60.24 | 26 | 0.65 | 5.33 | 2 |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln (E) | 0.60 | 5.52 | 2 | 1.07 | 128.94 | 73 |
| Buckingham Rd (S) | 0.53 | 8.21 | 1 | 0.90 | 53.44 | 7 |
| A4095 (W) | 0.85 | 14.57 | 6 | 0.84 | 15.67 | 5 |

6.5.5 The modelling results show that the junction is forecast to operate at capacity in the AM peak (RFC 1.00) and over capacity (RFC 1.07) in the PM peak when the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario is considered. This indicates that further mitigation over and above that already identified in relation to the approved FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application is required in this location to address traffic impacts as a result of the Experience Quarter application. Mitigation proposals for this junction are considered in Section 6.6.

## Junction 2-B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane

6.5.6 ARCADY assessments have been undertaken for this roundabout junction based upon the approved mitigation layout for the FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application (J32-3684-PS-106 Rev A), included in Appendix L, and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below.

Table 6.4: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | 409 | wold Ln/A | Lords L | 26 Re | ce Case |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.93 | 31.58 | 11 | 0.81 | 15.03 | 4 |
| A4095 Southwold Ln (E) | 0.93 | 30.99 | 11 | 0.99 | 52.89 | 22 |
| B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.63 | 13.37 | 2 | 0.83 | 31.44 | 4 |
| A4095 Lords Ln (W) | 0.61 | 9.79 | 2 | 0.97 | 64.21 | 14 |

Table 6.5: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| ARM | uth | A4095 | -n-20 |  | + Develo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.95 | 39.24 | 14 | 0.80 | 14.11 | 4 |
| A4095 Southwold Ln (E) | 0.96 | 40.12 | 14 | 1.05 | 105.27 | 53 |
| B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.64 | 14.33 | 2 | 0.86 | 39.39 | 5 |
| A4095 Lords Ln (W) | 0.68 | 11.74 | 2 | 0.97 | 60.69 | 14 |

6.5.7 The modelling results show that the junction is forecast to operate over capacity (RFC 1.05) in the PM peak when the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario is considered. This indicates that further mitigation over and above that already identified in relation to the approved FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application is required in this location to address traffic impacts as a result of the Experience Quarter application. Mitigation proposals for this junction are considered in Section 6.6.

## Junction 3 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Care Homes Access/Launton Road

6.5.8 ARCADY assessments have been undertaken for this roundabout junction based upon the approved mitigation layout for the FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application (J32-3684-PS-107 Rev A), included in Appendix L, and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below.

Table 6.6: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | Ln | mes Acc | aunton P | 26 R | ce Case |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| Care Home Access (E) | 0.10 | 22.85 | 0 | 0.13 | 18.37 | 0 |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln (S) | 0.87 | 16.21 | 6 | 0.93 | 26.13 | 11 |
| Launton Road (W) | 0.50 | 5.10 | 1 | 0.95 | 41.63 | 13 |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln (N) | 0.97 | 43.49 | 17 | 0.85 | 15.19 | 5 |

Table 6.7: 2026 Reference Case + Development

6.5.9 The modelling results show that the junction is forecast to continue to operate with some reserve capacity in the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario in both peak hour periods. The level of operation between the 2026 Reference Case and the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario does not significantly change with maximum changes in delay of c. 1 second/vehicle and a corresponding uplift tin queue length of $c .1$ vehicle on any one junction arm.
6.5.10 On this basis no further mitigation over and above the consented position for the FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application is deemed to be necessary to deliver the Experience Quarter.

## Junction 4 - A4421 Buckingham Road/Bicester Road

6.5.11 PICADY assessments have been undertaken for this priority junction and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below. These assessments are based upon the current junction arrangement.

Table 6.8: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | Junction 4 - A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd - 2026 Reference Case |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4421 Buckingham Road | 0.35 | 16.79 | 1 | 0.16 | 8.35 | 0 |
| Bicester Road | 0.47 | 7.82 | 2 | 0.99 | 80.57 | 38 |

Table 6.9: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| Junction 4 - A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd - 2026 Reference Case + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4421 Buckingham Road | 0.37 | 18.20 | 1 | 0.16 | 8.36 | 0 |
| Bicester Road | 0.50 | 8.34 | 3 | 1.02 | 110.36 | 52 |

6.5.12 The results indicate that the junction is operating close to practical capacity (RFC of 0.99) during the '2026 Reference Case scenario, at the A4421 Buckingham Road arm during the PM peak hour.
6.5.13 Following the introduction of the development traffic capacity is exceeded on the A4421 Buckingham Road arm in the PM peak hour with an RFC value of 1.02 reported.
6.5.14 Given the forecast exceedance of practical capacity and noting the safety concerns in relation to this junction noted by OCC in the Bicester Motion development brief (summarised in Section 2.5) a mitigation scheme is proposed for this junction. These proposals are considered in Section 6.6.

Junction 5 - A4095/Bucknell Road
6.5.15 ARCADY assessments have been undertaken for this roundabout junction and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below.

Table 6.10: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | Junction 5 - A4095/Bucknell Rd-2026 Reference Case |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4095 (E) | 0.19 | 2.53 | 0 | 0.23 | 2.64 | 0 |
| Bucknell Road (S) | 0.17 | 2.71 | 0 | 0.22 | 2.84 | 0 |
| Bucknell Road (N) | 0.01 | 4.96 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 |

Table 6.11: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| ARM | Junction 5 - A4095/Bucknell Rd - 2026 Reference Case + Development |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4095 (E) | 0.20 | 2.54 | 0 | 0.27 | 2.79 | 0 |
| Bucknell Road (S) | 0.21 | 2.85 | 0 | 0.22 | 2.84 | 0 |
| Bucknell Road (N) | 0.01 | 5.13 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 |

6.5.16 The model results show that there will be a minimal increase in the RFCs and delays (with zero impact on queuing) at the A4095/Bucknell Road roundabout when development traffic is added to the network.
6.5.17 All of the RFCs are well within the satisfactory design capacity of 0.85 at each arm of the junction in all scenarios considered.
6.5.18 Overall, the development traffic will have a negligible impact on the performance and operation of the roundabout in the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Junction 6 - Bucknell Road/Howes Lane
6.5.19 PICADY assessments have been undertaken for this priority junction and the results of the relevant scenarios are summarised below.

Table 6.12: 2026 Reference Case

| ARM | Junction 6 - Bucknell Rd/Howes Ln - 2026 Reference Case |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| Bucknell Road | 0.40 | 8.50 | 1 | 0.48 | 9.62 | 1 |
| Howes Lane | 0.35 | 8.25 | 1 | 0.41 | 9.35 | 1 |

Table 6.13: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| ARM | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| Bucknell Road | 0.45 | 9.86 | 1 | 0.41 | 10.91 | 1 |
| Howes Lane | 0.41 | 8.60 | 1 | 0.60 | 12.61 | 2 |

6.5.20 The model results show that there will be a minimal increase in the RFCs and delays (with a marginal impact on queuing) at the Bucknell Road/Howes Lane junction when development traffic is added to the network.
6.5.21 All of the RFCs are well within the satisfactory design capacity of 0.85 at each arm of the junction in all scenarios considered.
6.5.22 Overall, the development traffic will have a negligible impact on the performance and operation of the roundabout in the 2026 Reference Case + Development scenario; therefore, no mitigation is required.

## Access Junction - A4421 Buckingham Road Access Junction

6.5.23 PICADY assessments have been undertaken for this proposed access junction and the results of the analysis is summarised in the following table.

Table 6.14: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| ARM | d Ac | A) Junction | 26 Refe | Case | velopment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| Development Access Rd | 0.04 | 14.16 | 0 | 0.51 | 17.30 | 1 |
| A4421 Buckingham Road | 0.50 | 24.54 | 1 | 0.00 | 7.46 | 0 |

6.5.24 The results indicate that the junction would operate with significant reserve capacity during the '2026 Reference Case plus development' scenario. There is anticipated to be only a single queueing vehicle at the proposed access junction, either within the site or along the A4421 Buckingham Road, during the peak hours.

### 6.6 Mitigation

6.6.1 As aforementioned three junctions have been identified as requiring mitigation following the introduction of the development proposals as follows:

- A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 roundabout;
- B4100/A4095/Banbury Rd roundabout; and,
- A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Road priority junction.
6.6.2 It should be noted that the first two junctions identified in the above list have already identified mitigation schemes identified as part of previous applications. The mitigation requirements to address the Experience Quarter traffic demands are therefore over and above the extant mitigation position.
6.6.3 Following previous communication with OCC (as part of the Hotel, New Technical Site and FAST 'Innovation Quarter' applications) the following information/response was elicited in response to proposed infrastructure improvements in the local area, which is summarised below in the following paragraphs:
6.6.4 OCC's LTP 4 Bicester Area Strategy includes aspirational proposals for improvements to the eastern peripheral corridor to which the Bicester Motion site lies to the north of; i.e. along the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane, stating:
6.6.5 "Eastern peripheral corridor: upgrade to dual carriageway on the A4421 between the Buckingham Road and Gavray Drive to complement the transport solution at the railway level crossing at Charbridge Lane and facilitate development in the area. This scheme will improve the operation of this section of the eastern perimeter road and enhance the integration of the North-East Bicester Business Park site with the rest of the town. This will include improvements to the Buckingham Road / A4221 junction to provide the necessary capacity for the additional trips generated from nearby employment and residential development, as well as support the heritage tourism development of the neighbouring Former RAF Bicester site."
6.6.6 Furthermore, CDC's Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) supporting the Cherwell Local Plan states that, for Skimmingdish Lane, dualling and signalisation of various junctions along the corridor, including improvements to the strategic highway capacity are prioritised as critical in the medium to long term.
6.6.7 In terms of timescales, OCC are unable at this time to indicate precisely when these improvements are likely to come forward; and as such, it is believed that this will be sometime within the end of the local plan period at 2031. OCC has recently stated that they are currently planning to assess and consider the infrastructure requirements as part of the dualling and associated junction improvements along the Eastern Peripheral Route (over the course of the next year 2019-2020).
6.6.8 Therefore, and in summary, it is understood that the development is likely to be required to make a fair and proportionate contribution towards the wider improvement schemes, whenever they may come forward; and as such, in the interim, it will be important to consider appropriate mitigation, in order to offset the impact of the wider masterplan development proposals, and achieve a nil-detriment to the proposed future year (2026) highway network.


## Junction 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road/A4095

6.6.9 The forecast level of impact resulting from the development proposals at the Buckingham Road/Skimmingdish Lane roundabout can be mitigated (comparable to 2026 Reference Case) by introducing the following additional improvements at the junction:

- Increasing the approach half width on the Skimmingdish Lane (E) approach arm, creating a longer two to three-lane approach to the roundabout and hence increasing the effective flare length;
- Increasing the effective flare length on the Buckingham Road ( N ) arm, creating a longer two-lane approach to the roundabout;
- Increasing the entry width/effective flare length on the A4095 (W) arm, creating a longer two-lane approach to the roundabout; and,
- Increasing the entry width/effective flare length on the Buckingham Road (S) arm.
6.6.10 The full mitigation model outputs are contained in Appendix N , and a preliminary mitigation design layout drawing J32-3684-PS-205 has also been prepared and is contained in Appendix O, for reference. The ARCADY mitigation assessment results are summarised below.

Table 6.15: 2026 Reference Case + Development (MITIGATED)

| J1 - A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 - 2026 SATURN + Comm + Dev <br> AM Peak (08:00-09:00) <br> PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| A4421 Buckingham Rd (N) | 0.96 | 39.97 | 17 | 0.63 | 4.87 | 2 |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln (E) | 0.56 | 4.68 | 1 | 0.99 | 54.79 | 27 |
| Buckingham Rd (S) | 0.48 | 6.52 | 1 | 0.84 | 36.56 | 5 |
| A4095 (W) | 0.85 | 14.55 | 6 | 0.86 | 17.66 | 6 |

6.6.11 The results summarised in Table 6.15 demonstrate the junction can be mitigated to a similar operational capacity of that during the '2026 Reference Case scenario - as summarised in Table 6.2 and accordingly it is concluded that Experience Quarter development impacts can be mitigated.

Junction 2 - B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane
6.6.12 The forecast level of impact resulting from the development proposals at the B4100 Banbury Road/A4095 Southwold Lane/A4095 Lords Lane roundabout can be mitigated (comparable to 2026 Reference Case) by introducing the following improvements at the junction:

- Increasing entry width and effective flare length on all arms of the junction.
6.6.13 The full mitigation model outputs are contained in Appendix N , and a preliminary mitigation design layout drawing J32-3684-PS-206 has also been prepared and is contained in Appendix O, for reference. The ARCADY mitigation assessment results are summarised below.

Table 6.16: 2026 Reference Case + Development

| ARM | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.89 | 21.09 | 8 | 0.75 | 10.53 | 3 |
| A4095 Southwold Ln (E) | 0.90 | 21.86 | 8 | 0.98 | 50.03 | 22 |
| B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.60 | 11.98 | 2 | 0.84 | 33.89 | 5 |
| A4095 Lords Ln (W) | 0.64 | 9.86 | 2 | 0.92 | 41.57 | 9 |

6.6.14 The results summarised in Table 6.16 demonstrate the junction can be mitigated to a similar operational capacity of that during the ' 2026 Reference Case scenario - as summarised in Table 6.4.
6.6.15 It is important to note that in previous applications it was noted in discussions with OCC that there is already a prerequisite for mitigation at this junction. It is understood that OCC has a mitigation scheme for this roundabout, which is subject to final sign off and confirmation of funding; however, following the agreed approach for the approved FAST 'Innovation Quarter' application a mitigation scheme has been derived to address development traffic impacts as a result of the Experience Quarter.
6.6.16 It should be noted that this mitigation scheme may not in practice need to be implemented, subject to OCC's sign off of the aforementioned scheme; however, this exercise concludes that there is a mitigation proposal capable of accommodating the Experience Quarter's demands irrespective of OCC's proposals.

## Junction 4 - A4421 Buckingham Road/Bicester Road

6.6.17 The forecast level of impact resulting from the development proposals at the Buckingham Road/Bicester Road priority junction can be mitigated (comparable to 2026 Reference Case) by introducing the following improvements at the junction:

- Introduction of a ghost right turn lane for traffic on the Buckingham Road (S) arm;
- Realignment of the Bicester Road (minor arm) on the approach to the A4421; and,
- As a result of the above improvements - it is proposed that the visibility will also significantly be improved significantly to achieve the required $2.4 \mathrm{~m} \times 160 \mathrm{~m}$.
6.6.18 The full mitigation model outputs are contained in Appendix N , and a preliminary mitigation design layout plan (J32-3684-PS-008 (Rev C) has also been prepared and is contained in Appendix O, for reference. The PICADY mitigation assessment results are summarised below.

Table 6.17: 2026 Reference Case + Development (MITIGATED)

| ARM | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  | 026 Refe <br> 0) | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) | RFC | Delay (s) | Q (Veh) |
| Bicester Road | 0.42 | 22.18 | 1 | 0.18 | 9.47 | 0 |
| A4421 Buckingham Road | 0.26 | 14.55 | 0 | 0.24 | 9.80 | 0 |

## Bicester Motion - Experience Quarter

6.6.19 The results summarised in Table 6.17 demonstrate the junction can be improved and mitigated to experience a significantly improved operational capacity of that compared to the 2026 Reference Case scenario. The introduction of a right turn lane on the A4421 Buckingham Road and improvements to visibility from the Bicester Road arm also provide additional benefit in terms of highway safety thereby satisfying concerns raised by OCC in the Bicester Airfield Development Brief SPD as summarised in Section 2.5 of this TA.

### 6.7 Summary

6.7.1 In summary the capacity analysis has demonstrated that the traffic demands placed on the study area by the introduction of the Employment Quarter can be adequately accommodated either by existing or already committed infrastructure or by the introduction of mitigation schemes for three off-site junction locations.
6.7.2 Therefore, it is concluded that the impact of development can be appropriately accommodated on the local highway network, subject to providing the necessary improvements aforementioned.

## 7 Summary \& Conclusion

### 7.1 Summary

7.1.1 This TA has been prepared by mode transport planning to accompany an outline planning application for the Experience Quarter development included as part of wider Bicester Motion Masterplan development proposals. The Experience Quarter comprises Commercial, Business and Services uses (Class E), Light Industrial (Class B2) and Local Community and Learning Uses (Class F).
7.1.2 An analysis of the existing transport infrastructure within the vicinity of the site has demonstrated that the site is highly accessible by car via the local highway network, with links to the wider strategic road network.
7.1.3 Traffic surveys (ATCs) were undertaken along the A4421 Buckingham Road, Skimmingdish Lane and Bicester Road, for a one-week period during July 2016 and May 2019; The traffic surveys demonstrate that the 24 -hour AADT two-way traffic flows are c.15,480 vehicles along Buckingham Road, c.16,650 vehicles along Skimmingdish Lane and c.1,040 vehicles along Bicester Road.
7.1.4 Analysis of the accident records for the local highway network surrounding the development site has concluded that there are no historic or existing safety concerns, and therefore, no highway safety issues that might be exacerbated by the development proposals.
7.1.5 The site is adequately accessible by sustainable modes of travel; existing pedestrian and cycle links are located within close proximity of the site and provide good connections with local facilities/amenities in the local area and towards Bicester town centre. The level of existing infrastructure for these users is also subject to a number of committed improvements as a result of previous consented developments that collectively will enhance pedestrian and cycle access.
7.1.6 Bus stops are situated c.550m (c.6-7-min walk) to the south of the proposed site access on Buckingham Road (c. 50 m south of Thompson Drive) and are accessible via the existing footways along the western side of the A4421 Buckingham Road. These bus stops are served by the Stagecoach X5 service, which provides two services an hour to Bicester town and Bicester Village, as well as to a number of key towns and cities such as Oxford, Cambridge, Milton Keynes and Buckingham.
7.1.7 The proposed bus stops on the A4421 Buckingham Road that are intended to be delivered as part of the consented Hotel application site access are situated within 230m (c.3-min walk) of the Experience Quarter and will be accessible from the Experience Quarter via the internal network of foot/cycleways within the site. These will enhance accessibility to public transport for future staff and visitors to the Experience Quarter.
7.1.8 Vehicular access to the site will be provided at two proposed locations:

- A4421 Buckingham Road - ghost right turn junction (left out/exit only) to serve the Experience Quarter; and,
- Bicester Road - A reinstated access (located c.90m to the east of Buckingham Road) to provide infrequent service and emergency access to the Experience Quarter.
7.1.9 3.0 m wide shared footway/cycleways will be provided at the proposed accesses and within the internal access road from the A4421 Buckingham Road. A new dropped kerb crossing point (with tactile paving
and central refuge island) will also be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to connect with the existing provision and infrastructure within the local surrounding area.
7.1.10 As the application is Outline the parking standards and associated provision and delivery will be specified during the reserved matters/detailed design stages (subject to further consultation/agreement with OCC). A first principles analysis has been carried out to inform this initial process, concluding that provision of 400 parking spaces will adequately accommodate maximum calculated demands (350) with allowance for fluctuations in demand.
7.1.11 Within the overall total car parking layouts for each land use, $10 \%$ of the total spaces are intended to be allocated as disabled parking bays, in order to meet the required OCC parking standard.
7.1.12 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points will also be provided within the car parking areas; the level of provision is intended to be provided at c.3\% of total parking spaces (as agreed as part of the consented hotel application).
7.1.13 The cycle parking will be specified in more detail during the reserved matters/detailed design stages (subject to further consultation/agreement with OCC); however, an indicative preliminary provision of .
7.1.14 A travel demand review has been undertaken which indicates that the site will generate 201 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 195 two-way vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. This is the equivalent of c. 3 vehicles entering or leaving the site every minute, during the weekday peak hours.
7.1.15 Out of the six offsite junctions that have been assessed from a capacity perspective, three are forecast to require mitigation as a result of the traffic demands from the Experience Quarter, as follows:
- A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 roundabout;
- B4100/A4095/Banbury Rd roundabout; and,
- A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Road priority junction.
7.1.16 The forecast level of impact resulting from the development proposals have been mitigated by increasing the flare lengths and entry widths of specific problematic approach arms at each of the roundabouts and by upgrading the Bicester Road priority junction to include a ghost right turn lane. The upgrade to the Bicester Road priority junction provides a secondary benefit of enhancing safety at a junction already identified to have deficiencies in this respect.
7.1.17 A capacity assessment of the site access junction formed with the A4421 Buckingham Road has also been undertaken and concludes that the proposed arrangement will operate with significant reserve capacity with only a single vehicle queueing on both the major and minor (site access) roads in either peak period.


### 7.2 Conclusion \& Recommendation

7.2.1 On the basis of the information and mitigation presented in this report it is considered that the proposed development can be accommodated within the local area. As such there should be no reason why the application cannot be recommended in terms of highways and transportation.
7.2.2 It is therefore concluded that the proposed development (considering the proposed mitigation) will not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the surrounding highway network and therefore, in accordance with the NPPF, the proposal should be considered acceptable in transport terms.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A - OCC Highways Scoping Correspondence

## CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL

Pre-Application Report

| Pre-application Reference No: | 19/02092/PREAPP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Proposal: | The proposed development is for an Automotive experience centre comprising B1 (business), B2 (light industrial) and D2 (Leisure) uses with ancillary spectator facilities comprising D1 (Non-residential), Sui Generis (workshop/ showrooms), A3 (restaurants and cafes) and offices, storage, display and sales comprising the 'Brand Experience Centre' at Bicester Motion, Bicester |
| Site Address: | Land north-west of former RAF Bicester Bicester Oxfordshire OX26 5HA |
| Date Site Visited: | $7^{\text {th }}$ November 2019 |
| Date \& Time of Meeting (if applicable): | Two Meetings have taken place; Workshop 1 on 7th November 2019 and Workshop 2 on 18th December 2019. |
| Location of Meeting: | Bicester Motion Offices, Building 123, Bicester Heritage, Buckingham Road, Bicester |
| Attendees: | CDC - Rebekah Morgan, Tim Screen, Charlotte Watkins, Emma Harrison, Jennifer Ballinger, Neil Whitton. OCC - Tim Peart. <br> Applicants - Jon Westerman, Will Sparling (Edgars), Jonty Ashworth, Dan Geoghegan (Bicester Motion), Anneltje Hacquebord (Ridge), Anthony Stiff (Anthony Stiff Associates), Nick Worlledge (Worlledge Associates), Adrian Forte (Mode Transport). <br> N.B. List of the applicant's team is not complete. |

TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Internal Consultations Required: Building Control, Environmental Health, Landscape Services, Arboriculture, Conservation, Ecology, Policy Team, Economic Development Team, Public Art Team and the Bicester Delivery Team.

OCC Single Response (inc Highways, Drainage and Archaeology).

External Consultations Required: The Environment Agency, Historic England, Natural England, Thames Water, Thames Valley Police, Wildlife Trust, CPRE, relevant Town/Parish Council and adjoining Town/Parish Councils, Bicester Local History Society.

Drainage: You need to consider foul and surface water drainage when designing your proposals. In respect of foul drainage, you should first seek to connect to the public sewer network. You can contact Thames Water for further advice about this; information about their pre-application service is available online at:
https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/commercial-building-works/water-supply/disconnections/pre-application-help-and-advice.

Only if a connection to the public sewer network is not feasible should you then consider other foul drainage options. The Environment Agency would be consulted on any planning application that proposes non-mains foul drainage. If you are proposing non-mains foul drainage, you should submit a completed Foul Drainage Assessment Form with your planning application. This form can be viewed online at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/foul-drainage-assessment-form-fda1
In respect of surface water drainage, wherever possible surface water should be drained within the site using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Technical Standards for the design, maintenance and operation of SuDS can be viewed online at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-drainage-systems-non-statutory-technical-standards

In addition, you should refer to the guidance published on Oxfordshire County Council's Flood Toolkit concerning surface water drainage, and in particular the detailed guidance provided in the "Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage on Major Development in Oxfordshire".

The Pre-Application submission is not accompanied by any drainage details or reports. I would strongly recommend that you engage with the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority at as early a stage as possible as the use of SuDs could significantly affect the nature of the proposed development and the developable area. I would again strongly encourage you to seek pre-application advice on your drainage proposals to avoid delays during the application process.

EIA Screening Opinion Required? YES - an application for a Screening Opinion should be submitted.

## Committee or Delegated Matter? Committee

Relevant Planning History: None on the pre-application site itself. There is however extensive planning history across the wider site, including a recent consent for the 'New Technical Site', a resolution to approve a new hotel and a currently pending application for the FAST zone. In addition, the original technical site has a detailed planning history with several planning applications and listed building consent applications associated with individual buildings, including a site wide consent for commercial uses.

The red line area for this pre-application enquiry includes part of the adjacent quarry site. You would need to contact Oxfordshire County Council for information relating to the planning history of the quarry site.

## Policy:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031 PART 1 (CLP Part 1)
BIC8 - Former RAF Bicester
PSD1 - Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
SLE1 - Employment Development
SLE 2 - Securing Dynamic Town Centres
SLE3 - Supporting Tourism Growth
SLE4 - Improved Transport Connections
ESD1 - Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change
ESD2 - Energy Hierarchy and Allowable Solutions
ESD3 - Sustainable Construction
ESD4 - Decentralised Energy Systems
ESD5 - Renewable Energy
ESD7 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)
ESD10 - Biodiversity and the natural environment
ESD13 - Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement
ESD15 - The Character of the Built and Historic Environment INF1 - Infrastructure

## CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

TR1 - Transportation Funding
C1 - Protection of sites of nature conservation value
C2 - Development affecting protected sites
C4 - Creation of new habitats
C7 - Landscape Conservation
C23 - Retention of features contributing to character or appearance of a conservation area
C25 - Development affecting the site or setting of a schedule ancient monument
C28 - Layout, design and external appearance of new development
ENV12 - Development on Contaminated land
Other Material Planning Considerations include;
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
RAF Bicester Conservation Area Appraisal - November 2008
RAF Bicester Planning Brief 2009
Cherwell Non-Statutory Local Plan 2011

## You should be aware of the following matters/issues/designations:

- The site is located within the Conservation Area of RAF Bicester;
- The wider Bicester Heritage site contains many Listed Buildings and non-designated heritage assets;
- The site lies within the setting of Scheduled Monuments;
- There is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) on the adjacent quarry to the north - this appears to be outside of the application boundary (as shown).
- The site is within a designated Local Wildlife Site;
- There are residential properties to the west of the site;
- There are Public Rights of Way crossing the site around the quarry area;


## PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT BY CASE OFFICER

This formal report is the conclusion of long-standing pre-application discussions on these proposals. Two meetings have taken place with relevant technical disciplines involved on both sides, and an accompanied site visit has also been carried out. I have also issued initial
feedback following the original submission of information and the first meeting; workshop 1 (my letter dated $22^{\text {nd }}$ November 2019).

This report should be read in conjunction with that initial feedback, and the application submission should address the points raised. It should also take account of the points raised in the workshops and any agreed meeting notes.

I acknowledge that the presentation provided by the agent and their consultants, addressed at workshop 2 addressed many of the questions set out in the initial pre-application response regarding 'uses' and what the Brand Centre would be offering to users.

If the proposal is taken forward to the application stage, my understanding is that it would be submitted in outline with access being the only matter for consideration. My only concern with this approach is that some elements of the proposal will be more sensitive in terms of the historic environment and the natural environment (see detailed comments below) and we may require full details of some elements of the scheme to be able to fully consider the principal of the development. My comments below are made with the 'outline' approach in mind.

As with the advice on the FAST zone, the application will need to be accompanied by parameter plans and design coding of sufficient detail given the very significant constraints of this site.

It is considered that the main issues relating to your proposal are:

- The Principle of Development
- Economic Benefits
- The Outline submission and parameter plans
- Highway Safety and Connectivity
- Visual and Landscape Impact
- Trees and Landscaping
- Heritage Assets (Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Area)
- Ecology
- Impact on Aviation
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Energy Efficiency Measures
- Noise - neighbouring Amenity


## The Principle of Development

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 ("CLP Part 1") was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 replaced a number of the 'saved' policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 ("CLP 1996") though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The most relevant planning policies of Cherwell District's statutory Development Plan are set out above.

The majority of the pre-application site is part of a wider site which is allocated in the adopted CLP Part 1 under Policy Bicester 8 for 'conservation-led' proposals to 'secure a long-lasting, economically viable future for the site and flying field'. It should be noted that the 'quarry site' (which is also currently outside the applicant's ownership) is not included within the Policy Bicester 8 allocation and is considered to be outside the built up limits of Bicester and therefore within the open countryside.

Policy Bicester 8 seeks to establish uses which will be complementary to, and help enhance, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the nationally important heritage value of the site whilst securing an economically viable future for the site. The policy proposes a number of uses that will be acceptable at the (wider) site; this includes heritage tourism,
leisure, recreation and employment uses.
The policy is not specific about the precise type of uses within those categories that would be appropriate, the overall quantum of development for the site, or the form such development should take (conversion, re-use or new build for example); nor does it stipulate which parts of the overall site are suitable for development or otherwise. It does however refer to the approved Planning Brief for the site dated September 2009. This Brief is now somewhat out of date and superseded both by the CLP Part 1 itself as well as national planning policy and guidance and material circumstances; including the surrounding context and development that has taken place both on the wider site and within its environs. It also provides informal development principles only and does not have the status of a Supplementary Planning Document. This all affects the weight that can be applied to the Brief.

Within the Planning Brief the majority of the pre-application site is identified as comprising part of the flying field (n.b. the quarry site is not covered by the planning brief). The Brief states that "In respect of the flying field the study considered that its retention as an unobstructed area of green space was "essential to ensure its historic integrity" and concluded that "any loss of the extent of the flying field, or incursion into it by built development, would be wholly unacceptable and detrimental to its importance as an integral part of the conservation area". Accordingly, the development proposed here cannot be considered to be in accordance with the Planning Brief in principle terms. In this respect it conflicts with this part of Policy Bicester 8.

However, in my view there are material considerations which must be considered in the balance against this apparent conflict. These include; The issuing of a new national planning policy framework and planning practice guidance; the sale of Bicester Heritage by the MOD and its acquisition, investment and re-use by Bicester Heritage; the granting of permission for an extension to the technical site and the resolution to grant permission for a new hotel; the granting of planning permission for development within the environs of Bicester Heritage; the contribution that development at Bicester Heritage makes to the local economy and the employment and recreational offer now available at the site.

The types of uses proposed, themselves meet the aspirations of Policy Bicester 8 by providing leisure, recreation and employment uses. Although the Planning Brief suggests there should be no additional built development on the flying field, it is acknowledged that Policy Bicester 8 includes all of the flying field within the allocation and the Planning Brief alone, does not carry enough weight to identify areas where development should be strictly prohibited.

When considering the principle of development in the location proposed (within the flying field area) there is a need to consider the impact on the openness of the flying field and the ability to retain aviation activity (which links to its historic use as an airfield). In terms of retaining the 'openness' of the airfield, I do not believe this prohibits all development within the flying field.
Retaining sufficient space between the built limits of the technical site and any new building(s) will allow a feeling of openness to be retained, along with careful consideration of the placement of any further buildings around the fringes of the flying field.

In my view, locating a building (or complex of buildings) in the area shown could be achieved without impacting on the overall openness of the flying field. This will require careful design considerations (further comments below) and the development should be compact to avoid the appearance of sprawl around the fringes of the airfield. As previously advised, I do have some reservations about the proposed trackside spectator buildings (more detail provided in heritage section); these have the potential to appear as sprawling development along the edge of the airfield.

The 'former quarry site' is not included within the Policy Bicester 8 allocation and therefore does not benefit from a presumption to support the type of development outlined in your submission. The proposed use of the quarry area for $4 \times 4$ tracks would compliment the offering at the brand centre and the quarry does offer a unique opportunity to create this type of feature. However, the approach needs to be led by a well-planned restoration scheme,
with the proposed use respecting and responding to the natural environment of the quarry. On this basis, I would not support any building/structures, or heavily engineered element (in terms of additional concrete features) within the quarry site. The open countryside setting of this part of the site needs to be reflected within your submission and demonstrated that a nonintrusive scheme is possible.

Your Planning Statement should explain how you consider the proposals to comply with Policy Bicester 8 and the Planning Brief and the weight that should be applied to any conflict with these, bearing in mind the above comments. It also needs to clearly address the quarry site, which is not included in the policy allocation.

In addition to Policy Bicester 8, the proposal for expanding the leisure/tourism uses at the site is also supported by the wider policies of the Local Plan. Policy PSD1 ensures that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development that accords with the Plan and secures improvements to the economic, social and environmental conditions of an area, subject to other material considerations. Policy SLE2 relates to 'supporting tourism growth' and supports proposals for new and improved tourism facilities. The Council's planning committee have resolved to grant planning permission for a hotel on the site, and there are clear functional links between the proposals and the hotel.

In summary, in principle terms, the proposals will provide jobs, secure economic growth and significantly boost tourism in the local area, which would overall be consistent with the CLP
Part 1. Proposals will however also need to have regard to, and be considered against, other planning policy requirements which are considered below.

## Economic Benefits

The submitted design and access statement sets out an overview of the likely economic benefits of the scheme. It is acknowledged the scheme would bring clear and significant economic benefits to the town and the wider region. In a future planning application, we would encourage the economic impact assessment to be developed further, indicating likely connections to local supply chains, the relationship with other commercial development occurring around Bicester and the potential links with the town centre; including strategies for delivering these benefits.

## The Outline Submission and Parameter Plans

## Outline submission

If the proposal proceeds to the application stage, my understanding is that you intend to submit an application in outline, with all matters reserved except for access.

If you were to proceed in this manner, I believe there are elements of the scheme that we would require full details of to enable the LPA to determine the principal of the development. The brand centre building itself could be considered in outline, however, the majority of the ancillary development such as the trackside pavilions, any safety features and fencing around the airfield track and details of structures/engineering works in the quarry site (along with a restoration scheme) would need to be submitted with more substantial details to demonstrate how the use could be accommodated on the site without adverse impact.

## Developable Area Parameter Plan

Developable area plan (included within the DAS) highlights three areas of potential development; main build area for the brand centre, quarry site and the area for the proposed trackside pavilions.

I do have concerns with the quarry area being identified as 'developable land', which in conjunction with the 'heights' parameter plan, suggests the area would be capable of accommodating buildings/structures up to 4 m in height. Due to the history of the quarry site, any work in this area needs to be led by a sensitive restoration plan.
Given that the quarry site is outside of the Policy Bicester 8 allocation, and within the open countryside, the Local Planning Authority would resist buildings/structures within this area. I believe there is potential to accommodate the $4 \times 4$ tracks provided they are designed to integrate within the natural landscape.

## Land Use

The proposed brand centre would include a variety of proposed uses including restaurants, retail and employment uses. It is important that the predominant use is for leisure/tourism purposes to contribute to the requirements of Policy Bicester 8.

The purpose of the policy is to bring forward development on the site that contributes to the overall offer in Bicester but does not adversely impact on the town centre. The proposed restaurant and retail offers must be intrinsically linked to the leisure offering and should only represent a small proportion of the development.

Your application submission should explain in more detail the type of ancillary uses you envisage for this site, setting out maximum floorspace for each use and why this amount is needed. If a large proportion of town centre uses are proposed, we may require an impact assessment to be submitted.

## Heights

The heights plan included within the DAS identifies varying heights for different elements of the scheme. I am content with the proposed heights for the brand experience centre; the design of the building(s) will be key, but overall it should not appear overly intrusive.

As set out above, I do have objections to the potentially of 4 m high buildings or structures within the quarry site. Similarly, I have concerns about the impact of the spectator buildings on the edge of the flying field.

## Design

The design of the buildings will be very important to ensure the work well within the context of the site. I believe a high quality, modern design has the potential to work very well in this location. It would contrast with the historic buildings on the site and showcase the nature of the development being proposed. There is no reason why a modern design cannot take some influences from the historic nature of the site.

Whilst I have set out the above suggestion in terms of design style, it will be extremely important to work through this process with your architects/designers. The DAS should clearly set out the design process and the thinking behind the final design solution. I believe it will be worthwhile engaging in future pre-application discussions focussing on the design of the building(s), should you proceed to that stage.

The application should be accompanied by a Design Code. This will follow on from a thorough and detailed assessment and analysis of the site and its context in the DAS.

It needs to include;

- Building Frontages - please note that the buildings should have a clear relationship with the airfield and the Bicester Heritage site.
- Roof treatments
- Materials
- Colours
- Elevational detailing
- Surfacing
- Landscaping (hard and soft)
- Signage
- Lighting (also needs to be addressed in the Heritage Assessment and LVIA)
- Boundary Treatments (also needs to be addressed in the Heritage Assessment)
- Parking Principles (inc cycle parking and EV charging points)
- Service/delivery principles
- Use of photovoltaics (if applicable)


## Highway Safety and Connectivity

In matters of highway safety, there have been ongoing discussions between your consultants, Mode, and Tim Peart (OCC), including a recent meeting regarding the FAST development.

During that meeting, it was made clear that the comments made by the Local Highway Authority regarding the FAST development will also be applicable to this proposal.

I do not intend to repeat the advice in this report as your consultants are fully aware of the concerns and there are ongoing discussions as to how best the concerns can be addressed at the application stage. If necessary, I would strongly encourage you to engage in pre-application discussions with the Local Highway Authority to ensure a strategy is in place for addressing their concerns, particularly with regard to off-site infrastructure improvements and wider sustainable transport issues.

My understanding is that agreement has been reached with regards to access points and management of traffic entering/leaving the site.

On matters of connectivity, the application should be accompanied by a Connectivity and Movement Parameter Plan. This should show both on and off-site linkages.

We would expect the application to include details of measures to encourage active travel to and from the site. This could include improving footpath and cycle connections between the site and town (particularly to the two stations and bus hub); proposing a comprehensive network of cycle and footpath routes within the site which connect easily to the external routes and submitting a draft framework travel plan which contains proposals for how both employees and visitors to the site will be encouraged to travel by means other than the car. These measures should be included within the Transport Assessment and shown on the Connectivity and Movement Parameter Plan.

All of the issues raised by the Local Authority during the meeting and in written correspondence will need to be clearly addressed in your submission, otherwise it is likely the LHA will raise an objection to the scheme.

The application is accompanied by a LVIA upon which initial feedback has been provided.

In terms of the landscaping parameters, landscape mitigation and amenity proposals must go hand in hand with the development and must be integrated with the buildings, service road, service yard, car parking and circulation routes, SuDS etc. Landscape structural planting needs to be considered as a 'permanent' element, which will not be impacted upon by future building work. Structural landscaping parameters should be included within the Open Space/Landscaping Parameter Plan and established as part of any outline application.

The overall design of the development will be key to ensuring any development sits appropriately within the setting. Landscape mitiagation can be used to soften buildings and enhance the setting but should not attempt to 'hide' buildings. High quality design will be imperative on this site.

## Heritage Assets (Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Area)

The airfield is protected principally for its 1920's origins, however the WWII additions are important as part of the airfield as a whole. Heritage impact is a key issue on this site with numerous listed buildings and Scheduled Monuments around the site. The proposals will be located within the Conservation Area which covers the whole Policy Bicester 8 allocation.

Following the second pre-application meeting, the following comments were received from the Council's Conservation Team:
'The brand experience centre is proposed to be located mostly to the north west of the airfield. This area is considered to be marginally less sensitive than other locations around the historic flying field. However, the incremental development of the airfield will potentially detract from its significance and therefore this development needs to be carefully managed. There are ongoing concerns about the cumulative impacts of the development of the site as a whole as a result of progressing individual schemes one at a time. Also as advised previously it is suggested that the applicant engage with Historic England at an early stage and any advice should be taken on board and form part of any subsequent application that is submitted to the LPA.

The comments provided here are in addition to those already provided for the first part of the preapplication enquiry. These should be read together, and the response as a whole taken into account going forward.

## Perimeter track and bunding

The information submitted indicates that the perimeter track will be treated in such a way that it will remain the dominant feature of the airfield with any new tracks laid inside the perimeter track and appearing secondary due to their form and surface treatment. This approach is welcomed, however further details will be required as part of any application to allow for a full assessment of the resulting impacts. These details should include, the surfacing materials, a full justification and reasoning and an assessment of the extent to which the new tracks will visually intrude onto the historic airfield. In principle the proposed new track is considered on balance to be acceptable subject to appropriate detailing and materials.
equipment to be installed around the perimeter. The proposed green bunding/ha ha approach is favoured over the wholesale installation of engineered safety barriers.

The aim is to retain the open nature of the airfield and keep any encroachment to a minimum. It is accepted that some kind of barrier is required on the part of the airfield closest to the Bicester Heritage buildings, these barriers should be kept to the lowest number possible and should be designed to be discrete.

## Buildings

As the proposed designs for the buildings are indicative it is difficult to make a detailed assessment of their impact or provide any firm views. However, of the four approaches suggested at the second pre application meeting the village feel scheme is considered to be the least appropriate. It is felt that this site needs an innovative and unique building that addresses the individual characteristics of the historic airfield. Of the three remaining approaches the landmark and the campus feel are considered to address this the most. The final design and the materials used will be key to developing an appropriate and successful scheme that sustains the character of the conservation area.

There are still concerns regarding the appropriateness of the pavilion buildings. The preference would be for all of the buildings to be located together in one location in order to reduce the encroachment of development into the airfield. Similarly it is suggested that consideration needs to be given to the potential of including the spectating element within the main development of buildings, therefore the applicant is recommended to explore the possibility of locating the buildings differently as this will reduce any further harm that may result due to the development and reduce the visual impact on the historic flying field.

## Planning application submission

As previously advised if the planning application were to come forward as an outline application this makes it difficult to assess the impact of the development on the heritage assets. A comprehensive detailed submission would be preferred. However, as a minimum any application should be accompanied by progressed parameter plans and design codes with an appropriate indicative materials palate. It is also suggested that photomontages should from part of any submission to give a clearer indication of the visual impact and allow for a more considered visual assessment.

## Public Benefits

It is unavoidable that the proposed development will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. The NPPF para 196 states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. Therefore, a detailed assessment of the public benefits of the proposals should be included in any planning application. Public access alone is not considered to be a public benefit that can outweigh this less than substantial harm that will result. It is therefore suggested that more work is needed to explore other possible public benefits. This could include restoration of the existing buildings within the Bicester Heritage site such as the hangers and potentially taking wider view and considering the potential opportunities for Bicester town centre'.

I do not intend to repeat the advice set out above, but I would echo the comments of the Conservation team. The key points will be clearly demonstrating any public benefits of the scheme, the importance of high-quality design and addressing the concerns relating to the pavilion buildings.

I would re-iterate the need for early engagement with Historic England regarding the proposals. I would also request that you share any response with the LPA so our Conservation team can consider the comments as part of any future discussions.

Consideration also needs to be given to the cumulative impact of development around the airfield on heritage assets. This should include the consented schemes situated around the technical site, the hotel, the proposed FAST development and other schemes set out in the Bicester Motion masterplan. Although the masterplan has no status and has not been formally considered by the LPA, this information is in the public domain.

The Planning Practice Guidance: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment, highlights this 'When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change'. The Historic England advice note, The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, also advices on cumulative change and where significance may have been compromised in the past, additional change that may further detract from the significance of heritage assets needs to be considered.

The functional relationship between the Brand Centre and the rest of the airfield is very important. Whilst we are encouraging a modern, distinctive approach to architecture to set this development apart from the historic aspects of the site, the wider site still needs to read well as a whole site. The design needs to ensure the brand centre doesn't isolate itself as a separate development.

An element that has been discussed previously is the impact of lighting. Any lighting on the site, will need to be carefully considered both in terms of impact on heritage and ecology.

## Ecology/Protected Species/Biodiversity

A separate meeting was held on $25^{\text {th }}$ November 2020. The meeting focussed on technical details relating to the type/method of assessment used to calculate the required net biodiversity gain. There has also been ongoing correspondence with the Council's Ecologist who has provided technical advice.

In a very brief summary, my understanding is that the required net gain can be provided across the wider site. However, there is concern that each development parcel would not necessarily show the required net gain for that development as a stand-alone application. Therefore, in case where net gain can not be demonstrated, consideration needs to be given as how works on other parts of the site can be secured to mitigate the development.

The detailed advice provided by the Council's Ecologist should be considered prior to the submission of an application.

## Impact on Aviation

Policy Bicester 8 makes clear that any development of the site should not preclude use of the flying field for flying. Your application will need to be accompanied by an Aviation Assessment which demonstrates that no such adverse impact will result from the proposals.

The aviation report submitted with the applications, appears to reach the conclusion
that aviation can be retained on the site in conjunction with the proposed development.

As part of the pre-application process, the report is taken as read and has not been scrutinised. As part of an application this document will be in the public domain and therefore will likely be scrutinised by the public, members of the local gliding club and any relevant bodies that wish to make comment. Ay comments received will need to be carefully considered by the LPA and if necessary, we may choose to seek expert advice on the topic.

## Flood Risk and Drainage

I would strongly encourage that you make early contact with the County Council on this matter. You have the relevant contact details.

As part of our pre-application process we are unable to consult externally and would also recommend that you seek pre-application advice from the Environment Agency and Water Authority as necessary.

## Energy Efficiency Measures

The application should be accompanied by an Energy Statement. The relevant policies listed at the start of this report (esp ESD 1, ESD2, ESD 3 and ESD4) set out the Council's approach to ensuring that new development both mitigates and adapts to the impacts of climate change. Any future application needs to carefully consider these policies and demonstrate compliance.

The Energy Statement will need to demonstrate how reductions in carbon emissions will be achieved using the "energy hierarchy" set out in Policy ESD2. The development will also be required to meet BREEAM Very Good standard as a minimum and details of how this standard will be achieved should be set out in the Energy Statement where possible.

## Noise - Impact on neighbouring amenity

Detailed noise comments were included in the stage 1 pre-application response. They do highlight the likelihood that the development, on occasion will generate high levels of noise due to nature of the proposal.

To the west of Buckingham Road is a residential area, I do have concerns that noise levels could have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties if it is not carefully managed. My main concern is there is an element of unknown in terms of noise as this will vary based on the level of use and type/age of vehicle on the track. Therefore, there is a risk of underestimating impact on residential properties.

A mitigation strategy will be essential. The strategy needs to clear address potential residential impact and how mitigation will be managed so that residents can clearly understand how it will be managed. It should include a review process, that will allow adaptions should unexpected issues arise.

My understanding is that an electronic monitoring system could be implemented to monitor noise in real time and remove any vehicles exceeding agreed limits. If this type of technology is used, there will need to be clear monitoring of the system and safeguards put in place, should technical issues occur.

As part of any application, it is essential that the LPA is satisfied that noise can be adequately managed and the development will not adversely impact on residential amenity.

## Conclusion

In principle, I am satisfied that the development of this site for leisure/tourism accords with the CLP Part 1 as discussed above. I do however have concerns about some elements of the proposal (as set out above) and potential noise implications.

If an outline application is to be submitted, I would also need to see sufficiently detailed parameter plans and a design code accompanying the application as discussed in this report, given the heritage sensitivities and constraints of the site. Some elements, such as the safety barriers and pavilions will need a greater level of detail included in the submission.

The technical reports supporting the application should also reflect the preapplication advice provided to date.

I have not been able to carry out external consultation, including consultation with key consultees such as Historic England and the Wildlife Trust, or with the relevant Town/Parish Council's and affected residents.

It is my professional opinion that if your application submission were to satisfactorily resolve and respond to all the matters raised during the pre-application discussions and all the matters highlighted in this report that the application would be one that we would be able to support.

Notwithstanding the officer comments above, a Section 106 Legal Agreement is likely to be required for this type of proposal.

You are advised to read the Council's Supplementary Planning Document for further advice. This is available on the Council's website:
http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=3390
Developer contributions may also be required by external agencies such as OCC:
Highways, public transport (OCC)
Monitoring (OCC)
Police and Community Safety (Thames Valley Police)
You may wish to consult with these agencies prior to submitting a planning application.
Please note that a Solicitor's undertaking will be required to pay the Council's reasonable legal fees based on the time taken to prepare and negotiate the S106 agreement and to investigate land title/s. It would assist the efficient processing of your application if you provided such an undertaking with any formal application for planning permission.

## Date of Report: 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ February 2020

## Case Officer: Rebekah Morgan

## DISCLAIMER

The above advice represents the professional views of Council Officers and although given in good faith, it cannot prejudice any decision with the Council, as Local Planning Authority, may make at either Planning Committee or delegated officer level.
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Good afternoon Tim,
I hope you're keeping well.
Just tried to call you a short while ago in relation to your emails sent across over the course of the last week apologies for only coming back to you now on these, l'm just catching up on things after being away on leave.

I will be addressing the points raised by responding to the individual emails for ease and clarity.
In relation to the extent of the gravity model for the wider masterplan - this was taken from the hotel site, of which the methodology was agreed and approved by OCC as part of the application. The method and reasoning behind the 50 km catchment was based on the average trip length by journey purpose ('leisure/Holiday/day trip') from the NTS (table attached, for reference) - this came out at around 35km (21.6 miles); we then included, for robustness, a wider journey distribution sample size and extended this out to a 50km catchment.

I appreciate that this catchment does not include London and Birmingham (which would have the higher population densities); however, it should be noted that the gravity model as it stands, is based on a straight forward population/distance based gravity formula - this has not included any weighting factor on the travel distance, which would ultimately also have an impact on the distribution (as the propensity to visit the site would likely reduce, associated with the longer distance of travel).

Therefore, if we encompassed Birmingham and London within the model extent, we would most definitely incorporate a weighting factor (as above) within the formula, and this would likely not result in a significant impact on the existing distribution forecast to/from the development.

Considering the above we believe that the 50 km gravity model extent and methodology currently undertaken is sufficient and appropriate for the purposes of the development proposals and the forthcoming Transport Assessment.

I would greatly appreciate your confirmation and acceptance of this; however, if you have any queries or require any further clarification on any of the above, please just let me know.

Many thanks and kind regards, Adrian

## Adrian Forte BSc (Hons) MCIHT

Principal Transport Planner
mode transport planning

Lombard House | 145 Great Charles Street | Birmingham | B3 3LP
t: 01217948395 | e: adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk

## www.modetransport.co.uk

be green, keep it on the screen!

## WINNER!

From: "Peart, Timothy - Communities" [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Date: Wednesday, 22 May 2019 at 11:57
To: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Cc: "White, Joy - Communities" [Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk), "Smith, Benjamin -
Communities" [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping
Hi Adrian
I've just had a quick look at the spreadsheets you've sent across and just want to query the extent of the study area, which seems to be up to 50 km of the site.

This doesn't include any areas or London or Birmingham, which are both easily accessible to Bicester Heritage via the M40 and their inclusion could potentially have a significant impact on the distribution from the development.

Have you given any thought to extending the area or is there any particular reason for why the study area is restricted to 50 km ?

## Thanks

Tim Peart<br>Senior Transport Planner - Cherwell \& West Oxfordshire<br>Communities<br>County Hall<br>New Road<br>Oxford<br>OX1 1ND<br>Email: timothy.peart@oxfordshire.gov.uk

From: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Sent: 16 May 2019 18:24
To: Peart, Timothy - Communities [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Cc: White, Joy - Communities [Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk); Smith, Benjamin - Communities
[Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Subject: Re: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping

Good evening Tim,
I hope you are keeping well.
Further to my email that I sent across last week; apologies, I have just realised that I had forgotten to append the gravity model distribution Excel spreadsheets, containing the relevant areas (Districts/MSOAs/LSOAs), populations, associated distribution and route assignments - Please see these attached now within the zipped folder, for your reference.

I trust that this is acceptable; however, if you require any further information and/or clarification, please just let me know.

Many thanks and kind regards,
Adrian

Adrian Forte BSc (Hons) MCIHT<br>Principal Transport Planner<br>mode transport planning<br>Lombard House | 145 Great Charles Street | Birmingham | B3 3LP<br>t: 01217948395 | e: adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk

www.modetransport.co.uk
be green, keep it on the screen!


From: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Date: Tuesday, 7 May 2019 at 18:33
To: "Peart, Timothy - Communities" [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Cc: "White, Joy - Communities" < Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>, "Smith, Benjamin Communities" [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Subject: Re: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping

Good evening Tim,
I hope you're keeping well.
Apologies, I had intended to respond to you sooner. I had also appreciated that you were off on leave until the start of last week; I hope you had a nice break over Easter (a distant memory now) and the bank holiday weekend, just gone.

Thanks very much for your most recent comments/notes on the BH Masterplan scope. Please see below some additional points/information (in red) for consideration/discussion.

Maybe we could catch up/discuss these during the week over the phone, if possible; we are now beginning to model the required local junctions, utilising the flows from the OCC SATURN model and the traffic generation/distribution methodologies, as below.

If you are free and able to give me a call at some stage (once you have reviewed the below), this would be greatly appreciated. I trust that this is acceptable and understandable; however, if you have any queries or require any further information and/or clarification, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Many thanks in advance and look forward to hearing from you. Talk soon.
Kind regards,
Adrian

Adrian Forte BSc (Hons) MCIHT
Principal Transport Planner
mode transport planning

Lombard House | 145 Great Charles Street | Birmingham | B3 3LP
t: 01217948395 | e: adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk


From: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Date: Saturday, 13 April 2019 at 16:21
To: "Peart, Timothy - Communities" [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Cc: "Smith, Benjamin - Communities" [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk), "White, Joy -
Communities" < Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping
Hi Tim,
I hope you're keeping well.
Thanks very much for your email; and apologies that l'm only acknowledging receipt of this now (especially on a Saturday!)

Your additional comments are much appreciated, and I will give these some more thought at the start of next week.

Would we maybe be able to have a catch up on the phone, say Wednesday/Thursday, just to discuss a few ideas? If this is possible, please let me know your availability and we can hopefully organise a call.

Enjoy the rest of the weekend.
Many thanks and kind regards, Adrian

Adrian Forte BSc (Hons) MCIHT
Principal Transport Planner mode transport planning

Lombard House | 145 Great Charles Street | Birmingham | B3 3LP
t: 01217948395 | e: adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk

## www.modetransport.co.uk

be green, keep it on the screen!


From: "Peart, Timothy - Communities" [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Date: Tuesday, 9 April 2019 at 10:29
To: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Cc: "Smith, Benjamin - Communities" [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk), "White, Joy Communities" < Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping

## Dear Adrian

To follow up on the TA scoping note, please see my further comments below in blue.

## Kind regards

## Tim Peart

Senior Transport Planner - Cherwell \& West Oxfordshire
Communities
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND
Email: timothy.peart@oxfordshire.gov.uk

From: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Sent: 27 March 2019 15:47
To: Peart, Timothy - Communities [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk); White, Joy - Communities
[Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk); Smith, Benjamin - Communities [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Cc: ja@bicesterheritage.co.uk; Jon Westerman [jon@edgarslimited.co.uk](mailto:jon@edgarslimited.co.uk); Ben Fairgrieve
[benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk); David Frisby [davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk); Clare O'Hanlon
[Clare.O'Hanlon@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.O'Hanlon@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk)
Subject: Re: Bicester Heritage - Masterplan TA Scoping

Good afternoon Tim,
I hope you are keeping well.
Thank you very much for your comments below, in relation to our TA Scoping Note - please see our additional comments, clarifications and suggestions below in orange text, beneath your initial comments.

It would be worthwhile if we could possibly have a phone call over the next few days/week, in the hope of discussing and resolving/agreeing some of the topics further - I did try to call you last week, but unfortunately was unable to get through.

## 3. Access

I note that the new hotel access can also be utilised for access to Brand Experience Centre and Exhibition Hall. Is additional access onto Buckingham Road absolutely required? From a highways perspective it would be better to minimise the number of access points onto the highway and make better use of internal access routes as additional access points can cause delay, which would be a concern on a bus route in particular.

- Our comment within the Scoping Note was more in relation to the crossover/linked trips associated with the various land uses across the masterplan - there will be an element of linked trips associated with the hotel, brand experience centre, exhibition hall and general Bicester Heritage technical site uses, and therefore traffic may utilise the hotel access and park within the associated car parking areas - there is not intended to be vehicular internal access routes linking the various land uses based on the permitted hotel application and layout. There will however be permeable and convenient walking and cycling routes that will connect the various land uses across the wider masterplan layout.
- Therefore, it is proposed that a vehicular access specifically associated with the brand experience centre will be provided (and formalised) at the existing gated access location on Buckingham Road to the south of Thompson Drive. Likewise the permitted hotel access further south is planned to be retained as per the consented application.
Noted. However, the county council's view remains that better use of internal access routes for the complimentary land uses that outline above (the hotel, experience centre, exhibition hall etc.) should be prioritised over reliance on multiple access points from the highway in close proximity to each other.
Noted; however, the consolidation of accesses along Buckingham Road would likely require a larger (more significant) form of access (i.e. roundabout/signalisation scheme) to allow for the sufficient operation/capacity in relation to the combined overall traffic from the development site usage - this is considered to be out of context for the character of the road and local build up area. Therefore, the utilisation/upgrade/formalisation of the existing gated access to the south of Thompson's Drive for the Brand Experience Centre and the access further south for the Hotel application (both accesses to be ghost right priority junctions), are considered to be most
appropriate, and will allow for the respective development traffic (Hotel \& Brand Experience Centre) to be dispersed more evenly and efficiently along the highway (reducing potential queuing/delay), as opposed to being concentrated at one point of access (potentially creating more of a capacity impact at one location). Furthermore, the junctions are appropriately spaced, in excess of 200 m (c.250m) apart, and are not considered to be in close proximity of each other, which ensures that there will be no conflict/interaction/safety issues between the junctions.


## 4. Sustainable Access

I agree that the TA will need to consider the existing situation in terms of sustainable transport infrastructure and how the proposals can be linked this this.

- Agreed and to be included within the TA.


## 5. Parking Numbers

- Brand Experience Centre - Agreed that this should be based on first principles approach using assumptions within the business plan -
- Agreed; taking the total floor area of the brand experience centre (c.11,677sqm) and applying OCC's parking standard for D2 (Assembly \& Leisure - 1 space per 22sqm) would equate to an excessive requirement of $c .530$ car parking provision.
- A first principles approach will be adopted within the TA, supported by visitor assumptions within the business plan (provided by Bicester Heritage).
- Currently using the traffic generation methodology detailed within the Scoping Note, and taking the highest anticipated vehicle trips (from Saturday/weekend) $=640$ two-way trips ( 320 arrivals and departures); assuming that all vehicles (320) arrive during in the AM period and leave during the PM period, and all anticipated staff ( 64 FTE ) arrive by car in the AM period and leave during the PM period (this assumes that all employees travel by single occupancy car for robustness) this would equate to demand for c. 384 parking spaces being required - there is potential to add some contingency on top of this - to be determined as the scheme/proposals evolve.
- This will need to be discussed further with OCC, in light of, and in line with the comments in relation to the traffic generation first principles, including the use of the National Travel Survey (NTS) data (as per Point 7, below).
Noted
- Future Technology Hub - Agreed this should be based on OCC standards applying an indicative use class mix.
- Agreed, parking within the future technology hub will be provided in accordance with OCC's maximum standards for B1 (1 space per 30sqm) / B2 (1 space per 50sqm) / B8 (1 space per 200sqm) use, and in line with the anticipated mix of units within the development (total GFA c.9,353sqm).
- Currently the indicative mix of development is: $25 \%$ of $B 1$ (c) $-2,338$ sqm, $25 \%$ of $B 2-2,338$ sqm and $50 \%$ of $B 8-4,677$ sqm - this all equates to a total parking provision of c .148 spaces. Noted
- Bicester Reserve - Public - I agree this could be based on the OCC standard for hotels (one space per room), but would request clarification on whether it is likely that all units will be one-bed? Even if not, there is still likely to be some car sharing as groups of visitors may arrive together so the above standard is likely to be appropriate.
- Agreed, parking will be based on the OCC standard for C3 hotel (1 space per room) - at this stage parking has been calculated based on all units being one-bed; however, clarification on this will be sought from Bicester Heritage and the full development schedule will be included within the TA. There is the potential that c. 20 of the lodges may be 2-bed units - however, we agree with your comment that the lodges are likely to be rented by families and/or groups of visitors that are likely to arrive together by car-sharing, therefore, applying the one space per unit standard is considered appropriate and sufficient.
Noted
- Bicester Reserve - Private - I note the suggestion to use either the C1 hotel or C3 residential standards. Perhaps the number of spaces should be somewhere in between based on how likely is it that visitors to private holiday lodges would bring two cars. If spaces are unallocated for this use there could also be
some flexibility by providing a shared parking area. How likely is it that all owners of private lodges would be staying on-site at same time?
- Agreed - this parking provision could be consolidated and reduced slightly, considering your points that holidaying visitors (owners or guests) are less likely to bring two cars and are more inclined to car share (similarly to the Bicester Reserve - Private land use above). We will consider the option and scope to provide unallocated parking in consultation with Bicester Heritage and the development of the internal masterplan layout. Therefore, it may be more appropriate to consider a parking standard of c .1 to 1.5 parking spaces per unit.
Noted
- Bicester Reserve - Parkland - This will need to be determined on its merits through a first principles approach. Are there any forecasts for visitor numbers in the business case to base this on?
- This land use may prove to be slightly more challenging to provide a parking provision based on a first principles approach - we will consult with Bicester Heritage and see if there is any data/visitor numbers within the business case that could be utilised in this instance; however, in the absence of any insightful data/information, we reviewed the typical parking ratios sourced from the TRICS database for two country parks (07-Leisure / M-Country Parks) in Gloucester \& Preston - these equated to a provision of 1.3 and 1.9 parking spaces per hectare, respectively. Therefore, we envisage providing parking towards the higher end at c. 2 spaces per hectare. This would result in the provision of $c .58$ spaces for this element.
Noted. In the absence of any data from the business case, it's perhaps best to base this on TRICS data in the first instance but note that a larger (or smaller) parking area may be required in the future based on usage. Noted.
- Bomb stores - Are these to be privately owned? Presumably the 1 space per unit does not include the car storage area? Are the bomb stores going to be accompanied with individual parking spaces or a shared parking area(s)? If the latter, could there be a lower number of spaces provided depending on likelihood that all bomb stores are occupied at the same time?
- That is correct, the 1 space per unit does not include the car storage area - this parking will be in addition to these areas.
- Agreed, in relation to the allocated and unallocated parking provision, and likelihood of all bomb stores being occupied at the same time - we will consider the option and scope to provide unallocated parking in consultation with Bicester Heritage and the development of the internal masterplan layout. Therefore, it could be more appropriate to consider a lower parking ratio of c. 0.75 parking spaces per unit - equating to c. 36 communal/unallocated spaces.

Noted

- Hangar 5 Exhibition / Museum - Agree it may be best to base this on the adopted parking standards, unless the business case assumptions on visitor numbers suggest otherwise.
- Agreed, this land use will look to conform with OCC's maximum standards of 1 space per 22sqm, equating to a provision of c. 242 spaces; we will also consult further with Bicester Heritage in relation to any potential business case assumptions on an alternative/required ratio/standard. Noted


## 6. Assessment Periods

We can agree with the assessment periods being the weekday AM and PM peak periods as a worst case scenario given the difference in flows between the weekday and weekend peaks.

- Agreed and confirmed that the TA will assess the capacity of the local highway network during the typical worst-case weekday AM and PM peak hours - 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00, respectively. In line with the outputs from the County's SATURN traffic model.


## Noted

## 7. Trip Generation

## Brand Experience Centre

We would like some additional background or explanation in the TA on the forecast visitor numbers per annum.

- This will be reported within the TA, as provided from/informed by Bicester Heritage and contained within the business case.

I accept that the NTS data indicates that on average $38 \%$ of leisure trips are made by car. However, given the nature of the Brand Experience Centre proposed is it more likely that the destination may attract visitors from a wider area than average? Certain leisure attractions may be more likely to attract trips from a more local area (lowering the average in the NTS data), whereas the Brand Experience Centre may attract trips from a much wider region. Longer distance trips are more likely to be undertaken by car so an allowance should be made for this.

- We consider the NTS dataset (Table NTS0504) to be the most representative data source available (noting that ONS Census Data only covers Journey to Work (JtW) data), in order to forecast the anticipated modal split of visitors to the brand experience centre.
- It is appreciated that the NTS data is an average with nationwide coverage, and as commented, will include leisure trips made to more local facilities and attractions; however, this dataset will also include longer journey trips made to the wider national areas within England. Unfortunately, the NTS data cannot be split down further to cover either regional and/or only longer journey/wider leisure trips.
- Furthermore, there appears to be a main focus and reference from your comment in relation to longer distance trips (undertaken by the car) to the site - however, there are also visitors anticipated to travel to the site from local surrounding areas (including Bicester Town and local Oxfordshire and surrounding County residents, and visitors that are already visiting/within Bicester, Inc. Bicester Village) - these visitors (Inc. longer distant visitors) will also have the opportunity to travel to/from the site by sustainable means.
- Is OCC able to provide any advice on other relevant datasets and/or information to help justify an evidence base for the forecast car leisure trips to the site? This appears to be the main matter that we will need to resolve, in advance of undertaking our travel demand and capacity assessments within the TA.
- It would be appreciated if we could have a further discussion on this methodology, in order to agree the methodology and way forward.
Are there any first principles data sets of any similar developments that could be used? Is mode share data available from Gaydon Motor Museum (as with the arrival / departure profile outlined below)? The concern over use of the NTS data is that the category 'leisure trips' covers such a wide variety of trips, including very local trips (to the local swimming pool, pub etc.), that it is unlikely to be representative of the development proposed. Unfortunately we have been unable to source any first principles methodologies for comparable developments and unfortunately the Gaydon Motor Museum is not a multi-modal survey within the TRICS database. I have however given your concern regarding the NTS mode share for 'leisure trips' some more consideration and we have now formulated an additional first principles method and approach using the NTS Average Car Occupancy by Journey Purpose for both 'Leisure' and 'Holiday/Day Trip'. Please see the corresponding method detailed below, for your reference, review and comment; please note that this approach results in a higher number of vehicular trips than the previous NTS method, and is now considered to be more robust and applicable:
- To determine the Brand Experience Centre traffic generation, a first principles approach has been adopted using the projected visitor and staff numbers for the proposal.
- It is anticipated that the centre will be open 7-days per week for c. 360 days per annum (excluding major public holidays) and will attract a total of c.250,000 visitors per annum (based on BH figures/forecast).
- In terms of staff, it is anticipated that the development could employ up to c. 97 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members (based on 120sqm per FTE, as per the HCA's Employment Density Guide 2015). It is expected that there will be approximately 64 ( $97 \times 0.66$ ) staff on duty, daily, at a given time.
- The 2017 National Travel Survey (NTS) Table NTS0504 indicates that $65 \%$ of leisure trips (sport/entertainment \& holiday/day trips) occur between Monday to Friday, with 35\% of trips occurring at the weekend (Saturday/Sunday). Furthermore, 2017 NTS Table NTS0905 indicates that the average car occupancy for 'leisure' and 'holiday/day trips' is 1.80 .
- Using the NTS figures above; of the 250,000 annual visitors, it is anticipated that 138,889 (250,000 / 1.80) will arrive by car (vehicular trips), with $90,278(138,889 \times 0.65)$ arriving during the weekdays (MonFri) and $48,611(138,889 \times 0.35)$ arriving at the weekend (Sat-Sun).
- In terms of daily two-way vehicular movements during the weekday, this would equate to approximately 694 (( 90,278 / 52 weeks / 5 weekdays) x 2 ) trips. Applying the same methodology, it is anticipated that there would be 935 (( 48,611 / 52 weeks / 2 days) $\times 2$ ) daily two-way vehicular trips each day at the weekend (Sat \& Sun).
- In order to profile the Brand Experience Centre arriving and departing vehicular traffic patterns throughout the weekday (08:00-18:00), a traffic survey of the British Motor Heritage Museum in Gaydon was sourced from the TRICS (v.7.5.4) database; the proportions of in and out traffic movements across the day were extrapolated and applied to the proposed weekday for the 694 vehicle trips. The specific details of this is included within the attached Excel spreadsheet, for reference - in summary, the Brand Experience Centre is forecast to generate 107 and 103 two-way trips in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
- The forecast staff trips will also be included within the AM and PM peak hours; for a robust assessment, it will be considered that all staff (c.64) drive to the site, arriving in the AM (08:00-09:00) and departing in the PM (17:00-18:00).

I see the logic in the proposed methodology of applying the same arrival / departure profile from Gaydon Motor Museum to the proposed exhibition / museum space. However, would other elements of the experience centre generate different arrival / departure patterns? For instance would those arriving for a 'track day' experience be more likely to arrive / depart earlier or later? If so, this would alter the arrival / departure pattern.

- The brand experience centre is not only going to comprise of the driver/track experience element, there are also anticipated to be c. 13 buildings comprising of a total of $\mathrm{c} .11,677 \mathrm{sqm}$ floor area - these will consist of various D1/D2, Sui Generis land uses with ancillary A1/A3/A5 uses. Therefore, the use of the Gaydon Motor Museum for the profiling of arrival and departure of vehicles is considered to be an appropriate and reflective forecast for the brand experience centre, in its entirety.
- It is acknowledged that the driver/track experience element will potentially have a slightly varied pattern of visitor arrivals from the Gaydon Motor Museum; considering factors such as the maximum permitted number of users on the track at any given time, and that the driver/track development trips may be dictated/informed by set booking slots/periods associated with its use. Furthermore there is also likely to be an element of trips linked between both the brand experience centre and the driver/track experience where visitors choose to do both when already visiting the site.
- We will consult further with Bicester Heritage, to enquire whether any additional and relevant information that can be sourced from the business case and intended operations of the driver/track experience; and potentially incorporate this accordingly (if applicable).
Agreed. It seems to me that the driver / track day experience should be separated out and based on the intended operation of this part of the development (number of users on track, booking slots etc.).

I agree with the proposal to include all staff arrivals by car as a worst case scenario.

- Agreed - however, this is likely to be a robust and worst-case assessment as employees at the site are anticipated to be employed locally and more inclined and able to travel sustainably.
Noted
Future Technology Hub / FAST
We would agree with the same trip rates from the New Technical Site application being applied to this element of the masterplan provided that there is no reason to assume that the Future Technology Hub would generate any different travel patterns (for instance, if visitors are more likely to travel from a wider area for any particular reason).
- Agreed, it is anticipated that the use and proposals of the Future Tech Hub / FAST is going to operate in a similar fashion to that of the existing and recently approved technical site expansion.
Noted. However it would be useful to have, in the TA, an explanation of what the FAST is and how it is intended to operate.

Hangar 5 / Bicester Reserve / Motor Vaults / Bomb Stores
The proposed TRICS parameters for these uses appear to be appropriate.

- Agreed and confirmed.


## 8. Internalisation / Linked Trips

It is accepted that visitors staying in the hotel will likely also be making use of the facilities on the wider site and that this could contribute towards trips for other aspects of the development (i.e. the Brand Experience Centre). An allowance can be made for this, however is there any background as to why this is assumed to be $25 \%$ ?

- We will consult further with Bicester Heritage on this matter and look to provide justification through the
business case model; we will revert back to OCC on this for confirmation and approval; the TA will then incorporate the agreed level of internalised/linked trips for the relevant and associated highway assessments.
Noted
It is noted that hotel trips will be taken account of when considering committed developments.
- That is correct and agreed; both the Hotel and New Technical Site development trips will be considered as committed development within the TA.


## 9. / 10. Traffic Distribution and Capacity Assessments

Details of the routes allocated to / from journey origins / population centres generated by the gravity model should be provided. I note that figure 9.2 shows $32 \%$ of trips routing around Bicester via the western peripheral route (Howes Lane) and 9\% routing via the eastern route (Skimmingdish Lane). How has this been determined?

- Agreed and confirmed that full details of the gravity model (Inc. all population Census data, used to calculate and forecast the distribution) will be appended to the TA, for reference.
- The routing of traffic has been determined using Google Maps traffic directions - this is based on journeys originating from the individual District/MSOA/LSOA centroids and traveling to the proposed development, using the quickest routes during the typical weekday AM (08:00-09:00) and PM (17:0018:00) peak travel times.
- Where the directions provide two possible routing options, these are considered further, and if within a reasonable and comparable journey time of each other (within a few minutes), these have been apportioned using a 50/50 split of the two routes - otherwise, the fastest (i.e. most desirable) route has been chosen.
- Therefore, the resultant distribution and route assignment has resulted in c.32\% of vehicular trips travelling around the western Bicester peripheral route and c.9\% travelling via the eastern Bicester peripheral route.
- It should be noted further that the distribution proportions have been calculated using a population based gravity model (within a 50km catchment area drawn around the site), and as such, the resultant draw around the western peripheral route (to the south and west of the M40), could also be attributed to a larger resident population representation from the surrounding areas including Oxford, South Oxfordshire, Vale of Whitehorse, West Oxfordshire, Reading, West Berkshire, Swindon and Cotswold.
- Likewise, we have also carried out a high-level review of journey times and routes from wider areas including Greater London, these also primarily route along the M40 around the western periphery of Bicester, as this offers a considerably shorter journey time (c.30-minute benefit from Central London by car travelling on the M40 rather than A41/other cross-country routes).
Noted. We would like to see details of the centroid points, weighting, route assignment etc. Noted, the gravity model has been refined and the relevant and associated excel sheets, containing the areas (Districts/MSOAs/LSOAs), populations, and route assignments have been appended to this email, for your reference and review. Please note that this is the intended distribution to be used within the final TA and capacity assessments going forward.

In a future year scenario with the strategic infrastructure improvements proposed for Bicester, including the dualling of the Eastern Peripheral Route and the South East Perimeter Road, the eastern peripheral route will become more attractive and a greater share of development trips would be expected to route via Skimmingdish Lane.

- It is appreciated and acknowledged that the Council's strategic infrastructure improvement aspirations around the eastern (Skimmingdish Lane) and south-eastern peripheral routes may offer a more attractive route than the current grade of road. However, as mentioned above, when reviewing primary route choice from wider areas, there is ultimately a limited population area that would be expected to route around the eastern periphery (Inc. areas along the A41/Aylesbury/Hemel Hempstead/Watford corridor). The majority of wider destinations to the south-east and south-west would still potentially continue to travel along the M40 corridor and north to Bicester around the A4095.
- In terms of distribution, there is currently no possible way to forecast the resultant impact of these strategic improvements, and as such adjust the distribution/route assignment accordingly. Furthermore, OCC do not currently have any proposed scheme plans for the strategic improvements, and the future year modelling scenarios (2026) that we will be assessing within the TA (utilising OCC's SATURN traffic
model) will not include the strategic dualling of Skimmingdish Lane - therefore, the consideration of a development distribution increase use of Skimmingdish Lane is not appropriate and required.
It is noted that it is the 2031 scenario where we see a different picture. With the SEPR, improved eastern perimeter routes and a more urbanised Howes Lane, it is likely that the eastern route would become a more attractive route for journeys from the M40 (as well as those from A41 Aylesbury etc.) Agreed, that it will be within the 2031 scenario where we will likely see the benefits of the South Eastern Perimeter Route (SEPR) and the Eastern Peripheral (Skimmingdish Lane) Route (EPR); the SATURN model analysis and outputs currently provided by OCC/WYG do not include for any improvements/dualling along Skimmingdish Lane (EPR). We would consider that the best method for assessing the likely impact of development trips and reassignment of existing traffic along Skimmingdish Lane would be to use the SATURN model - therefore, and on this basis, it is not considered appropriate and necessary for us to manually assign/distribute (additional) development trips along this route to model the likely effects.

Colleagues from transport strategy are currently in discussions with WYG regarding use of flows extracted from the updated SATURN Bicester model and the future year modelling scenarios. Depending on the modelling scenarios required an allowance for the above may be needed and this will inform the junction assessments required.

- We have been in recent communication with your colleague Ben Smith, in relation to the SATURN modelling - WYG are currently updating and running the various future year scenarios proposed by OCC.
- We are however, still awaiting OCC's suggestions in relation to the extent of the off-site junction modelling to be undertaken as part of the TA - within the Scoping Note the following extent has been proposed:
- A4421 Buckingham Road/A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Buckingham Road/A4095 - 4-arm Roundabout;
- B4100/A4095/Banbury Road - 4-arm Roundabout;
- A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Wyndham Hall Care Home Access/Launton Road - 4-arm

Roundabout;

- A4095/Bucknell Road - 3-arm Roundabout; and,
- Bucknell Road/Howes Lane - Priority.

Noted that discussions are ongoing with OCC transport strategy. Regarding the additional 'rat-run' junctions that we have suggested should be assessed, my opinion is that the TA should at least consider the impact of development traffic on these routes in terms of traffic distribution and trip numbers (even if final agreed trip rates and distribution concludes that individual junction capacity assessments along this route are not required). The application would be criticised, including by local members and residents, if these routes were not included within the scope of the assessment. Noted and agreed, to include a statement of the development traffic impact at these junctions within TA.

## 11. PIA Assessment

I would agree with the scope of the PIA analysis set out in the scoping note.

- Agreed and accepted; PIA data has now been ordered from OCC's Traffic and Road Safety team, covering the agreed extent for the most recent 5-year period from December 2013 to December 2018. Noted


## 12. Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan will be required to support the masterplan site and all uses will be required to tie in with that Travel Plan. Individual uses within the site which exceed the thresholds set out in the document attached in the link below will require bespoke travel plans directly tailored to that use.
https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesan dplans/newdevelopments/Travelplanrequirementsmonitoringfees.pdf

- Agreed that the planning application will be accompanied and supported by a Framework Travel Plan.
- The individual uses/buildings that exceed the threshold requirement for an individual and supplementary Travel Plan will then be produced prior to their respective occupation, imposed by way of a relevant and appropriate planning condition/s.


## Noted

I trust that the above is acceptable and understandable; however, if you have any queries or require any further information and/or clarification, please do not hesitate to let me know.

As aforementioned, it would be beneficial to hopefully have a conversation on the phone, to follow up on a few of these points, once you have had the time to read and digest the information.

If you could please let me know when you are free for a call to discuss this, we can get something pencilled into our diaries.

I look forward to hearing from you.
Many thanks and kind regards, Adrian

Adrian Forte BSc (Hons) MCIHT
Principal Transport Planner
mode transport planning

Lombard House | 145 Great Charles Street | Birmingham | B3 3LP
t: 01217948395 | e: adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk
www.modetransport.co.uk
be green, keep it on the screen!


From: "Peart, Timothy - Communities" [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Date: Thursday, 7 March 2019 at 12:08
To: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk), "White, Joy - Communities"
[Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk), "Smith, Benjamin - Communities"
[Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk)
Cc: "ja@bicesterheritage.co.uk" [ja@bicesterheritage.co.uk](mailto:ja@bicesterheritage.co.uk), Jon Westerman
[jon@edgarslimited.co.uk](mailto:jon@edgarslimited.co.uk), Ben Fairgrieve [benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk), David Frisby [davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk), Clare O'Hanlon
[Clare.O'Hanlon@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.O'Hanlon@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Bicester Heritage - Hotel and NTS

## Dear Adrian

Please see below my comments on the TA scoping note tabled during our recent meeting.
I understand Ben will be getting back to you as soon as he's able to regarding the modelling outputs and scenarios.

I hope the comments below are clear, however if you have any queries please let me know.

I've numbered my comments in accordance with the sections in the TA scoping note.

1. Access

I note that the new hotel access can also be utilised for access to Brand Experience Centre and Exhibition Hall. Is additional access onto Buckingham Road absolutely required? From a highways perspective it would be better to minimise the number of access points onto the highway and make better use of internal access routes as additional access points can cause delay, which would be a concern on a bus route in particular.

1. Sustainable Access

I agree that the TA will need to consider the existing situation in terms of sustainable transport infrastructure and how the proposals can be linked this this.

1. Parking Numbers

- Brand Experience Centre - Agreed that this should be based on first principles approach using assumptions within the business plan
- Future Technology Hub - Agreed this should be based on OCC standards applying an indicative use class mix
- Bicester Reserve - Public - I agree this could be based on the OCC standard for hotels (one space per room), but would request clarification on whether it is likely that all units will be one-bed? Even if not, there is still likely to be some car sharing as groups of visitors may arrive together so the above standard is likely to be appropriate.
- Bicester Reserve - Private - I note the suggestion to use either the C1 hotel or C3 residential standards. Perhaps the number of spaces should be somewhere in between based on how likely is it that visitors to private holiday lodges would bring two cars. If spaces are unallocated for this use there could also be some flexibility by providing a shared parking area. How likely is it that all owners of private lodges would be staying on-site at same time?
- Bicester Reserve - Parkland - This will need to be determined on its merits through a first principles approach. Are there any forecasts for visitor numbers in the business case to base this on?
- Bomb stores - Are these to be privately owned? Presumably the 1 space per unit does not include the car storage area? Are the bomb stores going to be accompanied with individual parking spaces or a shared parking area(s)? If the latter, could there be a lower number of spaces provided depending on likelihood that all bomb stores are occupied at the same time?
- Hangar 5 Exhibition / Museum - Agree it may be best to base this on the adopted parking standards, unless the business case assumptions on visitor numbers suggest otherwise.


## 1. Assessment Periods

We can agree with the assessment periods being the weekday AM and PM peak periods as a worst case scenario given the difference in flows between the weekday and weekend peaks.

## 1. Trip Generation

## Brand Experience Centre

We would like some additional background or explanation in the TA on the forecast visitor numbers per annum.

I accept that the NTS data indicates that on average $38 \%$ of leisure trips are made by car. However, given the nature of the Brand Experience Centre proposed is it more likely that the destination may attract visitors from a wider area than average? Certain leisure attractions may be more likely to attract trips from a more local area (lowering the average in the NTS data), whereas the Brand Experience Centre may attract
trips from a much wider region. Longer distance trips are more likely to be undertaken by car so an allowance should be made for this.

I see the logic in the proposed methodology of applying the same arrival / departure profile from Gaydon Motor Museum to the proposed exhibition / museum space. However, would other elements of the experience centre generate different arrival / departure patterns? For instance would those arriving for a 'track day' experience be more likely to arrive / depart earlier or later? If so, this would alter the arrival / departure pattern.

I agree with the proposal to include all staff arrivals by car as a worst case scenario.

Future Technology Hub / FAST
We would agree with the same trip rates from the New Technical Site application being applied to this element of the masterplan provided that there is no reason to assume that the Future Technology Hub would generate any different travel patterns (for instance, if visitors are more likely to travel from a wider area for any particular reason).

Hangar 5 / Bicester Reserve / Motor Vaults / Bomb Stores
The proposed TRICS parameters for these uses appear to be appropriate.

1. Internalisation / Linked Trips

It is accepted that visitors staying in the hotel will likely also be making use of the facilities on the wider site and that this could contribute towards trips for other aspects of the development (i.e. the Brand Experience Centre). An allowance can be made for this, however is there any background as to why this is assumed to be 25\%?

It is noted that hotel trips will be taken account of when considering committed developments.

1. / 10. Traffic Distribution and Capacity Assessments

Details of the routes allocated to / from journey origins / population centres generated by the gravity model should be provided. I note that figure 9.2 shows $32 \%$ of trips routing around Bicester via the western peripheral route (Howes Lane) and 9\% routing via the eastern route (Skimmingdish Lane). How has this been determined?

In a future year scenario with the strategic infrastructure improvements proposed for Bicester, including the dualling of the Eastern Peripheral Route and the South East Perimeter Road, the eastern peripheral route will become more attractive and a greater share of development trips would be expected to route via Skimmingdish Lane.

Colleagues from transport strategy are currently in discussions with WYG regarding use of flows extracted from the updated SATURN Bicester model and the future year modelling scenarios. Depending on the modelling scenarios required an allowance for the above may be needed and this will inform the junction assessments required.

1. PIA Assessment

I would agree with the scope of the PIA analysis set out in the scoping note.

1. Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan will be required to support the masterplan site and all uses will be required to tie in with that Travel Plan. Individual uses within the site which exceed the thresholds set out in the document attached in the link below will require bespoke travel plans directly tailored to that use. https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transport policiesandplans/newdevelopments/Travelplanrequirementsmonitoringfees.pdf

## Kind regards

## Tim Peart

Senior Transport Planner - Cherwell \& West Oxfordshire
Communities
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND
Email: timothy.peart@oxfordshire.gov.uk

From: Adrian Forte [adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:adrianforte@modetransport.co.uk)
Sent: 15 February 2019 18:05
To: Peart, Timothy - Communities [Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Timothy.Peart@Oxfordshire.gov.uk); White, Joy - Communities [Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Joy.White@Oxfordshire.gov.uk); Smith, Benjamin - Communities [Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Benjamin.Smith@Oxfordshire.gov.uk) Cc: ja@@bicesterheritage.co.uk; Jon Westerman [jon@edgarslimited.co.uk](mailto:jon@edgarslimited.co.uk); Ben Fairgrieve [benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:benfairgrieve@modetransport.co.uk); David Frisby [davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk](mailto:davidfrisby@modetransport.co.uk)
Subject: Re: Bicester Heritage - Hotel and NTS
Good evening Tim, et al,
Please find attached our Transport Assessment Scoping Note for the Bicester Heritage Masterplan; this includes the development schedule, traffic generation/trip rates, distribution and proposed extent of capacity assessments to be undertaken.

There is also an Excel file attached which contains the raw data for the traffic generation, including some additional notes/comments, for reference.

I look forward to our meeting next Tuesday, at which we can discuss these elements in some more detail.
I hope you have a nice weekend.
Many thanks and kind regards, Adrian

Lombard House<br>145 Great Charles Street Birmingham B3 3LP<br>© 01217948390<br>- info@modetransport.co.uk<br>@mode_transport<br>\section*{Bicester Heritage Masterplan}<br>modetransport.co.uk

Job Number: J323684 Date: 15 February 2019 Client: Bicester Heritage
Prepared By: ALF
Approved By: JEGB

## Transport Assessment Scoping Note

## 1 Introduction / Development Proposals

1.1 mode transport planning (mode) has been appointed to prepare a Transport Assessment in support of a forthcoming planning application for the development of the wider Bicester Heritage Masterplan. It is envisaged that the site will comprise of the following development schedule:

- Brand Experience Centre - mixed use, leisure \& tourism (D1, D2, B2 + ancillary A1, A3, A5; Sui Generis/Showroom) - c.11,677sqm;
- Future Technology Hub (FAST - Future Automotive Speed \& Technology) - light industrial, workshops, vehicle maintenance/repair/parts workshops (B1c, B2 + B8) - c.9,353sqm;
- Bicester Reserve (Public) - holiday village, lodges, tipis \& ancillary spa, restaurant, activities (C3) - c. 64 units;
- Bicester Reserve (Private) - private holiday dwelling houses/lodges (C3) - c. 27 units;
- Bicester Reserve (Public) - c. 28.9 Hectares - public open space, to include pedestrian walkways and cycle routes, within parkland, for recreational purposes - to include ancillary ticket office/visitor centre \& A4 (café/lounge);
- Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores - 48 car storage units, with ancillary accommodation (C3) - c. 48 units; and,
- Hangar 5 Exhibition Hall/Museum - D1, D2 - c.5,314sqm.
1.2 An indicative block masterplan layout (Ridge Project Radial plan), illustrating the location of the development parcels (above) is appended to this note, for reference (Appendix A).
1.3 This note is provided to set out the intended methodology and parameters to be adopted within the assessment of the development proposals. It is proposed that a Transport Assessment (TA) and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) will be submitted to accompany the planning application.
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## 2 Planning Policy

2.1 The proposals will be considered in relation to the following national and local planning policy:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Planning Practice Guidance (PPG);
- Adopted Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031);
- Cherwell District Council RAF Bicester Planning Brief (Sept 2009);
- Connecting Oxfordshire: Local Transport Plan (LTP4) - 2015-2031; and,
- Connecting Oxfordshire: LTP4: Active \& Healthy Travel Planning.


## 3 Vehicular Access

3.1 The proposed site access locations (x4) are summarised below and can also be seen on the indicative masterplan contained in Appendix A.

- Skimmingdish Lane - south eastern corner - predominantly serving the Future Technology Hub/FAST, Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores and Bicester Reserve (Private);
- Skimmingdish Lane - existing Bicester Gliding Club access - serving Hangar 5 Exhibition Hall/Museum, and also the Future Technology Hub/FAST;
- Buckingham Road - existing gated access to the airfield (c.30m south of Thompson Drive) - this is proposed to become the main access to the Brand Experience Centre; and,
- Bicester Road - existing gated access to the northern corner of the site - to serve the Bicester Reserve \& Park and Bicester Reserve (Public).
3.2 The site access visibility requirements will be informed by ATC (85th \%ile speeds) data, previously collected over a week-long period between 13th and 19th July 2016 along both the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane and Buckingham Road within the vicinity of the proposed site access junctions.
3.3 In addition to the proposed accesses summarised above, the access serving the hotel site application on Buckingham Road is also proposed to be utilised to serve the Brand Experience Centre and Exhibition Hall/Museum. Supplementary emergency/event day accesses will also be located on Bicester Road (x 2) and Skimmingdish Lane (access at the New Technical Site), all shown on the masterplan.


## 4 Sustainable Access

4.1 The TA will consider the existing situation in terms of sustainable transport infrastructure surrounding the site and will identify how the proposals intend to be linked with this.
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## 5 Parking

5.1 Table 5.1 summarises the OCC parking standards to be incorporated within the masterplan development proposals. The parking standards and indicative figures are to be discussed, agreed and confirmed with OCC through the scoping process.

Table 5.1: OCC Parking Standards

| Development Schedule | Area/Units | OCC (max) Standard to be Applied | Parking Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brand Experience Centre | 11,677sqm | No relevant/specific OCC standard for this bespoke/sui generis land use. Closest land use is D2 Assembly \& Leisure - 1 spaces per 22sqm | TBC/discussed with OCC (c. 385 based on first principles approach) |
| Future Technology Hub | 9,353sqm | B1 - 1 space per 30sqm / B2 - 1 space per 50sqm / B8-1 space per 200 | c. 178 (based on indicative mix of $25 \%$ B1, $25 \%$ B2 \& 50\% B8) |
| Bicester Reserve - Public | 64 units | C1 Hotel \& Guest House - 1 space per bed | c. 64 (assuming all units are 1-bed) |
| Bicester Reserve - Private | 27 units | C1 Hotel \& Guest House - 1 space per bed or C3 Resi - 1-2 spaces per unit | c. 54 (based on C3) (max) |
| Bicester Reserve - Public Walk/Cycle Ways/Parkland | $\begin{gathered} 28.9 \\ \text { Hectares } \end{gathered}$ | No defined OCC parking standard (c. 2 spaces per Hectare) | TBC/discussed with OCC (c.58) |
| Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores | 48 units | Sui Generis - 1 space per unit (applying C1 Hotel/Guest House) | c. 48 |
| Hangar 5 Exhibition/Museum | 5,314sqm | D2 Assembly \& Leisure - 1 space per 22sqm | c. 242 |

## 6 Assessment Periods

6.1 It should be noted (as previously presented and accepted within the BH Hotel application) that the weekday AM and PM peak hours are considerably higher than any peak hour recorded over the weekend (on a Saturday/Sunday), as shown by the traffic surveys undertaken in July 2016. As a result, it is proposed that the TA will only assess the weekday peak hours, as a worst-case scenario. The traffic flow differences between weekday and weekend flows are summarised in Table 6.1 below for further reference.

Table 6.1: Two-way Traffic Volumes (Skimmingdish Lane)
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| Hour Ending | Weekday 5-day Average | Saturday | Sunday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0700 | 620 | 199 | 134 |
| 0800 | 1471 | 465 | 192 |
| 0900 | 1614 | 712 | 251 |
| 1000 | 1080 | 1071 | 465 |
| 1100 | 838 | 1355 | 929 |
| 1200 | 890 | 1390 | 1031 |
| 1300 | 978 | 1336 | 1166 |
| 1400 | 1032 | 1196 | 1031 |
| 1500 | 1096 | 1194 | 957 |
| 1600 | 1225 | 1128 | 920 |
| 1700 | 1554 | 1073 | 829 |
| 1800 | 1834 | 985 | 747 |
| 1900 | 1297 | 865 | 654 |
| 2000 | 833 | 599 | 579 |
| 2100 | 487 | 395 | 361 |
| 2200 | 344 | 300 | 287 |

6.2 Table 6.1 demonstrates that the weekday traffic volumes are significantly greater than those recorded at the weekend in this location, and also that there are clear weekday AM (08:00-09:00) and PM (17:0018:00) peak hour periods, respectively. The traffic peaks during the weekday at 1,614 in the AM and 1,834 in the peak, which is significantly higher than the worst-case peak of 1,390 vehicles over the weekend (on Saturday). Accordingly, the capacity assessments undertaken within the TA will focus on the weekday time periods only.
6.3 Furthermore, it is noted that the SATURN traffic model does not contain any weekend traffic flow data, and therefore, the assessment of Saturday/Sunday cannot be undertaken (in line with previous assessments, in which we were requested to use the SATURN model).
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## 7 Traffic Generation

7.1 The traffic generation for the proposed wider masterplan development is summarised in Table 7.1. An electronic Excel spreadsheet has also been provided to OCC, which contains this information (Inc. trip rates) in more detail.

Table 7.1: Masterplan Traffic Generation Summary

|  | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |  | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Schedule | In | Out | 2-Way | In | Out | 2-Way |
| Brand Experience Centre | 89 | 4 | 93 | 1 | 90 | 91 |
| Future Technology Hub | 64 | 8 | 73 | 7 | 59 | 66 |
| Bicester Reserve - Public | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Bicester Reserve - Private | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Bicester Reserve - Public Parkland | 13 | 7 | 20 | 14 | 19 | 33 |
| Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Hangar 5 Exhibition/Museum | 72 | 9 | 81 | 17 | 52 | 69 |
| Total | 248 | 34 | 281 | 47 | 230 | 278 |

## Brand Experience Centre - First Principles

7.3 To determine the Brand Experience Centre traffic generation, a first principles approach has been adopted using the projected visitor and staff numbers for the proposal.
7.4 It is anticipated that the centre will be open 7 -days per week for c .360 days per annum (excluding major public holidays) and will attract a total of c.250,000 visitors per annum (based on client figures).
7.5 In terms of staff, it is anticipated that the development could employ up to c. 97 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members (based on 120sqm per FTE, as per the HCA's Employment Density Guide 2015). It is expected that there will be approximately $64(97 \times 0.66)$ staff on duty, daily, at a given time.
7.6 The 2017 National Travel Survey (NTS) Table NTS0504 indicates that 65\% of leisure trips (sport/entertainment \& holiday/day trips) occur between Monday to Friday, with 35\% of trips occurring at the weekend (Saturday/Sunday). Furthermore, 2017 NTS Table NTS0409 indicates that 38\% of leisure trips are undertaken by car.
7.7 Using the NTS figures above; of the 250,000 annual visitors, it is anticipated that 95,000 (250,000 $\times 0.38$ ) will arrive by car (vehicular trips), with $61,750(95,000 \times 0.65)$ arriving during the weekdays (Mon-Fri) and $33,250(95,000 \times 0.35)$ arriving at the weekend (Sat-Sun).
7.8 In terms of daily two-way vehicular movements during the weekday, this would equate to approximately 475 ((61,750 / 52 weeks / 5 weekdays) $\times 2$ ) trips. Applying the same methodology, it is anticipated that there would be 640 (( $33,250 / 52$ weeks / 2 days) $\times 2$ ) daily two-way vehicular trips each day at the weekend (Sat \& Sun).
7.9 In order to profile the Brand Experience Centre arriving and departing vehicular traffic patterns throughout the weekday (08:00-18:00), a traffic survey of the British Motor Heritage Museum in Gaydon was sourced from the TRICS (v.7.5.4) database; the proportions of in and out traffic movements across the day were extrapolated and applied to the proposed weekday for the 475 vehicle trips. The specific details of this is included within the electronic spreadsheet provided to OCC and contained with the TRICS output reports in Appendix B. The forecast staff trips will also be included within the AM and PM peak hours; for a robust assessment, it will be considered that all staff (c.64) drive to the site, arriving in the AM (08:00-09:00) and departing in the PM (17:00-18:00). This is considered a worst case, as the majority of staff are anticipated to be employed locally and more inclined to travel sustainably.

## Future Technology Hub / FAST

7.10 The agreed and approved trip rates from the New Technical Site planning application are proposed to be utilised for the Future Technology Hub/FAST element; these trip rates were calculated based on a site survey that was undertaken in July 2018 at the existing main Bicester Heritage access. The trip rates and associated traffic generations are considered to be relevant and appropriate for the proposed land use and operations.

Hangar 5 (Exhibition Hall/Museum) / Bicester Reserve / Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores
7.11 The TRICS database (v.7.5.4) was used in order to calculate the trips rates associated with the Hangar 5 Exhibition Hall/Museum, Bicester Reserve, and Bomb Stores/Motor Vaults.
7.12 The Exhibition Hall/Museum TRICS parameters included land use 07: Leisure and Category S: Exhibition Centre for sites with a GFA range between c. 900 to 30,000 sqm; these are considered relevant and robust for the proposed land use.
7.13 The Bicester Reserve and Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores TRICS parameters included land use 03: Residential and Category J: Holiday Accommodation for sites with a no. of unit range between c. 50 to 1,780; these survey sites are also considered relevant and robust for the proposed land use.
7.14 The Bicester Reserve public open space (Inc. walk/cycle paths \& ancillary use) TRICS parameters included land use 07: Leisure and Category M: Country Parks for sites with an average area of c. 38 Hectares. The TRICS sites only included surveys that were undertaken at the weekend (Sat/Sun); however, these are considered to be a worst-case and robust assessment when applying to a typical weekday AM \& PM peak hour assessment.
7.15 Full TRICS output reports are appended to this note (Appendix B), for reference.

## 8 Internalisation / Linked Trips

8.1 It is considered that a proportion of the overall masterplan development trips will be internalised and linked with other various uses throughout the site; Bicester Heritage envisage that $\mathrm{c} .25 \%$ of hotel users/guests
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will be associated with/contribute towards trips for other aspects of the development. In particular, and for the purposes of the transport assessment, this level of hotel development traffic will be deducted from the traffic generated to/from the Brand Experience Centre.

## 9 Traffic Distribution

9.1 Similarly, and as agreed with OCC for the BH Hotel application, a gravity model has been developed to inform the trip distribution for the overall masterplan development (given that the site predominantly comprises of leisure use); this is again based on 2011 Census population data, using the following methodology:

- District Areas, Middle Super Output Areas (MSOA) \& Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) identified within a 50 km catchment area of the site; and,
- A distribution proportion has been calculated based on resident populations within the identified catchment areas (Districts, MSOAs \& LSOAs).
9.2 Figure 9.1 illustrates the identified weighted centroids of the districts, MSOAs, LSOAs and catchment area used.

Figure 9.1: Distribution Catchment/Methodology
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9.3 The hotel vehicular trips have been assigned to the local highway network based upon the locations of the above Districts, MSOAs \& LSOAs, and the logical routes taken to and from these areas.
9.4 The distribution percentages are shown graphically in Figure 9.2 and are summarised by route assignment, including forecast traffic generation (worst-case AM peak traffic), in Table 9.1.

Figure 9.2: Development Traffic Distribution


Table 9.1: Development Traffic Distribution Route Assignment
$\left.\begin{array}{|llcc}\text { Zone } & \text { Traffic Distribution Route } & \text { Distribution \% }\end{array} \begin{array}{ccc}\text { Approx. Dev Trips (2-Way) } \\ \text { (AM Peak Trips) }\end{array}\right]: 51$
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| Zone | Traffic Distribution Route | Distribution \% | Approx. Dev Trips (2-Way) (AM Peak Trips) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | Charbridge Ln, towards A41 | 9\% | 25 |
| D | Howes Ln, towards B4030 / A4095 / A41 | 32\% | 90 |
| E | Skimmingdish Ln, local to Caversfield | 1\% | 3 |
| F | Fringford Rd, local to Caversfield | 1\% | 3 |
| H | Buckingham Rd, local to Bicester Town Centre | 8\% | 23 |
| 1 | Southwold Lane, local access | 0.5\% | 2 |
| J | Banbury Rd, local access | 1\% | 3 |
| K | Launton Rd, local access | 2\% | 6 |
| L | Bucknell Rd, local access | 1\% | 3 |
| M | A4095, local access | 1\% | 3 |

9.5 It is considered that a population-based gravity model is the best forecast of traffic distribution for the purposes of the overall masterplan development, considering its predominant leisure use; also considering that 2011 Census Journey to Work (JtW) Data would only be appropriate for residential and employment development-based distributions.

## 10 Capacity Assessments

10.1 Considering the forecast traffic generation and distribution of the development proposals, as prescribed within this note, off-site junction capacity assessments will be undertaken at $6 \times$ locations as part of the Transport Assessment. Table 10.1 and Figure 10.1, overleaf, summarise the junctions to be assessed and illustrate their locations, respectively.
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Figure 10.1: Location of Highway Capacity Assessments


Table 10.1: Junctions to be Assessed

| Junction | Type of Junction |
| :--- | :--- |
| A4421 Buckingham Rd/A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Buckingham Rd/A4095 | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| B4100/A4095/Banbury Rd | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| A4421 Skimmingdish Ln/Wyndham Hall Care Home Access/Launton Rd | 4-Arm Roundabout |
| A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Road | Priority |
| A4095/Bucknell Rd | 3-Arm Roundabout |
| Bucknall Rd/Howes Ln | Priority |

10.4 It is anticipated that the outputs from Bicester's SATURN model at the junctions specified above (to be agreed with OCC) will be utilised for the purposes of the capacity modelling assessments within the TA.
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10.5 The following scenarios (for both the AM (08:00-09:00) and PM (17:00-18:00) weekday) will be modelled, based on the outputs obtainable from the SATURN model:

- 2021 Future Year SATURN Model;
- 2021 + Proposed Development (Cumulative Inc. Committed Hotel and New Tech Site applications);
- 2026 Future Year SATURN Model; and,
- 2026 + Proposed Development (Cumulative Inc. Committed Hotel \& New Tech Site applications).


## 11 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) Data Analysis

11.1 The TA will also include a review and provide analysis of Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the extents illustrated on Figure 11.1, for the most recent 5-year period (provided by OCC).

## Technical Note

Bicester Heritage Masterplan

## mode

Transport Assessment Scoping Note

Figure 11.1: Extent of PIA Analysis


## 12 Travel Plan

12.1 The planning application will be supported by a FTP for the wider masterplan land uses with the intention of minimising car traffic to/from the site in favour of sustainable modes of travel.
12.2 The Travel Plan for the hotel application previously suggested exploring the provision of shuttle bus services to connect and link with the local area, including Bicester, Bicester Village, and the local railway stations - Bicester Heritage are keen to introduce and fully support this facility as part of the wider masterplan, and envisage/look to attain a substantial level of sustainable travel as a result.
12.3 It should be noted that the forecast traffic generation summarised earlier in this note is considered to be robust and worst case, as this does not take account for such travel planning measures that will aim to reduce further the level of single occupancy car drivers to/from the development.

Appendix A - Indicative Masterplan

Appendix B - TRICS Outputs

## TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 03-RESIDENTIAL
Category : J - HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION
VEHICLES
```

Selected reqions and areas:
02 SOUTH EAST
HF HERTFORDSHIRE 1 days
WS WEST SUSSEX 1 days
04 EAST ANGLIA
SF SUFFOLK 1 days
WEST MIDLANDS
SH SHROPSHIRE 1 days

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

## Secondary Filtering selection:

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

Parameter: Number of units
Actual Range: 55 to 1779 (units:)
Range Selected by User: 31 to 9700 (units:)
Parking Spaces Range: Selected: 29 to 5000 Actual: 29 to 5000
Public Transport Provision:
Selection by:
Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 06$ to $15 / 08 / 16$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Monday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wednesday | 2 days |
| Friday | 1 days |

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

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 4 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

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

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

Selected Location Sub Cateqories:
No Sub Category
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:
Not Known 3 days
D2 1 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®.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
5,001 to $10,000 \quad 1$ days
10,001 to $15,000 \quad 3$ days

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

| 50,001 to 75,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75,001 to 100,000 | 2 days |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 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 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.1 to 1.5 | 2 days |
| 1.6 to 2.0 | 1 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:

| Yes | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| No | 3 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 Ratinq:
No PTAL Present 4 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 HF-03-J-01 CARAVAN HERTFORDSHIRE
BREAKSPEAR WAY
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
Edge of Town
No Sub Category

Total Number of units:
55
30/07/08
CARAVAN PARK
WALTON AVENUE
FELIXSTOWE
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
No Sub Category
Total Number of units:
Survey date: WEDNESDAY
3 SH-03-J-01
CARAVAN PARK
WELSHPOOL ROAD
SHREWSBURY
BICTON HEATH
Edge of Town
No Sub Category
Total Number of units: Survey date: FRIDAY

115
26/06/09
4 WS-03-J-02 BUTLINS
UPPER BOGNOR ROAD
BOGNOR REGIS
Edge of Town Centre
No Sub Category
Total Number of units:
Survey date: MONDAY

1779
15/08/16 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/J - HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION
VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 UNITS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


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

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

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

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

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
$55-1779$ (units:)
$01 / 01 / 06-15 / 08 / 16$
4
0
0
1
0

Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday): 01/01/06-15/08/16

Number of Saturdays:
0
Number of Sundays:
1
Surveys automatically removed from selection: 0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 07-LEISURE
Category : S - EXHIBITION CENTRE
VEHICLES
```

Selected reqions and areas:
06 WEST MIDLANDS
HE HEREFORDSHIRE 1 days
SH SHROPSHIRE 1 days
$\begin{array}{lll}07 \text { YORKSHIRE \& NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE } & 1 \text { days }\end{array}$
08 NORTH WEST
GM GREATER MANCHESTER 1 days

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

## Secondary Filtering selection:

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

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 932 to 30000 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 250 to 30000 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | Selected: 5 to 3000 Actual: 5 to 3000 |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by:
Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 01$ to $29 / 03 / 14$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Tuesday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thursday | 1 days |
| Friday | 2 days |

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

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 4 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

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

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

## Selected Location Sub Cateqories: <br> Residential Zone 1

Built-Up Zone 1
Out of Town 1
No Sub Category 1
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:

## D1 <br> 2 days

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

Population within 1 mile:

| 1,001 to 5,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10,001 to 15,000 | 3 days |

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

|  | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 75,001 to 50,000 | 100,000 |
| 100,001 do 125,000 | 1 days |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 1 days |

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

## 1.1 to $1.5 \quad 4$ days

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

## Travel Plan:

No 4 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 Ratinq:

No PTAL Present 4 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.5.4 040119 B18.56 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2019. All rights reserved | Friday 01/02/19 Page 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mode transport limited Lom | rd House, 145 Great Charles Street Birmimgham, B3 3LP | Licence No: 754101 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 GM-07-S-01 CONFERENCE CENTRE

## GREATER MANCHESTER

HUDDERSFIELD ROAD
OLDHAM
SCOUTHEAD
Edge of Town
Out of Town
Total Gross floor area: 2100 sqm Survey date: FRIDAY 24/05/13
2 HE-07-S-01 CONFERENCE CENTRE
CONINGSBY STREET
HEREFORD
Edge of Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: 932 sqm
Survey date: TUESDAY 22/10/13
3 NY-07-S-01
EXHIBITION CEN.
WETHERBY ROAD
HARROGATE
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Gross floor area: 6044 sqm Survey date: FRIDAY 13/10/06
4 SH-07-S-01 EXHIBITION CENTRE
SAINT QUENTIN GATE
TELFORD
Edge of Town Centre
No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area: 30000 sqm
Survey date: THURSDAY 27/04/06 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.

## MANUALLY DESELECTED SITES

| Site Ref |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| SH-07-S-02 | GFA too small. |
| TW-07-S-01 | GFA too small. |

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/S - EXHIBITION CENTRE
VEHICLES
Calculation factor: $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


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

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

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

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

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
932-30000 (units: sqm)
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday): 01/01/01-29/03/14

Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

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

## TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

Land Use : 07-LEISURE
Category : M-COUNTRY PARKS
VEHICLES

## Selected reqions and areas:

## 03 SOUTH WEST

GS GLOUCESTERSHIRE 1 days
08 NORTH WEST
LC LANCASHIRE
1 days
This section displays the number of survey days per $T R I C S ®$ sub-region in the selected set

## Secondary Filtering selection:

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

| Parameter: | Site area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 16.00 to 60.80 (units: hect) |
| Range Selected by User: | 16.00 to 560.00 (units: hect) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | Selected: 30 to 540 Actual: 30 to 540 |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 10$ to $12 / 05 / 12$
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:

| Saturday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sunday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Manual count } & 2 \text { days } \\ \text { Directional ATC Count } & 0 \text { days }\end{array}$
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:
Free Standing (PPS6 Out of Town)
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Out 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:
D2 1 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®.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
1,000 or Less
2 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
5,001 to 25,000
1 days

125,001 to 250,000
1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5-mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 1.1 to 1.5 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.6 to 2.0 | 1 days |

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

Travel Plan:
No

## 2 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 Ratinq:
No PTAL Present 2 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 GS-07-M-01 COUNTRY PARK
B4070
NEAR GLOUCESTER
Free Standing (PPS6 Out of Town)
Out of Town
Total Site area: 60.80 hect Survey date: SUNDAY 25/04/10
2 LC-07-M-03
COUNTRY PARK
SKITHAM LANE
PRESTON
PILING
Free Standing (PPS6 Out of Town) Out of Town
Total Site area: 16.00 hect Survey date: SATURDAY Survey Type: MANUAL

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

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/M - COUNTRY PARKS
VEHICLES
Calculation factor: $\mathbf{1}$ hect
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


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

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

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

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

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
16.00 to 60.80 (units: hect)

Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
01/01/10-12/05/12
Number of Saturdays:
1
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
0
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

TIME RATE \% TRIPRATEGRAPH-ARRIVALS OT-LESURE M-COUNTRYPARKS VEHICLES
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 08:00-09:00 09:00-10:00 10:00-11:00 11:00-12:00 12:00-13:00 13: 00-14:00 14:00-15:00 15:00-16:00 16:00-17:00 17:00-18:00 18:00-19:00 19:00-20:00 20:00-21:00 21:00-22:00 22:00-23:00 23:00-24:00


This graph is a visual representation of the trip rate calculation results screen. The same time periods and trip rates are displayed, but in addition there is an additional column showing the percentage of the total trip rate by individual time period, allowing peak periods to be easily identified through observation. Note that the type of count and the selected direction is shown at the top of the graph.

TIME
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 08:00-09:00 09:00-10:00 10:00-11:00 11:00-12:00 12:00-13:00 13:00-14:00 14:00-15:00 15:00-16:00 16:00-17:00 17:00-18:00 18:00-19:00 19:00-20:00 20:00-21:00 21:00-22:00 22:00-23:00 23:00-24:00

RATE \% TRIPRATEGRAPH-DEPARTLRES 07-LEISURE M-COUNTRYPARKS VEMIES


This graph is a visual representation of the trip rate calculation results screen. The same time periods and trip rates are displayed, but in addition there is an additional column showing the percentage of the total trip rate by individual time period, allowing peak periods to be easily identified through observation. Note that the type of count and the selected direction is shown at the top of the graph.

## TME
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RATE \% TRIPRATEGRAPH-TOTALS 07-LESURE M-COUNIRYPARKS VEHICLES


This graph is a visual representation of the trip rate calculation results screen. The same time periods and trip rates are displayed, but in addition there is an additional column showing the percentage of the total trip rate by individual time period, allowing peak periods to be easily identified through observation. Note that the type of count and the selected direction is shown at the top of the graph.

Site Reference:
Latitude/Longitude:
Land Use Type:
Region/Area
Description:
Street:
District:
Town:
Post Code:
Planning Authority:
Location:
Location Sub Category:
Use Class:
Population within 500m:
Population within 1 Mile:
Population within 5 Miles:
Car ownership within 5 Miles:
Reason for blank public transport table:

WM-10-A-01
52.18886, -1.48111

10 - TOURIST ATTRACTIONS/A - TOURIST ATTRACTIONS
WEST MIDLANDSWEST MIDLANDS
MOTOR CENTRE
OFF THE B4100
GAYDON
NEAR WARWICK
CV35 0BJ

Free Standing (PPS6 Out of Town)
Out of Town
D2

0
1,001 to 5,000
5,001 to 25,000
0.6 to 1.0

No local PT

Is site associated with a travel plan:
No
If not, are there any plans to implement a Travel Plan in the future?
Is survey data available before the
implementation of the Travel Plan? Is the location of the site hilly or flat: Urban Regeneration:

No. of developments for this Site:
No. of survey Days for this Site:

## Comments

The site is located south of Coventry, and to the east of Stratford Upon Avon. It is west of Junction 12 of the M40 and is surrounded by open land.

Bus (or tram) site accessibility

1. Is there a site specific company bus service associated with the development?: Yes
2. If Yes to question 1, for how many years: 0
3. Please enter general comments/views about the relevance, quality and importance of public transport services relating to this development.
There is no local public transport available.
Design features encouraging non-car modes
4. Pedestrians

None
13. Pedal cycles

None
14. Public transport

None


| Site reference:Trade name: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HERITAGE MOTOR CENTRE |  |
| Site area (h/a): |  | 25.50 |  |
| Open since |  | 1993 |  |
| Total Employees |  | 150 |  |
| Full Time Employees |  | 90 60\% |  |
| Part Time Employees |  | 60 40\% |  |
| Approximate \% of total employees working standard 9-5 hours or similar |  | 100\% |  |
| Percentage Split of Employee Gender |  |  |  |
|  | Male <br> Female |  |  |
| Name of nearest site |  | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & 50 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | COVENTRY TRANSPORT M. |  |
| Distance to nearest similar site |  | 25.0 | Km |
| OPENING TIMES (24 Hour forma |  |  |  |
| Mon to Thurs | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Friday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Saturday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Sunday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |

## Comments

The site contains a gift shop, licenced cafe, land rover $4 \times 4$ experience, go kart track and kids mini railway.

| On-Site parking |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total no. of parking spaces | 422 |
| Number of spaces |  |
| Employee | 0 |
| Disabled | 40 |
| Visitor/Customer | 0 |
| OGV parking bays | 0 |
| Cycle racks | 0 |
| OGV loading bays | 0 |
| Mother \& Toddler | 4 |
| Motorcycle spaces | No |

Comments about the management of the site car park, along with enforcement measures There is also one space for the site's shuttle bus, included in the total spaces shown.

Site parking surface or non-surface (multi-storey/underground) Surface

Off-Site parking details
Is there off-site parking available No
Off-Site parking included in the counts No
Free On-Street parking available nearby No
If yes, considered easy to find a space
No
If prepared to pay, easy to find somewhere to park off-site all day No

Parking restrictions
Area subject to parking restrictions (controlled parking zone - CPZ) No

Off-Street parking
Off-Street parking available NO
Park \& Ride
Park \& Ride Type Facility providing relevant means of accessing the site No
Site reference:
WM-10-A-01
Survey date: 15/02/06
Day of week: Wednesday

| Survey type: | Manual Count |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM weather: | Mild and Cloudy |
| PM weather: | Mild and Clear |

Initial car park occupancy: 15
BRACKETED ACCUMULATION FIGURES ARE NOT ABSOLUTE Parking Capacity 24\% (422 On-Site Spaces) Data proportions in \%
Motor cars 98
Motor cycles
OGV (1)
Public service
OGV (2)
Taxis

0
0
OGV (2)

Taxis are included as cars in this survey

| Time | Arr 313 | Dep 328 | Totals 641 | Parking Accum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 33 | 6 | 39 | 42 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 47 | 10 | 57 | 79 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 41 | 23 | 64 | 97 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 34 | 28 | 62 | 103 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 34 | 52 | 86 | 85 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 54 | 39 | 93 | 100 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 37 | 46 | 83 | 91 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 19 | 46 | 65 | 64 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 13 | 42 | 55 | 35 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 36 | 37 | 0 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |

## Comments

No PSVs, pedal cycles or taxis entered or exited the site during this survey.
Site reference:
WM-10-A-01
Survey date: 15/02/06
Day of week: Wednesday

## Vehicles surveyed: OGV

Data proportions in \%
OGV (1) 100
OGV (2) 0

1 occupant per OGV is assumed, and included in the vehicle occupants count

| Time | Arr 1 | Dep 1 | Totals 2 | Accumulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 1 | 2 | (0) |
| 10:00-11:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 11:00-12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 12:00-13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 13:00-14:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 14:00-15:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 15:00-16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 16:00-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 18:00-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX B - Traffic Survey Data

Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Southbound
Vehicle Flow
Week 1

|  | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | 14/07/2016 <br> Thursday | $\begin{gathered} 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16/07/2016 <br> Saturday | 17/07/2016 <br> Sunday | 18/07/2016 <br> Monday | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hr Ending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 Day Ave | 7 Day Ave |
| 1 | 28 | 26 | 26 | 42 | 51 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 30 |
| 2 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 25 | 31 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 16 |
| 3 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| 4 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 20 | 18 | 17 |
| 5 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 26 | 10 | 30 | 27 | 29 | 26 |
| 6 | 130 | 131 | 127 | 60 | 27 | 158 | 140 | 137 | 110 |
| 7 | 527 | 503 | 422 | 138 | 78 | 542 | 508 | 500 | 388 |
| 8 | 897 | 906 | 782 | 252 | 125 | 930 | 905 | 884 | 685 |
| 9 | 753 | 786 | 730 | 405 | 201 | 940 | 914 | 825 | 676 |
| 10 | 568 | 545 | 629 | 562 | 350 | 594 | 510 | 569 | 537 |
| 11 | 423 | 447 | 534 | 621 | 453 | 545 | 429 | 476 | 493 |
| 12 | 402 | 442 | 500 | 623 | 547 | 466 | 411 | 444 | 484 |
| 13 | 410 | 467 | 459 | 581 | 481 | 457 | 394 | 437 | 464 |
| 14 | 423 | 410 | 475 | 503 | 471 | 391 | 367 | 413 | 434 |
| 15 | 427 | 454 | 504 | 470 | 495 | 427 | 384 | 439 | 452 |
| 16 | 466 | 436 | 559 | 467 | 480 | 413 | 416 | 458 | 462 |
| 17 | 529 | 505 | 618 | 468 | 423 | 455 | 519 | 525 | 502 |
| 18 | 604 | 553 | 583 | 419 | 496 | 582 | 596 | 584 | 548 |
| 19 | 517 | 511 | 559 | 394 | 365 | 473 | 462 | 504 | 469 |
| 20 | 291 | 335 | 391 | 267 | 279 | 274 | 264 | 311 | 300 |
| 21 | 224 | 208 | 229 | 207 | 225 | 161 | 190 | 202 | 206 |
| 22 | 150 | 173 | 164 | 156 | 160 | 132 | 152 | 154 | 155 |
| 23 | 113 | 112 | 118 | 132 | 101 | 78 | 105 | 105 | 108 |
| 24 | 65 | 48 | 71 | 86 | 45 | 53 | 73 | 62 | 63 |


| $7-19$ | 6419 | 6462 | 6932 | 5765 | 4887 | 6673 | 6307 | 6559 | 6206 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-22$ | 7611 | 7681 | 8138 | 6533 | 5629 | 7782 | 7421 | 7727 | 7256 |
| $6-24$ | 7789 | 7841 | 8327 | 6751 | 5775 | 7913 | 7599 | 7894 | 7428 |
| $0-24$ | 8018 | 8074 | 8554 | 6941 | 5917 | 8155 | 7825 | 8125 | 7641 |



## Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Southbound
Average Speed
Week 1

| Hr Ending | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $14 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Thursday | $15 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Friday | $16 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Saturday | 17/07/2016 <br> Sunday | 18/07/2016 <br> Monday | 19/07/2016 <br> Tuesday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 46.1 | 50.1 | 44.9 | 49.0 | 47.1 | 50.6 | 49.1 |
| 2 | 52.2 | 49.7 | 49.2 | 49.2 | 47.3 | 42.1 | 48.6 |
| 3 | 49.7 | 45.5 | 55.3 | 49.2 | 48.6 | 52.3 | 49.8 |
| 4 | 55.9 | 50.4 | 49.7 | 54.0 | 51.8 | 52.2 | 55.1 |
| 5 | 54.1 | 54.2 | 49.6 | 53.2 | 52.8 | 50.5 | 48.1 |
| 6 | 49.7 | 50.6 | 50.5 | 49.5 | 51.5 | 50.0 | 51.9 |
| 7 | 46.3 | 46.0 | 46.9 | 51.5 | 52.1 | 46.3 | 46.4 |
| 8 | 44.3 | 42.6 | 44.7 | 48.3 | 50.3 | 43.9 | 42.7 |
| 9 | 43.3 | 42.9 | 43.5 | 45.2 | 47.8 | 42.7 | 41.4 |
| 10 | 44.0 | 44.6 | 43.1 | 44.7 | 46.3 | 44.6 | 45.5 |
| 11 | 44.9 | 44.1 | 44.4 | 44.1 | 45.9 | 44.5 | 45.3 |
| 12 | 44.8 | 46.4 | 44.7 | 44.0 | 45.0 | 40.5 | 46.4 |
| 13 | 45.8 | 45.9 | 44.2 | 45.5 | 45.8 | 45.6 | 43.5 |
| 14 | 41.7 | 45.8 | 44.8 | 45.6 | 46.2 | 44.7 | 46.9 |
| 15 | 44.1 | 46.0 | 43.4 | 44.7 | 46.7 | 44.5 | 46.9 |
| 16 | 45.4 | 47.1 | 44.2 | 45.2 | 45.5 | 45.8 | 46.3 |
| 17 | 45.3 | 45.6 | 44.8 | 45.7 | 46.8 | 43.9 | 45.5 |
| 18 | 46.3 | 46.8 | 46.0 | 47.1 | 47.2 | 47.6 | 48.0 |
| 19 | 46.3 | 47.0 | 46.9 | 48.4 | 46.8 | 45.9 | 46.2 |
| 20 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 47.6 | 48.0 | 47.4 | 48.9 | 47.6 |
| 21 | 48.6 | 49.0 | 47.4 | 47.8 | 46.9 | 46.4 | 49.1 |
| 22 | 47.6 | 49.2 | 47.5 | 46.9 | 47.2 | 50.0 | 47.4 |
| 23 | 48.4 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 46.0 | 47.9 | 47.6 | 46.9 |
| 24 | 46.1 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 47.0 | 46.4 | 49.5 | 47.0 |


| 10-12 | 44.8 | 45.3 | 44.5 | 44.1 | 45.4 | 42.7 | 45.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14-16 | 44.8 | 46.5 | 43.8 | 45.0 | 46.1 | 45.1 | 46.6 |
| 0-24 | 45.3 | 45.7 | 45.1 | 45.9 | 46.6 | 45.0 | 45.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 Day Ave | 45.6 |


| Hr Ending | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $14 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Thursday | $15 / 07 / 2016$ Friday | 16/07/2016 <br> Saturday | 17/07/2016 <br> Sunday | 18/07/2016 <br> Monday | 19/07/2016 <br> Tuesday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 58.7 | 58.6 | 54.0 | 58.7 | 53.9 | 58.7 | 58.2 |
| 2 | 66.0 | 53.3 | 58.4 | 58.9 | 53.7 | 58.9 | 66.0 |
| 3 | 58.6 | 53.3 | 65.8 | 58.8 | 53.5 | 58.5 | 58.3 |
| 4 | 65.8 | 58.8 | 58.2 | 65.5 | 65.9 | 65.6 | 58.3 |
| 5 | 65.8 | 66.3 | 53.2 | 58.5 | 58.1 | 58.8 | 53.0 |
| 6 | 58.8 | 66.1 | 58.6 | 58.9 | 66.3 | 58.4 | 58.5 |
| 7 | 53.0 | 49.0 | 53.4 | 58.4 | 58.5 | 53.5 | 53.2 |
| 8 | 48.8 | 48.9 | 48.4 | 53.7 | 58.8 | 48.5 | 48.9 |
| 9 | 48.8 | 48.2 | 48.7 | 53.5 | 58.6 | 48.2 | 48.6 |
| 10 | 48.7 | 48.7 | 48.3 | 48.5 | 53.8 | 48.3 | 48.8 |
| 11 | 48.0 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 48.5 | 53.0 | 48.1 | 53.9 |
| 12 | 48.4 | 53.2 | 48.2 | 48.4 | 48.2 | 48.6 | 53.3 |
| 13 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 48.2 | 48.4 | 48.1 | 53.2 | 53.5 |
| 14 | 53.8 | 53.1 | 48.6 | 48.3 | 48.1 | 48.9 | 53.1 |
| 15 | 48.4 | 49.0 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 53.3 | 48.1 | 53.6 |
| 16 | 49.0 | 53.7 | 48.5 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 48.4 | 53.4 |
| 17 | 48.9 | 48.0 | 48.9 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 53.3 | 54.0 |
| 18 | 53.1 | 53.6 | 48.3 | 53.1 | 53.5 | 53.9 | 53.1 |
| 19 | 53.9 | 53.1 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 53.7 | 53.8 | 53.9 |
| 20 | 53.4 | 53.1 | 53.4 | 53.4 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 53.6 |
| 21 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.3 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.7 | 53.3 |
| 22 | 53.8 | 53.3 | 53.9 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 58.3 | 53.1 |
| 23 | 58.1 | 53.0 | 53.6 | 53.5 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 53.5 |
| 24 | 53.6 | 53.3 | 53.6 | 53.3 | 53.7 | 58.0 | 53.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-12 | 48.5 | 48.4 | 48.4 | 48.6 | 48.5 | 48.3 | 54.0 |
| 14-16 | 48.3 | 53.3 | 48.1 | 53.5 | 53.4 | 48.8 | 53.1 |
| 0-24 | 48.6 | 48.9 | 48.6 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 53.3 | 53.0 |

Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Southbound
Speed Summary
Week 1

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 07 / 2016 \\ & \text { Wednesday } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 14/07/2016Thursday | $\begin{gathered} 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16/07/2016 <br> Saturday | $\begin{gathered} 17 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speed (MPH) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-25 | 67 | 10 | 64 | 31 | 28 | 127 | 127 |
| 26-40 | 1041 | 1029 | 1254 | 859 | 525 | 1124 | 1007 |
| 41-55 | 6689 | 6814 | 7050 | 5774 | 5099 | 6682 | 6416 |
| 56- | 221 | 221 | 186 | 277 | 265 | 222 | 275 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 8018 | 8074 | 8554 | 6941 | 5917 | 8155 | 7825 |

Speed Summary (MPH)


13/07/2016 14/07/2016 15/072国6 $16 / 07 / 2016$ 17/07/2016 $18 / 07 / 201619 / 07 / 2016$

| $\square 0-25$ | $\square 26-40$ | $\square 41-55$ | $\square 56-$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Southbound

| $\mathrm{Day} \mathrm{/} \mathrm{Time}^{\text {Classes }}$ | Car / LGV / Caravan-1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OGV1 / Bus } \\ & -2,3,5,6,7,12 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OGV2 } \\ -4,8,9,10,11,13 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & -1-13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13/07/2016 |  | $\frac{(26 / W / W) W / W / W)}{222}$ |  |  |
| 7-19 |  |  |  | 6419 |
| 6-22 | 7246 | 261 | 104 | 7611 |
| 6-24 | 7412 | 267 | 110 | 7789 |
| 0-24 | 7598 | 291 | 129 | 8018 |
| 14/07/2016 | 776777717777707 | 767776777776 | 77777717877770 |  |
| 7-19 | 6142 | 221 | 99 | 6462 |
| 6-22 | 7303 | 265 | 113 | 7681 |
| 6-24 | 7449 | 270 | 122 | 7841 |
| 0-24 | 7644 | 285 | 145 | $\frac{8074}{10 W W W W 04}$ |
| 15/07/2016 |  |  | $\mathscr{W}$ |  |
| 7-19 | 6621 | 229 | 82 | 6932 |
| 6-22 | 7766 | 267 | 105 | 8138 |
| 6-24 | 7948 | 269 | 110 | 8327 |
| 0-24 | 8128 | 288 | 138 | 8554 |
| 16/07/2016 | (7/7/7/7/7/7/7/7/7/17 | 7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7/7 | 7/7/7/7/7/7/7/7, |  |
| 7-19 | 5629 | 114 | 22 | 5765 |
| 6-22 | 6376 | 131 | 26 | 6533 |
| 6-24 | 6586 | 136 | 29 | 6751 |
| 0-24 | 6751 | 151 | 39 | 6941 |
| 17/07/2016 |  |  |  | (7/7/7/ $/ 1 / 7 / 7 / 7 / \mathrm{C}$ |
| 7-19 | 4777 | 89 | 21 | 4887 |
| 6-22 | 5496 | 106 | 27 | 5629 |
| 6-24 | 5638 | 108 | 29 | 5775 |
| 0-24 | 5772 | 109 | 36 | 5917 |
| 18/07/2016 | (20161617101617101 |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6345 | 214 | 114 | 6673 |
| 6-22 | 7403 | 252 | 127 | 7782 |
| 6-24 | 7525 | 254 | 134 | 7913 |
| 0-24 | 7737 |  | $\frac{149}{(7 \angle 1710101717010}$ |  |
| 19/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6032 | 197 | 78 | 6307 |
| 6-22 | 7091 | 230 | 100 | 7421 |
| 6-24 | 7256 | 237 | 106 | 7599 |
| 0-24 | 7448 | 250 | 127 | 7825 |


| Average |  |  | W/W 10.1 | WWWW 1 W 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7-19 | 5951 | 184 | 72 | 6206 |
| 6-22 | 6954 | 216 | 86 | 7256 |
| 6-24 | 7116 | 220 | 91 | 7428 |
| 0-24 | 7297 | 235 | 109 | 7641 |

Total Vehicle Class Distribution


Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 2 - Northbound

|  | 13/07/2016 <br> Wednesday | 14/07/2016 Thursday | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16/07/2016 Saturday | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 5 \text { Day Ave } & 7 \text { Day Ave } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hr Ending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 33 | 33 | 37 | 54 | 87 | 21 | 30 | 31 | 42 |
| 2 | 11 | 19 | 19 | 29 | 42 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 21 |
| 3 | 11 | 9 | 18 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 8 | 13 | 14 |
| 4 | 8 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 16 | 13 | 11 | 12 |
| 5 | 21 | 15 | 19 | 14 | 13 | 22 | 19 | 19 | 18 |
| 6 | 65 | 67 | 71 | 38 | 21 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 58 |
| 7 | 234 | 233 | 228 | 180 | 62 | 245 | 246 | 237 | 204 |
| 8 | 510 | 517 | 479 | 232 | 122 | 579 | 536 | 524 | 425 |
| 9 | 476 | 508 | 439 | 312 | 255 | 480 | 474 | 475 | 421 |
| 10 | 378 | 322 | 407 | 405 | 263 | 435 | 327 | 374 | 362 |
| 11 | 389 | 353 | 338 | 495 | 457 | 380 | 357 | 363 | 396 |
| 12 | 391 | 383 | 450 | 615 | 426 | 387 | 375 | 397 | 432 |
| 13 | 405 | 418 | 522 | 555 | 555 | 439 | 392 | 435 | 469 |
| 14 | 397 | 455 | 573 | 539 | 470 | 413 | 408 | 449 | 465 |
| 15 | 492 | 497 | 645 | 535 | 468 | 476 | 507 | 523 | 517 |
| 16 | 589 | 605 | 841 | 491 | 509 | 571 | 616 | 644 | 603 |
| 17 | 808 | 747 | 904 | 519 | 555 | 746 | 802 | 801 | 726 |
| 18 | 911 | 900 | 969 | 493 | 498 | 913 | 892 | 917 | 797 |
| 19 | 739 | 708 | 781 | 403 | 446 | 667 | 630 | 705 | 625 |
| 20 | 448 | 489 | 506 | 320 | 470 | 433 | 441 | 463 | 444 |
| 21 | 278 | 338 | 315 | 287 | 366 | 240 | 311 | 296 | 305 |
| 22 | 244 | 219 | 227 | 242 | 194 | 198 | 257 | 229 | 226 |
| 23 | 173 | 172 | 175 | 203 | 134 | 133 | 157 | 162 | 164 |
| 24 | 91 | 93 | 99 | 153 | 85 | 78 | 71 | 86 | 96 |


| $7-19$ | 6485 | 6413 | 7348 | 5594 | 5024 | 6486 | 6316 | 6610 | 6238 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-22$ | 7689 | 7692 | 8624 | 6623 | 6116 | 7602 | 7571 | 7836 | 7417 |
| $6-24$ | 7953 | 7957 | 8898 | 6979 | 6335 | 7813 | 7799 | 8084 | 7676 |
| $0-24$ | 8102 | 8108 | 9074 | 7148 | 6525 | 7980 | 7950 | 8243 | 7841 |



Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)


Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)

| Channel 2 - Northbound |  |  |  | Speed Summary |  |  | Week 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speed (MPH) | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $\begin{gathered} \text { 14/07/2016 } \\ \text { Thursday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 16/07/2016 } \\ \text { Saturday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 17/07/2016 } \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 19/07/2016 } \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 0-25 | 17 | 13 | 35 | 22 | 25 | 22 | 42 |
| 26-40 | 1614 | 1564 | 2016 | 1006 | 847 | 1526 | 1467 |
| 41-55 | 6171 | 6203 | 6724 | 5790 | 5309 | 6088 | 6146 |
| 56- | 300 | 328 | 299 | 330 | 344 | 344 | 295 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 8102 | 8108 | 9074 | 7148 | 6525 | 7980 | 7950 |

Speed Summary (MPH)

$\square$

## Bicester ATC 1, A4421 (Week 1)



Total Vehicle Class Distribution


Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Eastbound
Vehicle Flow
Week 1

|  | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $\begin{gathered} 14 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Thursday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Saturday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 18 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 19/07/2016 } \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hr Ending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 33 | 29 | 27 | 57 | 45 | 18 | 37 | 29 | 35 |
| 2 | 17 | 24 | 17 | 18 | 34 | 16 | 11 | 17 | 20 |
| 3 | 23 | 23 | 18 | 20 | 13 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 19 |
| 4 | 42 | 43 | 46 | 27 | 18 | 30 | 46 | 41 | 36 |
| 5 | 48 | 48 | 46 | 28 | 9 | 49 | 40 | 46 | 38 |
| 6 | 161 | 156 | 163 | 65 | 33 | 162 | 155 | 159 | 128 |
| 7 | 403 | 386 | 359 | 105 | 63 | 366 | 393 | 381 | 296 |
| 8 | 898 | 930 | 855 | 255 | 106 | 946 | 904 | 907 | 699 |
| 9 | 1075 | 1141 | 992 | 361 | 120 | 1204 | 1027 | 1088 | 846 |
| 10 | 654 | 618 | 598 | 548 | 276 | 680 | 641 | 638 | 574 |
| 11 | 441 | 464 | 486 | 750 | 509 | 448 | 465 | 461 | 509 |
| 12 | 419 | 498 | 471 | 712 | 577 | 435 | 409 | 446 | 503 |
| 13 | 461 | 465 | 507 | 662 | 603 | 495 | 450 | 476 | 520 |
| 14 | 494 | 476 | 547 | 600 | 549 | 469 | 468 | 491 | 515 |
| 15 | 531 | 518 | 572 | 602 | 492 | 547 | 503 | 534 | 538 |
| 16 | 486 | 524 | 598 | 554 | 495 | 496 | 500 | 521 | 522 |
| 17 | 611 | 608 | 681 | 520 | 400 | 607 | 584 | 618 | 573 |
| 18 | 706 | 722 | 671 | 498 | 415 | 733 | 738 | 714 | 640 |
| 19 | 568 | 567 | 563 | 436 | 345 | 557 | 580 | 567 | 517 |
| 20 | 391 | 387 | 394 | 289 | 294 | 368 | 389 | 386 | 359 |
| 21 | 244 | 243 | 212 | 184 | 189 | 213 | 227 | 228 | 216 |
| 22 | 173 | 172 | 144 | 139 | 151 | 188 | 174 | 170 | 163 |
| 23 | 114 | 139 | 120 | 139 | 99 | 103 | 110 | 117 | 118 |
| 24 | 46 | 33 | 89 | 94 | 44 | 45 | 53 | 53 | 58 |


| $7-19$ | 7344 | 7531 | 7541 | 6498 | 4887 | 7617 | 7269 | 7460 | 6955 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-22$ | 8555 | 8719 | 8650 | 7215 | 5584 | 8752 | 8452 | 8626 | 7990 |
| $6-24$ | 8715 | 8891 | 8859 | 7448 | 5727 | 8900 | 8615 | 8796 | 8165 |
| $0-24$ | 9039 | 9214 | 9176 | 7663 | 5879 | 9194 | 8923 | 9109 | 8441 |

Vehicle Flow (Channel 1)


Date
$\square \square-19 \quad \square 6-22 \quad \square 6-24 \quad \square 0-24$

Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Eastbound
Average Speed
Week 1

|  | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | 14/07/2016 | 15/07/2016 | $16 / 07 / 2016$ | 17/07/2016 | 18/07/2016 | 19/07/2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hr Ending |  | Thursday | Friday | Saturday | Sunday | Monday | Tuesday |
| 1 | 43.9 | 43.3 | 46.2 | 48.9 | 47.9 | 42.3 | 44.2 |
| 2 | 49.5 | 46.8 | 44.2 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 47.7 | 47.3 |
| 3 | 47.6 | 44.3 | 48.1 | 48.4 | 48.4 | 46.7 | 45.6 |
| 4 | 48.4 | 47.1 | 49.2 | 48.6 | 46.9 | 46.5 | 47.1 |
| 5 | 47.6 | 47.1 | 48.8 | 48.5 | 49.9 | 47.9 | 47.6 |
| 6 | 47.7 | 47.3 | 46.0 | 46.8 | 47.1 | 48.5 | 47.6 |
| 7 | 45.4 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 49.2 | 47.1 | 47.5 | 45.9 |
| 8 | 43.2 | 43.3 | 42.7 | 46.5 | 46.8 | 43.7 | 42.9 |
| 9 | 42.0 | 40.3 | 41.8 | 45.4 | 44.9 | 39.3 | 42.0 |
| 10 | 43.8 | 43.3 | 43.4 | 44.7 | 45.0 | 43.8 | 44.0 |
| 11 | 43.1 | 42.9 | 42.7 | 44.1 | 44.5 | 43.4 | 43.3 |
| 12 | 42.9 | 43.2 | 44.6 | 42.7 | 44.6 | 43.0 | 43.0 |
| 13 | 43.3 | 44.2 | 43.7 | 44.8 | 44.1 | 43.2 | 43.1 |
| 14 | 44.3 | 44.6 | 43.3 | 45.7 | 44.6 | 44.3 | 44.0 |
| 15 | 43.2 | 43.8 | 43.3 | 46.3 | 45.5 | 43.0 | 43.1 |
| 16 | 43.0 | 43.9 | 43.5 | 45.5 | 46.4 | 43.3 | 42.9 |
| 17 | 43.5 | 43.9 | 43.5 | 45.4 | 46.7 | 43.4 | 43.1 |
| 18 | 44.4 | 43.5 | 44.0 | 45.7 | 47.4 | 44.4 | 44.5 |
| 19 | 45.0 | 44.7 | 45.9 | 46.7 | 47.1 | 45.2 | 44.8 |
| 20 | 45.9 | 45.2 | 46.9 | 47.8 | 47.5 | 45.7 | 46.0 |
| 21 | 44.9 | 45.5 | 47.7 | 47.1 | 48.1 | 48.2 | 44.6 |
| 22 | 46.1 | 46.5 | 45.5 | 46.4 | 47.6 | 46.2 | 45.2 |
| 23 | 46.6 | 46.3 | 48.3 | 46.9 | 47.9 | 47.0 | 46.6 |
| 24 | 47.5 | 43.8 | 46.9 | 47.8 | 47.8 | 45.4 | 48.0 |


| $10-12$ | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.7 | 43.4 | 44.5 | 43.2 | 43.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $14-16$ | 43.1 | 43.9 | 43.4 | 45.9 | 45.9 | 43.1 | 43.0 |
| $0-24$ | 43.9 | 43.7 | 44.0 | 45.5 | 45.8 | 43.7 | 43.8 |

Channel 1 - Eastbound
85th Percentile

| Hr Ending | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | 14/07/2016 <br> Thursday | $15 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Friday | 16/07/2016 Saturday | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 17/07/2016 } \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 18/07/2016 <br> Monday | 19/07/2016 <br> Tuesday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 48.7 | 53.6 | 54.0 | 58.7 | 58.9 | 53.7 | 48.2 |
| 2 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 53.4 | 58.9 | 53.7 | 53.9 | 53.5 |
| 3 | 58.6 | 48.3 | 58.3 | 53.8 | 53.5 | 53.5 | 53.3 |
| 4 | 58.3 | 53.8 | 58.2 | 58.0 | 53.4 | 53.1 | 53.3 |
| 5 | 58.3 | 58.8 | 53.2 | 53.5 | 53.1 | 53.8 | 58.0 |
| 6 | 58.8 | 53.6 | 53.6 | 53.9 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 53.5 |
| 7 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 53.4 | 58.4 | 58.5 | 53.5 | 53.2 |
| 8 | 48.8 | 48.9 | 48.4 | 53.7 | 58.8 | 48.5 | 48.9 |
| 9 | 48.8 | 48.2 | 48.7 | 53.5 | 53.6 | 48.2 | 48.6 |
| 10 | 48.7 | 48.7 | 48.3 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 48.3 | 48.8 |
| 11 | 48.0 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 48.5 | 53.0 | 53.1 | 53.9 |
| 12 | 48.4 | 48.2 | 48.2 | 48.4 | 53.2 | 48.6 | 48.3 |
| 13 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 48.2 | 53.4 | 48.1 | 48.2 | 48.5 |
| 14 | 48.8 | 53.1 | 48.6 | 53.3 | 53.1 | 48.9 | 48.1 |
| 15 | 48.4 | 49.0 | 48.1 | 53.1 | 53.3 | 48.1 | 48.6 |
| 16 | 49.0 | 48.7 | 48.5 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 48.4 | 48.4 |
| 17 | 48.9 | 48.0 | 48.9 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 48.3 | 49.0 |
| 18 | 48.1 | 48.6 | 53.3 | 53.1 | 53.5 | 48.9 | 48.1 |
| 19 | 53.9 | 53.1 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 53.7 | 53.8 | 53.9 |
| 20 | 53.4 | 53.1 | 53.4 | 53.4 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 53.6 |
| 21 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.3 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.7 | 53.3 |
| 22 | 53.8 | 53.3 | 53.9 | 53.2 | 58.1 | 58.3 | 53.1 |
| 23 | 58.1 | 53.0 | 58.6 | 53.5 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 53.5 |
| 24 | 58.6 | 53.3 | 53.6 | 53.3 | 53.7 | 48.0 | 58.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10-12 | 48.5 | 48.4 | 48.4 | 48.6 | 53.5 | 48.3 | 49.0 |
| 14-16 | 48.3 | 48.3 | 48.1 | 53.5 | 53.4 | 48.8 | 48.1 |
| 0-24 | 48.6 | 48.9 | 48.6 | 53.2 | 53.1 | 48.3 | 48.0 |

## Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Eastbound
Speed Summary
Week 1

| Speed (MPH) | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $14 / 07 / 2016$ Thursday | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Saturday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 17/07/2016 } \\ \text { Sunday } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 18/07/2016 } \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 19/07/2016 } \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-25 | 123 | 154 | 77 | 71 | 81 | 124 | 118 |
| 26-40 | 2167 | 2289 | 2207 | 1207 | 797 | 2344 | 2146 |
| 41-55 | 6493 | 6513 | 6628 | 6050 | 4704 | 6462 | 6437 |
| 56- | 256 | 258 | 264 | 335 | 297 | 264 | 222 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 9039 | 9214 | 9176 | 7663 | 5879 | 9194 | 8923 |



Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 1 - Eastbound
Vehicle Class
Week 1

| Classes <br> Day / Time | Car / LGV / <br> Caravan-1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { OGV1 / Bus } \\ -2,3,5,6,7,12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OGV2 } \\ -4,8,9,10,11,13 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & -1-13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13/07/2016 |  | V171717171717171 | (71717171717171) | (17)767171767) |
| 7-19 | 6905 | 298 | 141 | 7344 |
| 6-22 | 8055 | 332 | 168 | 8555 |
| 6-24 | 8207 | 334 | 174 | 8715 |
| 0-24 | 8480 | 355 | 204 | 9039 |
| 14/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 7109 | 274 | 148 | 7531 |
| 6-22 | 8232 | 311 | 176 | 8719 |
| 6-24 | 8390 | 315 | 186 | 8891 |
| 0-24 | 8664 | 334 | 216 | 9214 |
| 15/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 7121 | 292 | 128 | 7541 |
| 6-22 | 8177 | 318 | 155 | 8650 |
| 6-24 | 8375 | 324 | 160 | 8859 |
| 0-24 | 8641 | 338 | 197 | 9176 |
| 16/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6341 | 116 | 41 | 6498 |
| 6-22 | 7036 | 131 | 48 | 7215 |
| 6-24 | 7259 | 136 | 53 | 7448 |
| 0-24 | 7450 | 145 | 68 | 7663 |
| 17/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 4769 | 77 | 41 | 4887 |
| 6-22 | 5447 | 91 | 46 | 5584 |
| 6-24 | 5585 | 92 | 50 | 5727 |
| 0-24 | 5725 | 95 | 59 | 5879 |
| 18/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 7143 | 314 | 160 | 7617 |
| 6-22 | 8227 | 345 | 180 | 8752 |
| 6-24 | 8358 | 350 | 192 | 8900 |
| 0-24 |  |  |  | $\qquad$ |
| 19/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6843 | 282 | 144 | 7269 |
| 6-22 | 7973 | 310 | 169 | 8452 |
| 6-24 | 8128 | 312 | 175 | 8615 |
| 0-24 | 8389 | 329 | 205 | 8923 |



Total Vehicle Class Distribution


Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 2 - Westbound
Vehicle Flow
Week 1

|  | $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $\begin{gathered} 14 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Thursday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Friday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Saturday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Sunday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 18 / 07 / 2016 \\ \text { Monday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 19/07/2016 } \\ \text { Tuesday } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hr Ending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 25 | 35 | 37 | 44 | 57 | 22 | 22 | 28 | 35 |
| 2 | 18 | 23 | 13 | 19 | 37 | 15 | 18 | 17 | 20 |
| 3 | 17 | 15 | 18 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 4 | 16 | 14 | 19 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 5 | 46 | 46 | 44 | 16 | 13 | 35 | 39 | 42 | 34 |
| 6 | 75 | 74 | 98 | 32 | 16 | 72 | 73 | 78 | 63 |
| 7 | 248 | 252 | 231 | 94 | 71 | 218 | 246 | 239 | 194 |
| 8 | 575 | 572 | 571 | 210 | 86 | 547 | 556 | 564 | 445 |
| 9 | 542 | 561 | 510 | 351 | 131 | 508 | 512 | 527 | 445 |
| 10 | 429 | 440 | 467 | 523 | 189 | 445 | 430 | 442 | 418 |
| 11 | 352 | 401 | 440 | 605 | 420 | 352 | 343 | 378 | 416 |
| 12 | 432 | 437 | 487 | 678 | 454 | 417 | 444 | 443 | 478 |
| 13 | 463 | 525 | 573 | 674 | 563 | 476 | 473 | 502 | 535 |
| 14 | 522 | 496 | 625 | 596 | 482 | 523 | 538 | 541 | 540 |
| 15 | 525 | 593 | 697 | 592 | 465 | 501 | 493 | 562 | 552 |
| 16 | 680 | 663 | 843 | 574 | 425 | 658 | 676 | 704 | 646 |
| 17 | 917 | 980 | 979 | 553 | 429 | 916 | 888 | 936 | 809 |
| 18 | 1118 | 1109 | 1060 | 487 | 332 | 1150 | 1162 | 1120 | 917 |
| 19 | 742 | 763 | 710 | 429 | 309 | 715 | 722 | 730 | 627 |
| 20 | 442 | 476 | 435 | 310 | 285 | 450 | 431 | 447 | 404 |
| 21 | 282 | 268 | 226 | 211 | 172 | 240 | 282 | 260 | 240 |
| 22 | 161 | 197 | 179 | 161 | 136 | 175 | 159 | 174 | 167 |
| 23 | 158 | 141 | 123 | 121 | 79 | 125 | 150 | 139 | 128 |
| 24 | 72 | 51 | 80 | 88 | 48 | 67 | 61 | 66 | 67 |


| $7-19$ | 7297 | 7540 | 7962 | 6272 | 4285 | 7208 | 7237 | 7449 | 6829 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-22$ | 8430 | 8733 | 9033 | 7048 | 4949 | 8291 | 8355 | 8568 | 7834 |
| $6-24$ | 8660 | 8925 | 9236 | 7257 | 5076 | 8483 | 8566 | 8774 | 8029 |
| $0-24$ | 8857 | 9132 | 9465 | 7398 | 5225 | 8656 | 8750 | 8972 | 8212 |

Vehicle Flow (Channel 2)


Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 2 - Westbound
Average Speed
Week 1

| $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $14 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Thursday | $15 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Friday | $16 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Saturday | $17 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Sunday | $18 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Monday | $19 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Tuesday |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 40.8 | 46.2 | 47.3 | 44.7 | 47.5 | 43.5 | 40.5 |
| 2 | 47.4 | 48.5 | 46.7 | 44.8 | 47.6 | 44.3 | 45.6 |
| 3 | 43.9 | 47.7 | 47.0 | 44.9 | 48.2 | 47.5 | 44.2 |
| 4 | 46.1 | 45.5 | 48.3 | 42.6 | 44.2 | 46.5 | 48.0 |
| 5 | 46.4 | 44.6 | 44.8 | 48.3 | 48.2 | 49.4 | 46.3 |
| 6 | 47.3 | 47.7 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 48.6 | 47.8 | 47.9 |
| 7 | 47.1 | 47.0 | 44.7 | 52.0 | 51.1 | 47.2 | 47.1 |
| 8 | 42.5 | 42.0 | 42.4 | 48.6 | 48.9 | 44.0 | 42.7 |
| 9 | 42.9 | 41.4 | 40.9 | 45.7 | 45.9 | 42.1 | 42.5 |
| 10 | 42.7 | 41.6 | 43.0 | 43.9 | 45.8 | 43.5 | 43.0 |
| 11 | 42.8 | 41.5 | 41.7 | 42.8 | 43.8 | 43.0 | 42.8 |
| 12 | 41.5 | 40.9 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 43.7 | 41.6 | 41.2 |
| 13 | 41.4 | 40.9 | 42.3 | 42.3 | 43.8 | 41.4 | 41.4 |
| 14 | 40.2 | 42.1 | 41.5 | 43.5 | 43.4 | 40.5 | 39.8 |
| 15 | 40.5 | 41.4 | 40.5 | 43.1 | 44.4 | 40.3 | 40.3 |
| 16 | 39.9 | 40.2 | 39.7 | 45.4 | 42.9 | 40.1 | 39.6 |
| 17 | 37.1 | 37.7 | 39.0 | 44.0 | 44.7 | 37.1 | 37.1 |
| 18 | 32.3 | 36.8 | 36.9 | 44.5 | 44.3 | 31.9 | 32.2 |
| 19 | 41.1 | 40.4 | 40.6 | 44.4 | 45.9 | 40.9 | 41.0 |
| 20 | 42.7 | 41.6 | 45.2 | 45.9 | 46.2 | 45.1 | 43.1 |
| 21 | 45.0 | 44.5 | 45.6 | 45.3 | 44.6 | 46.4 | 45.4 |
| 22 | 45.9 | 44.1 | 43.9 | 44.7 | 45.8 | 43.9 | 45.9 |
| 23 | 44.3 | 45.4 | 44.5 | 45.3 | 45.3 | 45.8 | 43.6 |
| 24 | 46.7 | 43.0 | 47.9 | 46.0 | 47.5 | 47.9 | 46.0 |


| $10-12$ | 42.1 | 41.2 | 41.8 | 42.3 | 43.7 | 42.3 | 41.9 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $14-16$ | 40.2 | 40.8 | 40.1 | 44.2 | 43.7 | 40.2 | 39.9 |
| $0-24$ | 40.5 | 40.8 | 41.2 | 44.1 | 44.6 | 40.6 | 40.3 |

Channel 2 - Westbound
85th Percentile

| $13 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Wednesday | $14 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Thursday | $15 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Friday | $16 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Saturday | $17 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Sunday | $18 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Monday | $19 / 07 / 2016$ <br> Tuesday |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 48.3 | 53.3 | 58.7 | 53.6 | 53.2 | 53.6 | 48.8 |
| 2 | 58.5 | 65.8 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 58.2 | 53.8 | 53.3 |
| 3 | 48.9 | 53.2 | 58.6 | 53.1 | 53.3 | 58.5 | 48.7 |
| 4 | 53.5 | 48.5 | 58.2 | 48.2 | 53.8 | 53.2 | 53.4 |
| 5 | 53.4 | 53.2 | 53.5 | 53.1 | 53.1 | 58.9 | 53.8 |
| 6 | 53.8 | 53.6 | 53.7 | 58.4 | 53.5 | 53.4 | 58.7 |
| 7 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 53.8 | 59.0 | 58.8 | 53.3 | 53.4 |
| 8 | 48.7 | 48.9 | 48.4 | 53.5 | 58.8 | 53.8 | 48.1 |
| 9 | 48.7 | 48.5 | 48.9 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 48.2 | 48.4 |
| 10 | 49.0 | 48.2 | 48.7 | 49.0 | 54.0 | 48.4 | 48.3 |
| 11 | 48.3 | 48.7 | 48.1 | 48.2 | 48.8 | 48.2 | 48.7 |
| 12 | 48.5 | 48.7 | 48.6 | 48.4 | 48.7 | 48.9 | 48.3 |
| 13 | 48.4 | 48.6 | 48.7 | 48.4 | 48.9 | 48.6 | 48.8 |
| 14 | 48.7 | 48.8 | 48.0 | 48.3 | 48.9 | 48.4 | 48.2 |
| 15 | 48.2 | 48.2 | 48.4 | 48.5 | 48.4 | 48.4 | 48.6 |
| 16 | 48.4 | 48.8 | 48.4 | 53.1 | 48.1 | 48.9 | 49.0 |
| 17 | 43.5 | 43.2 | 43.3 | 53.5 | 54.0 | 48.6 | 43.2 |
| 18 | 43.8 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 49.0 | 53.8 | 43.9 | 43.9 |
| 19 | 48.5 | 48.1 | 48.8 | 48.6 | 53.7 | 48.5 | 48.1 |
| 20 | 48.4 | 48.1 | 53.7 | 53.9 | 53.4 | 53.3 | 49.0 |
| 21 | 53.5 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 53.7 | 53.0 | 53.9 | 53.6 |
| 22 | 53.2 | 53.4 | 48.7 | 53.4 | 53.2 | 53.3 | 53.6 |
| 23 | 53.6 | 53.5 | 53.3 | 53.7 | 53.2 | 53.3 | 48.9 |
| 24 | 53.5 |  | 58.1 | 58.4 | 53.1 | 58.5 | 53.2 |

Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 2 - Westbound
Speed Summary
Week 1

| Speed (MPH) | $13 / 07 / 2016$ | 14/07/2016 | $15 / 07 / 2016$ | $16 / 07 / 2016$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 17/07/2016 } \end{gathered}$ | 18/07/2016 | 19/07/2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-25 | 521 | 257 | 264 | 110 | 102 | 515 | 543 |
| 26-40 | 3273 | 3766 | 3663 | 1637 | 995 | 3147 | 3262 |
| 41-55 | 4897 | 4982 | 5359 | 5390 | 3870 | 4839 | 4790 |
| 56- | 166 | 127 | 179 | 261 | 258 | 155 | 155 |
| TOTAL | 8857 | 9132 | 9465 | 7398 | 5225 | 8656 | 8750 |



## Bicester ATC 2, A4421 (Week 1)

Channel 2 - Westbound
Vehicle Class
Week 1

| Classes <br> Day / Time | Car / LGV / <br> Caravan-1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { OGV1 / Bus } \\ -2,3,5,6,7,12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OGV2 } \\ -4,8,9,10,11,13 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & -1-13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13/07/2016 |  | V171717171717171 | (71717171717171) | (17)767171767) |
| 7-19 | 6882 | 261 | 154 | 7297 |
| 6-22 | 7954 | 296 | 180 | 8430 |
| 6-24 | 8170 | 301 | 189 | 8660 |
| 0-24 | 8293 | 332 | 232 | 8857 |
| 14/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 7096 | 295 | 149 | 7540 |
| 6-22 | 8218 | 333 | 182 | 8733 |
| 6-24 | 8398 | 335 | 192 | 8925 |
| 0-24 | 8549 | 359 | 224 | 9132 |
| 15/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 7553 | 272 | 137 | 7962 |
| 6-22 | 8557 | 306 | 170 | 9033 |
| 6-24 | 8753 | 310 | 173 | 9236 |
| 0-24 | 8916 | 352 | 197 | 9465 |
| 16/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6135 | 102 | 35 | 6272 |
| 6-22 | 6891 | 117 | 40 | 7048 |
| 6-24 | 7095 | 119 | 43 | 7257 |
| 0-24 | 7213 | 133 | 52 | 7398 |
| 17/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 4190 | 53 | 42 | 4285 |
| 6-22 | 4833 | 63 | 53 | 4949 |
| 6-24 | 4952 | 66 | 58 | 5076 |
| 0-24 | 5085 | 76 | 64 | 5225 |
| 18/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6795 | 253 | 160 | 7208 |
| 6-22 | 7837 | 276 | 178 | 8291 |
| 6-24 | 8013 | 281 | 189 | 8483 |
| 0-24 |  |  | $\qquad$ |  |
| 19/07/2016 |  |  |  |  |
| 7-19 | 6832 | 248 | 157 | 7237 |
| 6-22 | 7890 | 284 | 181 | 8355 |
| 6-24 | 8089 | 288 | 189 | 8566 |
| 0-24 | 8209 | 312 | 229 | 8750 |


| Average | W1010101010181012 | 161016101610101 | (1) 10101010101 | 26101610101014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7-19 | 6498 | 212 | 119 | 6829 |
| 6-22 | 7454 | 239 | 141 | 7834 |
| 6-24 | 7639 | 243 | 148 | 8029 |
| 0-24 | 7772 | 267 | 173 | 8212 |

Total Vehicle Class Distribution
















APPENDIX C - Personal Injury
Accident Data

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8} / \mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selected using Manual Selection



| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Manual Selection |  |  |



| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 01 / 2015$ | and $31 / 08 / 2020$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selected using Manual Selection



| Monday | 22/07/2019 | 19 Time | 1730 | 0 Sligh |  |  | BUCKINGHAM ROAD AT CROSSING POINT APPROX 5M S OF RBT J/W A4421 / A4095 SKIMMINGDISH LAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 458976 | N: 224305 Jun | Junction Detail: | 1 | Control | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine without | ut high winds |  |  | Road surface | Dry |  |  | Daylight |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference | 1 Car |  |  |  |  |  | Moving from | N to | S | Going ahead other |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference 2 | 2 Peda | ycle |  |  |  |  | Moving from | W to | E | Going ahead other |  |  |  |
|  |  | sualty Reference |  | 1 | Age: | 12 | 2 Male |  | ver/rider |  | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 | 2 |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selected using Manual Selection




| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8} / \mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Manual Selection |  |  |



| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |
| Selected using Manual Selection |  |  |



Tuesday $25 / 08 / 2020$ Time 1705 atight VULCAN VIEW WHERE CYCLE PATH JOINS AND J/W SKIMMINGDISH LANE BICESTER E: 459935 N: 223477 Junction Detail: 3 Control 4
Fine without high winds Road surface Wet/Damp Daylight

| Vehicle Reference 1 | Car |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vehicle Reference 2 | Pedal Cycle |  |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: | 28 | Male |


| Moving from N to S | Going ahead other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moving from E to W | Going ahead other |  |
| Driver/rider | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: 2 |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 1 / 2 0 1 5}$ and $\mathbf{3 1 / 0 8 / 2 0 2 0}$ | (68) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |

Selected using Manual Selection

## Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 0 | 5 | 21 | 26 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Pedal cycles | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 10 | 34 | 44 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 1 | 20 | 21 |
| Passenger | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Motorcycle rider | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Cyclist | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 10 | 39 | 49 |

Number of casualties meeting the criteria:
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## APPENDIX E - Preliminary Access Drawings




APPENDIX F - Parking Accumulation Summary
survey type:
M weather:
PM weather:
Manual Count
Mild and Cloudy
Mild and Clear
nitial car park occupancy:
15 Final car par
0
BRACKETED ACCUMULATION FIGURES ARE NOT ABSOLUTE
Parking Capacity
24\% (422 On-Site Spaces) ons in \%

| Motor cars | 98 Motor cycles | 0 Public servict | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Light goods | 2 OGV (1) | 0 OGV (2) | 0 |
| Taxis | 0 |  |  |

2 0 OGV (2)

0

Arr 313 Dep 328 Totals 641 Parking Accum
:00-01:00
0:00-01:00
1:00-02:00
2:00-03:00
3:00-04:00
 5:00-06:00 06:00-07:00 07:00-08:00 08:00-09:00 09:00-10:00 10:00-11:00 0:00-11:00 1:00-12:00 2:00-13:00 13:00-14:00 14:00-15:00 5:00-16:00 6:00-17:00 17:00-18:00 18:00-19:00 19:00-20:00 20:00-21:00 1.00-22.00 21:00-22:00 2.00-23.00

3:00-24:00


| Weekday |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Brand Experience Visitor Trips |  | Staff Trips132 |  | 0 |
| Proportions / Trip Profile |  | 555 | 555 |  |  |  |
| IN | OUT | IN | OUT | IN | OUT | Park Acc |
| 11\% | 2\% | 58 | 10 | 132 | 0 | 180 |
| 15\% | 3\% | 83 | 17 |  |  | 247 |
| 13\% | 7\% | 73 | 39 |  |  | 281 |
| 11\% | 9\% | 60 | 47 |  |  | 294 |
| 11\% | 16\% | 60 | 88 |  |  | 266 |
| 17\% | 12\% | 96 | 66 |  |  | 296 |
| 12\% | 14\% | 66 | 78 |  |  | 283 |
| 6\% | 14\% | 34 | 78 |  |  | 239 |
| 4\% | 13\% | 23 | 71 |  |  | 191 |
| 0\% | 11\% | 2 | 61 | 0 | 132 | 0 |


| Saturday |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brand Experience Visitor Trips | Staff Trips |  |
| 747 | 747 | 132 |
| IN | OUT | Park Acc |
| 79 | 14 | 197 |
| 112 | 23 | 287 |
| 98 | 52 | 332 |
| 81 | 64 | 349 |
| 81 | 118 | 312 |
| 129 | 89 | 352 |
| 88 | 105 | 336 |
| 45 | 105 | 276 |
| 31 | 96 | 212 |
| 2 | 82 | 0 |

## APPENDIX G - Trip Generation Summary

PROJECT RADIAL
DEVELOPMENT DATA - FINAL - MODE 27.11.2019


| PROJECT RADIAL <br> DEVELOPMENT DATA -FINAL - MODE 27.11.2019 |  | Weekday (Mon-Fri) Traffic Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Trip Rates |  |  |  |  |  | Vehicular Trips |  |  |  |  |  | 12-Hour Traffic (c.0700-1900) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | AM Peak (0800-0900) |  |  | PM Peak (1700-1800) |  |  | AM Peak (0800-0900) |  |  | PM Peak (1700-1800) |  |  | Trip Rates |  |  | Vehicular Trips |  |  |
| mode Ref. on Plan | Zone name | IN | OUT | 2-WAY | IN | OUT | 2-WAY | IN | OUT | 2-WAY | IN | OUT | 2-WAY | IN | OUT | 2-WAY | IN | OUT | 2-WAY |
| A | Brand Experience Centre | First Principles -Please see 'Gaydon British Motor Museum' tab sheet for full calculation \& details |  |  |  |  |  | 191 | 10 | 201 | 2 | 193 | 195 |  |  |  | 687 | 687 | 1373 |
| в | Future Technology Hub/FAST | 0.687 | 0.09 | 0.777 | 0.072 | 0.633 | 0.705 | 151 | 20 | 171 | 16 | 139 | 155 | 3.723 | 3.38 | 7.103 | 819 | 743 | 1562 |
| c | Bicester Reserve-Public | 0.067 | 0.04 | 0.107 | 0.064 | 0.072 | 0.136 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 1.101 | 1.008 | 2.109 | 70 | 65 | 135 |
| D | Bicester Reserve - Private | 0.067 | 0.04 | 0.107 | 0.064 | 0.072 | 0.136 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1.101 | 1.008 | 2.109 | 30 | 27 | 57 |
| E | Bicester Reserve - Public Country Park/Land | 0.443 | 0.234 | 0.677 | 0.482 | 0.664 | 1.146 | 13 | 7 | 20 | 14 | 19 | 33 | 7.502 | 7.365 | 14.867 | 217 | 213 | 430 |
| F | Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores Area | 0.067 | 0.04 | 0.107 | 0.064 | 0.072 | 0.136 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 1.101 | 1.008 | 2.109 | 53 | 48 | 101 |
| G | Aircraft Hangar | These trips are already on the highway network - associated with the existing Gliding Club-typical vehicluar trips are illustrated in the adjacent cells, for reference |  |  |  |  |  | 30 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 30 |  | aily visito |  | 30 | 30 | 60 |
| н | Hangar 5 - Exhibition Hall 3 (Museum) | 1.361 | 0.161 | 1.522 | 0.315 | 0.978 | 1.293 | 72 | 9 | 81 | 17 | 52 | 69 | 6.777 | 6.737 | 13.514 | 360 | 358 | 718 |
|  |  | TOTAL TRIPS (ex Aircraft Hangar) |  |  |  |  |  | 436 | 51 | 487 | 57 | 413 | 471 |  |  |  | 2236 | 2141 | 4377 |
|  |  | Internalised /Linked Trips to be Established (in consultation with BH) - Hotel Trips |  |  |  |  |  | 79 | 103 | 182 | 83 | 66 | 149 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | New discounted trips (link |  | ternal use | be Agree | 20\% | 16 | 21 | 36 | 17 | 13 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total (Inc. linked internalisation) |  |  | 420 | 30 | 451 | 41 | 400 | 441 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PROJECT RADIAL
DEVELOPMENT DATA - FINAL - MODE 27.11.2019

| mode Ref. on Plan | Zone name | Comments/Clarifications |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Brand Experience Centre | Based on forecast daily weekday visitors (c.625), by applying NTS 65\% leisure trips occuring on weekday; and applying the NTS single car driver (38\%) method of travel for leisure/recreational purposes (extrapolated using arrival/departure trip profile from British Motor Museum Gaydon site - see separate tab) |
| в | Future Technology Hub/FAST | BH NTS surveyed trip rates (July 2018) that were approved and accepted as part of the recent NTS permission |
| c | Bicester Reserve-Public | TRICS Resi - Holiday Accommodation |
| D | Bicester Reserve-Private | TRICS Resi - Holiday Accommodation |
| E | Bicester Reserve - Public Country Park/Land | TRICS Leisure - Country Parks - Only Saturday TRICS data available - considered worst-case/robust assumption when applied to weekday peak hours |
| F | Motor Vaults/Bomb Stores Area | TRICS Resi- Holiday Accommodation |
| G | Aircraft Hangar | c. 120 members-with 10-15 members visiting the site on a daily basis |
| н | Hangar 5 -Exhibition Hall 3 (Museum) | TRICS - Exhibition Centre in absence of specific \& relevant museum sites (exhibition centre considered to be a worst-case and robust assessment) |

survey type:
M weather:
PM weather:
Manual Count
Mild and Cloudy
Mild and Clear
nitial car park occupancy:
15 Final car par
0
BRACKETED ACCUMULATION FIGURES ARE NOT ABSOLUTE
Parking Capacity
24\% (422 On-Site Spaces) ons in \%

| Motor cars | 98 Motor cycles | 0 Public servict | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Light goods | 2 OGV (1) | 0 OGV (2) | 0 |
| Taxis | 0 |  |  |

2 0 OGV (2)

0

Arr 313 Dep 328 Totals 641 Parking Accum
:00-01:00
0:00-01:00
1:00-02:00
2:00-03:00
3:00-04:00
 5:00-06:00 06:00-07:00 07:00-08:00 08:00-09:00 09:00-10:00 10:00-11:00 0:00-11:00 1:00-12:00 2:00-13:00 13:00-14:00 14:00-15:00 5:00-16:00 6:00-17:00 17:00-18:00 18:00-19:00 19:00-20:00 20:00-21:00 1.00-22.00 21:00-22:00 2.00-23.00

3:00-24:00


| Weekday |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Brand Experience Visitor Trips |  | Staff Trips132 |  | 0 |
| Proportions / Trip Profile |  | 555 | 555 |  |  |  |
| IN | OUT | IN | OUT | IN | OUT | Park Acc |
| 11\% | 2\% | 58 | 10 | 132 | 0 | 180 |
| 15\% | 3\% | 83 | 17 |  |  | 247 |
| 13\% | 7\% | 73 | 39 |  |  | 281 |
| 11\% | 9\% | 60 | 47 |  |  | 294 |
| 11\% | 16\% | 60 | 88 |  |  | 266 |
| 17\% | 12\% | 96 | 66 |  |  | 296 |
| 12\% | 14\% | 66 | 78 |  |  | 283 |
| 6\% | 14\% | 34 | 78 |  |  | 239 |
| 4\% | 13\% | 23 | 71 |  |  | 191 |
| 0\% | 11\% | 2 | 61 | 0 | 132 | 0 |


| Saturday |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brand Experience Visitor Trips | Staff Trips |  |
| 747 | 747 | 132 |
| IN | OUT | Park Acc |
| 79 | 14 | 197 |
| 112 | 23 | 287 |
| 98 | 52 | 332 |
| 81 | 64 | 349 |
| 81 | 118 | 312 |
| 129 | 89 | 352 |
| 88 | 105 | 336 |
| 45 | 105 | 276 |
| 31 | 96 | 212 |
| 2 | 82 | 0 |

## APPENDIX H - TRICS Database <br> Outputs

Site Reference:
Latitude/Longitude:
Land Use Type:
Region/Area
Description:
Street:
District:
Town:
Post Code:
Planning Authority:
Location:
Location Sub Category:
Use Class:
Population within 500m:
Population within 1 Mile:
Population within 5 Miles:
Car ownership within 5 Miles:
Reason for blank public transport table:

WM-10-A-01
52.18886, -1.48111

10 - TOURIST ATTRACTIONS/A - TOURIST ATTRACTIONS
WEST MIDLANDSWEST MIDLANDS
MOTOR CENTRE
OFF THE B4100
GAYDON
NEAR WARWICK
CV35 0BJ

Free Standing (PPS6 Out of Town)
Out of Town
D2

0
1,001 to 5,000
5,001 to 25,000
0.6 to 1.0

No local PT

Is site associated with a travel plan:
No
If not, are there any plans to implement a Travel Plan in the future?
Is survey data available before the
implementation of the Travel Plan? Is the location of the site hilly or flat: Urban Regeneration:

No. of developments for this Site:
No. of survey Days for this Site:

## Comments

The site is located south of Coventry, and to the east of Stratford Upon Avon. It is west of Junction 12 of the M40 and is surrounded by open land.

Bus (or tram) site accessibility

1. Is there a site specific company bus service associated with the development?: Yes
2. If Yes to question 1, for how many years: 0
3. Please enter general comments/views about the relevance, quality and importance of public transport services relating to this development.
There is no local public transport available.
Design features encouraging non-car modes
4. Pedestrians

None
13. Pedal cycles

None
14. Public transport

None


| Site reference:Trade name: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | HERITAGE MOTOR CENTRE |  |
| Site area (h/a): |  | 25.50 |  |
| Open since |  | 1993 |  |
| Total Employees |  | 150 |  |
| Full Time Employees |  | 90 60\% |  |
| Part Time Employees |  | 60 40\% |  |
| Approximate \% of total employees working standard 9-5 hours or similar |  | 100\% |  |
| Percentage Split of Employee Gender |  |  |  |
|  | Male <br> Female |  |  |
| Name of nearest site |  | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & 50 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | COVENTRY TRANSPORT M. |  |
| Distance to nearest similar site |  | 25.0 | Km |
| OPENING TIMES (24 Hour forma |  |  |  |
| Mon to Thurs | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Friday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Saturday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |
| Sunday | 10:00 | to | 17:00 |

## Comments

The site contains a gift shop, licenced cafe, land rover $4 \times 4$ experience, go kart track and kids mini railway.

| On-Site parking |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total no. of parking spaces | 422 |
| Number of spaces |  |
| Employee | 0 |
| Disabled | 40 |
| Visitor/Customer | 0 |
| OGV parking bays | 0 |
| Cycle racks | 0 |
| OGV loading bays | 0 |
| Mother \& Toddler | 4 |
| Motorcycle spaces | No |

Comments about the management of the site car park, along with enforcement measures There is also one space for the site's shuttle bus, included in the total spaces shown.

Site parking surface or non-surface (multi-storey/underground) Surface

Off-Site parking details
Is there off-site parking available No
Off-Site parking included in the counts No
Free On-Street parking available nearby No
If yes, considered easy to find a space
No
If prepared to pay, easy to find somewhere to park off-site all day No

Parking restrictions
Area subject to parking restrictions (controlled parking zone - CPZ) No

Off-Street parking
Off-Street parking available NO
Park \& Ride
Park \& Ride Type Facility providing relevant means of accessing the site No
Site reference:
WM-10-A-01
Survey date: 15/02/06
Day of week: Wednesday

| Survey type: | Manual Count |
| :--- | :--- |
| AM weather: | Mild and Cloudy |
| PM weather: | Mild and Clear |

Initial car park occupancy: 15
BRACKETED ACCUMULATION FIGURES ARE NOT ABSOLUTE Parking Capacity 24\% (422 On-Site Spaces) Data proportions in \%
Motor cars 98
Motor cycles
OGV (1)
Public service
OGV (2)
Taxis

0
0
OGV (2)

Taxis are included as cars in this survey

| Time | Arr 313 | Dep 328 | Totals 641 | Parking Accum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 33 | 6 | 39 | 42 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 47 | 10 | 57 | 79 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 41 | 23 | 64 | 97 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 34 | 28 | 62 | 103 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 34 | 52 | 86 | 85 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 54 | 39 | 93 | 100 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 37 | 46 | 83 | 91 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 19 | 46 | 65 | 64 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 13 | 42 | 55 | 35 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 36 | 37 | 0 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |

## Comments

No PSVs, pedal cycles or taxis entered or exited the site during this survey.
Site reference:
WM-10-A-01
Survey date: 15/02/06
Day of week: Wednesday

## Vehicles surveyed: OGV

Data proportions in \%
OGV (1) 100
OGV (2) 0

1 occupant per OGV is assumed, and included in the vehicle occupants count

| Time | Arr 1 | Dep 1 | Totals 2 | Accumulation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00-09:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 1 | 2 | (0) |
| 10:00-11:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 11:00-12:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 12:00-13:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 13:00-14:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 14:00-15:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 15:00-16:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 16:00-17:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 18:00-19:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX I - Gravity Distribution Model


| MsOA - Lower Layer (Population Centres -Weighted Centroids) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| E01028479: Cherwell 001A-Mollington | 27.0 |
| E01028480: Cherwell 0018 - Wardington | 24.528.128.1 |
|  |  |
| E01028509: Cherwell 0010 - Wroxton |  |
| E01028443 : Cherwell 002C - North Oxfordshire Academy | 22.9 |
|  | 23.2 |
| E01028444: Cherwell 002 D - Hill V View Primary 5 chool | 22.8 |
| E01032943: Cherwell 002 E - Usher Drive, Hawwell FieldsE01032943 | 23.6 |
|  | 23.3 |
| E01028445: Cherwell 003 BA - Beaumont Industrial Estate | 22.6 |
| E01028446: Cherwell 0038 - Ruscote | 22.1 |
| E01028447: Cherwell 003 C - Townsend, Neithrop | 21.8 |
| E01028448: Cherwell 0030 - Gillett Road, Neithrop | 21.6 |
|  | 20.8 |
| E01028435: Cherwell 0 O4A-Castle Quay Shopping Centre | ${ }^{21.1}$ |
| E01028438: Cherwell 004 D - Spiceball Park | 21.3 |
| E01028439 : Cherwell 004 E -Winchester Close, Grimsbury | 20.7 |
| E01028440: Cherwell 0 04F - South Street, (rimsbury | 20.9 |
| E01032941 : Cherwell 0046 -Thorpe Wa, , Grimsbury | 20.5 |
| E01032942: Cherwell 0044 -Banbury | 20.5 |
| E01028449: Cherwell 005 A -Bretch hill (E) | 21.7 |
| E01028450: Cherwell 0 O5B-Edmunds Road | 22.0 |
|  | 22.9 |
| E01028452: Cherwell 005 S - Cromwell Road, Bretch Hill | 22.3 |
| E01028453: Cherwell 0 O5E-D Dover Avenue, , Bretch hill | 22.5 |
| E01028454: Cherwell 005 F - Miller Road, Neithrop | 22.2 |
|  | ${ }^{21.3}$ |
|  | 20.8 |
| E01028432: Cherwell 006 C - Banbury Academy | ${ }^{20.6}$ |
| E01028433 : Cherwell 0060 - Blessed George Napier Catholic School and Sixth Form College, Banbury | 19.7 |
| E01028434: Cherwell 0066 - Tudor Hall School | 21.1 |
| E01028426: Cherwell 007 A - Bankside, Cherwell Heights | 19.5 |
| E01028427: Cherwell 0078-Upper Windsor Street, Calthorpe | 20.5 <br> 19.4 |
| E01028428: Cherwell 007 C - Chatsworth Drive, herwell He eights | 19.4 |
|  | 20.0 |
| E01028422: Chewell 0088 - Twyford | 16.6 |
|  | 16.4 |
|  | 18.5 |
| E01028476: Cherwell 0 O8D-B-BIoxham ( N ) | 19.8 |
| E01028474:Cherwell 0 O9A-Milcombe | 20.0 |
| E01028485: Cherwell 00988 - Hook Nooton (N) | 25.2 |
| E01028886: Cherwell 0 OgC - Wigigiton | 24.8 |
|  | 22.7 27.0 |
| E01028481: Cherwell 010 A - Deddington ( 5 ) | 14.4 |
| E01028482: Cherwell 010 B - Barford St Michael | 16.6 |
| E01028505: Cherwell 0100 - CaulcottE01028506: Cherwell 0100 - Souldern | 8.4 |
|  | 8.4 |
| E01028507: Cherwell 010 E -Middle Aston | ${ }_{5}^{12.4}$ |
| E01028425: : herwell 011 A - Ambrosden ( W ) | ${ }_{5}^{5.1}$ |
| E01028477: Cherwell 0118 - Bucknell | 5.6 0.6 |
| E01028483: Cherwell 0111 - Stratton Audley | 8.4 |
| E01028484: Cherwell 011 E - -ringford | 4.6 |
| E01028499: Cherwell 011 F - -aunton | 2.6 |
| E01028459: Cherwell 012 - Lime Crescent, Southwold | ${ }_{1.6}^{0.7}$ |
| E0010284461: Cherwell 1012 C- Willow Crive, Southwold | 1.6 1.1 |
| E01028462: Cherwell 012 L - Taylor Cllose, Bure Park | 1.4 |
| E01028455: Cherwell 013 A - Manston Park | 1.2 |
|  | 1.4 |
|  | 1.0 |
| E01028458: Cherwell 0130 - Glory Farm, Bicester | ${ }^{0.8}$ |
| E01028467: Cherwell 013 E - Bicester North Station | 1.9 |
| E01028466: Cherwell 014 A -The Bicester School | 2.6 |
| E01028449: Cherwell 014 B - Bunyan Road, BicesterE01028470: Cherwell 014 C -Hudson Street, Bicester | 2.3 |
|  | 1.9 |
| E01028471: Cherwell 014 D - Orchard Way, Bicester | 2.4 |
| E01028472: Cherwell 014 E - Hemingway Drive, Bicester | 2.7 3.0 |
| E01028473 : Cherwell 014 F - Eden Way, , Bicester | 3.0 |
|  | 2.4 |
| E01028465: Cherwell 015 C - Avocet Way, Bicester | 3.1 2.9 |
| E010284688: Cherwell 015 D - Chapel Street, Bicester | 2.4 |
|  | 4.7 |
| E01028497: Cherwell 0168 - Weston On The Green | 9.7 |
|  | 11.7 |
|  | 7.8 |
| E01028501: Cherwell 016E-Murcott | 9.0 |
| E01028502 : Cherwell 016 F - -sip | 12.1 |
| E01028487: Cherwell 017 A - Grovelands, , Kidilington | 15.0 |
| E01028489: Cherwell 0178 -Church Street, Kidlington | 14.2 14.5 |
| $\frac{\text { E01028490: Cherwel } 017 \text { C-Marborough Avenue, Kidilington }}{\text { E01028491: Cherwell } 017 \mathrm{D} \text { - } \text { Exeter Road , Kidilinton }}$ | 14.5 14.5 |
| E01028494: Cherwell 017 E - Bellenger Way, Kidlington | 15.2 |
| E01028492: Cherwell 1818 -Churchill Road, Kidldington | 14.8 |
| E01028493: Cherwell 0188 - Queens Avenue, Kidlington | ${ }^{14.2}$ |
| E01028495: Cherwell 018 C - Morton Avenue, , Kidilington E01028496: ${ }^{\text {Cherwell } 0180}$ - Beech Crescent, Kidilinton | 15.1 |
| E01028488: Chervell 019 A - Oxtord A irport | 15.4 14.8 |
|  | 14.8 16.3 |
| E01228510: Cherwell 0198 - Begbroke | 14.9 |
| E01028512 : Cherwell 0190 - Yarnton | 16.8 |

[^2][^3]








## APPENDIX J - Traffic Turning Flow Diagrams


























## APPENDIX K - OCC SATURN Model <br> Outputs






\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{18}{*}{} \& \multirow{18}{*}{A41 Oxford Road／Vendee Drive roundabout} \& \({ }^{\text {Amma }}\) AM1（North） \&  \& \({ }^{63}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& \({ }^{63}\) \& \({ }_{6}^{63}\) \& \({ }^{27}\) \& \({ }^{4}\) \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& \({ }^{31}\) \& \({ }^{31}\) \& \({ }^{62}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& \({ }^{62}\) \& 62 \\
\hline \& \& ARMA ：AA1（ North） \& ARM ：AA1（Suth） \& 454 \& \({ }_{141}\) \& 97 \& 54 \& 10 \& 658 \& 711 \& 565 \& 107 \& \({ }_{84}\) \& \({ }_{47}\) \& 10 \& 729 \& 776 \& 744 \& \({ }_{80}\) \& 。 \& \({ }_{16}\) \& 10 \& \({ }_{850}\) \& 872 \\
\hline \& \& Amma \(:\) al（ （orth） \& ARmD：Pri（Wett） \& 2 \& － \& 0 \& － \& ， \& \({ }^{2}\) \& 2 \& 3 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& ， \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \({ }^{3}\) \& 1 \& \& 0 \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& \& 1 \& \({ }^{1}\) \\
\hline \& \& ARMAAAP（ North） \& \& 118 \& 0 \& － \& － \& 2 \& 120 \& 122 \& 129 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 5 \& 3 \& 2 \& 134 \& 138 \& 302 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }^{4}\) \& 2 \& 2 \& \({ }^{306}\) \& 310
153 \\
\hline \& \& ARMP：Unlabeled d R （IEst） \& Amma \(:\) A1（North） \& \({ }^{137}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& \({ }^{137}\) \& 137 \& \({ }^{37}\) \& 7 \& \({ }^{12}\) \& 7 \& \& 51 \& 57 \& 146 \& 7 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& 153 \& 153 \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& 2 \& 0 \& ： \& ： \& \& \(\stackrel{0}{2}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{2}\) \& \({ }_{2}^{0}\) \& ： \& \(\stackrel{4}{4}\) \& \({ }_{2}\) \& \& 4 \& \({ }_{6}\) \& \({ }_{15}\) \& ： \& \({ }_{1}^{0}\) \& \({ }_{1}\) \& \& \({ }_{16}^{0}\) \& \\
\hline \& \& ARMP：Unlabeled AdGESt \& ARmD．PrR（ （eett \& ， \& O \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& 9 \& \({ }_{9}^{8}\) \& \({ }_{6}^{13}\) \& 0 \& ： \& 0 \& \& \begin{tabular}{l}
13 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \({ }_{1}^{13}\) \& \({ }_{29}^{5}\) \& 。 \& 0 \& ： \& \& 5
29 \& \({ }_{2}{ }^{5}\) \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \({ }_{831}\) \& \(\stackrel{1}{0}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{190}\) \& 78 \& 10 \& \(\stackrel{9}{1074}\) \& 1146 \& \({ }_{612}^{6}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{19}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{121}\) \& \({ }_{67}\) \& 10 \& \({ }_{83}^{6}\) \& \({ }_{903}^{6}\) \& \({ }_{880}^{29}\) \& \({ }_{139}\) \& \({ }_{34}\) \& \({ }_{19}\) \& 10 \& 2988
1048 \& \({ }_{1073}{ }^{29}\) \\
\hline \& \& ARMC：AA1（South） \&  \& 18 \& \& O \& 0 \& \& 18 \& 18 \& 35 \& \& ， \& \& \& 35 \& 35 \& 22 \& \& \& 。 \& \& 22 \& 22 \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \({ }_{75}\) \& ： \& ： \& ： \& \& \({ }_{75}\) \& \({ }_{7}{ }^{\circ}\) \& \({ }_{295}\) \& ： \& \(\bigcirc\) \& ： \& \& \({ }_{295}\) \& \({ }_{2} 295\) \& \({ }_{105}^{0}\) \& ： \& \(\bigcirc\) \& ： \& \& \({ }_{105}\) \& 105 \\
\hline \& \& ARMC：AA1（South） \& ARME VVendee or（Nort \& 267 \& 9 \& 11 \& 6 \& 2 \& 285 \& 292 \& 147 \& \({ }^{17}\) \& 18 \& 10 \& 2 \& 176 \& 186 \& 442 \& \({ }_{41}\) \& 15 \& 8 \& 2 \& \({ }_{493}\) \& 502 \\
\hline \& \& armo：Primest） \& ARMA：AA1（North） \& 0 \& － \& 0 \& 。 \& \& 0 \& 0 \& － \& 。 \& 0 \& 。 \& \& － \& 0 \& \& \& 0 \& 。 \& \& 1 \& \\
\hline \& \& ammo primest \& ARMP：Ulabaleed R（ Isat） \& \& ： \& \(\bigcirc\) \& － \& \& \({ }_{7}^{2}\) \& \({ }_{7}^{2}\) \& 0 \& ： \& 0 \& － \& \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }_{3}^{1}\) \& ： \& ： \& ： \& \& 1 \& \\
\hline \& \& Ammo．pramest \&  \& 7 \& ： \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& \& 7 \& ？ \& 1 \& ： \& ： \& ： \& \& 1 \& 1 \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \& － \& \％ \& \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \\
\hline \& \& Ammo pren（West） \& ARME：Vendee or（ （orth） \& 2 \& 。 \& － \& 。 \& \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \& 。 \& 0 \& 。 \& \& 1 \& 1 \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \& 0 \& 。 \& \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \\
\hline \& \& ARME：Vendee or（Nort） \& ARM M：A1（ \(\mathrm{North)}\) \& 309
35 \& ： \& \({ }_{14}\) \& \({ }_{8}^{0}\) \& \& \({ }_{42}^{309}\) \& 309 \& \({ }_{1}^{167}\) \& ： \& \({ }_{13}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \& \({ }^{167}\) \& \({ }_{38}^{167}\) \& \({ }_{33}^{221}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }_{1}^{1}\) \& ： \& \& \({ }_{33}^{221}\) \& \({ }_{23}^{222}\) \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \({ }_{403}^{35}\) \& \({ }_{64}\) \& \({ }_{96}^{14}\) \& \({ }_{53}^{8}\) \& 2 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
42 \\
522 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& 488
566 \& \({ }_{191}^{26}\) \& 11 \& \({ }_{25}^{13}\) \& \({ }_{14}\) \& 2 \& 33
217 \& \({ }_{23} 23\) \& \({ }^{33}\) \& 10 \& 12 \& \[
{ }_{7}^{0}
\] \& 2 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
33 \\
33 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \({ }_{3}{ }^{33}\) \\
\hline \& \& AMMEVevdeor 0 （（Worth） \& ARMO：Prs（West） \& 13 \& \({ }^{6}\) \& \({ }^{6}\) \& \({ }^{53}\) \& \& \({ }^{522}\) \& \(\begin{array}{r}13 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \& 0 \& 0 \& \({ }^{25}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{14}\) \& 2 \& 12 \& 230 \& \({ }_{24}\) \& 0 \& \({ }_{0}\) \& － \& 2 \& \({ }^{32}\) \& \\
\hline \multirow{12}{*}{12} \& \multirow{12}{*}{maounction9} \& Ammemi North \& Amm A．M1 North \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \& 0 \& \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \& \& \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \& \& \& \\
\hline \& \& AmA AMI North \& Amb man east \& 245 \& 1 \& \({ }^{68}\) \& \({ }^{38}\) \& \& \({ }^{284}\) \& 314 \& 171 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 57 \& 32 \& \& \({ }^{203}\) \& \({ }^{228}\) \& 157 \& 3 \& \({ }^{31}\) \& \({ }^{17}\) \& \& 177 \& 190 \\
\hline \& \& Amm A．M M Noorth \& Amm Di：A3west \& 800 \& 192 \& 799 \& 445 \& \& 1437 \& 1791 \& 1057 \& 252 \& \({ }_{686}\) \& \({ }^{383}\) \& \& 1692 \& 1995 \& 1670 \& 370 \& 560 \& 312 \& \& 2352 \& 2600 \\
\hline \& \& Ambeant last \& AmA AMI North \& 75 \& 1 \& \({ }^{45}\) \& 25 \& \& 101 \& 120 \& 51 \& 。 \& 58 \& 32 \& \& 84 \& 109 \& \({ }^{99}\) \& － \& 51 \& 29 \& \& 127 \& 150 \\
\hline \& \& Ambeal east \& Amm： all \(^{\text {East }}\) \& \& \({ }^{0}\) \& 0 \& － \& \& \({ }^{0}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& \& 0 \& \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \({ }_{854}^{208}\) \& \({ }_{214}^{31}\) \& \({ }_{21}^{51}\) \& 28
124 \& 12 \& \({ }_{128}^{267}\) \& \({ }_{1316}^{290}\) \& \({ }_{792}^{212}\) \& \({ }_{1}^{44}\) \& 26
146 \& \({ }_{81}^{14}\) \& 12 \& 271
1010 \& 282
1087
1 \& \({ }_{838}^{389}\) \& \({ }_{95}^{19}\) \& \({ }_{53}^{68}\) \& \begin{tabular}{|}
30 \\
30
\end{tabular} \& 12 \& \({ }_{975}^{412}\) \& \({ }^{414} 10\) \\
\hline \& \& AmCimisuth \& Amm A．M N North \& \({ }_{0}\) \& \({ }^{214}\) \& \({ }^{224}\) \& \({ }^{124}\) \& 12 \& 12 \& － \& 0 \& 0 \& \({ }_{0}\) \& 0 \& \& \(\bigcirc\) \& － \& 0 \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& 0 \& \％ \& \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \\
\hline \& \& \({ }^{\text {AmCM M M S South }}\) \&  \& \({ }^{306}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{43}\) \& 16 \& 9 \& \& 357 \& 364 \& \({ }_{2}^{210}\) \& \({ }^{37}\) \& \({ }^{46}\) \& \({ }^{25}\) \& \& \({ }^{272}\) \& \({ }^{293}\) \& \({ }_{3}^{343}\) \& \({ }^{23}\) \& \({ }^{29}\) \& \({ }^{16}\) \& \& \({ }^{382}\) \& 395 \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \({ }_{202}\) \& \({ }_{36}\) \& 50 \& \({ }_{28}\) \& \& \({ }_{266}\) \& \({ }^{288}\) \& 161 \& 30 \& \({ }_{9}\) \& \({ }_{27}\) \& \& \({ }_{218}\) \& 239 \& 566 \& 120 \& 26 \& \({ }_{15}\) \& \& \({ }_{7} 01\) \& 713 \\
\hline \& \& Amm： A a West \& AmA AMI North \& 1326 \& 244 \& 440 \& \({ }_{245}^{28}\) \& \& 1815 \& 2011 \& 1221 \& 268 \& \({ }^{298}\) \& 462 \& \& 1951 \& 2318 \& 1830 \& 372 \& \({ }_{638}\) \& 356 \& \& 2558 \& 2840 \\
\hline \& \& Amm \(:\) ：334 West \& Amm：Aal East \& 1018 \& 150 \& 148 \& \({ }^{83}\) \& 12 \& 1262 \& 1340 \& 925 \& 152 \& 159 \& 88 \& 12 \& 1177 \& 1259 \& 1219 \& 232 \& 61 \& \({ }^{34}\) \& 12 \& 1996 \& \\
\hline \& \& Ammian eser \&  \& （13 \& \({ }_{0}^{99}\) \& 59 \& －33 \& \& \({ }_{6}^{645}\) \& 672 \& \({ }_{0}^{105}\) \& \({ }_{8}^{8}\) \& 35 \& \({ }_{0}^{19}\) \& \& \({ }_{0}^{133}\) \& \({ }^{148} 8\) \& \({ }_{0}^{61}\) \& \({ }^{28}\) \& 45 \& \({ }_{0}^{25}\) \& \& \({ }_{0}^{113}\) \& \\
\hline \multirow{12}{*}{15} \& \multirow{12}{*}{A4095 Southwold Lane／B4100 Banbury Road roundabout} \& ARMA A8AOO（North） \& \(\xrightarrow{\text { ARMAAPAPIOO（North）}}\) \& \({ }_{387}\) \& \({ }_{88}^{0}\) \& \({ }_{4}^{0}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{24}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 5 \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& 0 \& 5 \& 33 \& 0 \& 35 \& 391 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& 27 \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& \\
\hline \& \& ARMA A4100（North） \& ARMP：A099（East） \& \({ }_{415}^{387}\) \& 88
88
88 \& \({ }^{4}\) \& 24 \& \({ }_{2}\) \& \({ }_{5}^{499}\) \& \& \& \({ }_{21}^{40}\) \& 60 \& \(3_{3}^{33}\) \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& － \(\begin{aligned} \& 364 \\ \& 238 \\ \& \text { 20，}\end{aligned}\) \& \({ }_{2}^{392}\) \& \({ }^{482}\) \& \({ }_{45}^{61}\) \& 27 \& \& \& \({ }_{258}^{598}\) \& \begin{tabular}{|c}
570 \\
301 \\
\hline 0
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \begin{tabular}{l}
145 \\
148 \\
\hline 80
\end{tabular} \& 15
18 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }_{6}\) \& 505
170 \& 507
176 \& \({ }_{6}^{212}\) \& \({ }_{2}^{21}\) \& \({ }_{6}^{6}\) \& \({ }^{3}\) \& \({ }_{6}\) \& \％
73
78 \& \({ }_{79}^{24}\) \& \({ }_{1}^{251}\) \& 7 \& ： \& ： \& 6 \& \({ }^{29}\) \& \\
\hline \& \& ARMB：AAO9S（East） \&  \& \({ }_{517}\) \& \({ }_{8}^{80}\) \& \({ }_{51}^{51}\) \& 290 \& ： \& cic \& 699 \& \({ }_{0}^{276}\) \& \({ }^{45}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{61}\) \& \({ }^{34}\) \& ： \& \({ }^{354}\) \& \({ }^{381}\) \& \(\stackrel{623}{62}\) \& \({ }^{48}\) \& 9 \& \({ }_{5}^{5}\) \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& 0 \\
\& 0
\end{aligned}
\] \& 675
2 \& \\
\hline \& \& ARME：A0995（East） \& ARMC：BA0100（suuth） \& 76 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& ： \& － \& ： \& \({ }_{76}\) \& 76 \& \({ }_{64}\) \& \({ }_{3}\) \& ： \& － \& ： \& 67 \& 67 \& \({ }_{76}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& ： \& ： \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \({ }_{76}\) \& \({ }_{76}{ }^{2}\) \\
\hline \& \& ARME：A0095（tast） \& ARMD：Aa995 West） \& \({ }^{346}\) \& \({ }^{78}\) \& 94 \& \({ }_{5} 3\) \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& \({ }^{476}\) \& 518 \& \({ }_{251}^{251}\) \& \({ }^{36}\) \& \({ }^{21}\) \& \({ }^{12}\) \& 0 \& \({ }^{299}\) \& 309 \& 500 \& \({ }^{39}\) \& \({ }^{10}\) \& 6 \& 0 \& \({ }^{544}\) \& 549 \\
\hline \& \&  \& ARMA Ba400（North） \& \({ }_{304}\) \& 52 \& 0 \& \％ \& \({ }^{2}\) \& \({ }^{357}\) \& 359 \& \({ }_{1}^{156}\) \& \({ }^{26}\) \& 8 \& 4 \& 2 \& \({ }^{188}\) \& 194 \& \({ }^{309}\) \& \({ }_{6}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 2 \& \({ }^{373}\) \& 375 \\
\hline \& \& ARMC ：B4100（south） \& ARMC：B41100（ssuth） \& 0 \& 0 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& \({ }^{\circ}\) \& \％ \& 0 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& 0 \& \％ \& \\
\hline \& \& AmmC：B8100（South） \& ARMD：An095 West） \& 54 \& 0 \& 0 \& 。 \& 。 \& 54 \& 54 \& 30 \& 。 \& 3 \& 2 \& － \& 32 \& \({ }^{33}\) \& 49 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& － \& 49 \& 4 \\
\hline \& \& ARMD：An095（West） \& ARMA：B4100（North） \& \({ }^{45}\) \& 0 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& 45 \& 45 \& \({ }^{42}\) \& 0 \& \& 0 \& 0 \& \({ }^{42}\) \& 42 \& 26 \& － \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 26 \& 26 \\
\hline \& \& ARMD：AAOOS（West） \&  \& （30 20 \& （15 \& 16 \& 0 \& － \& 375
20 \& 382
20 \& \({ }_{28}^{217}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{31}\) \& \({ }_{3}^{19}\) \& \({ }_{2}^{11}\) \& ： \& （258 \& \({ }_{31}^{267}\) \& 503
55 \& \({ }_{0}^{69}\) \& 168 \& \％ \& \(\bigcirc\) \& （ 581 \& \\
\hline \& \& ARMD：Anoss（ （est） \& ARMD：AA095（ West） \& \({ }_{0}^{20}\) \& 0 \& 0 \& 。 \& 0 \& \({ }_{0}^{20}\) \& \({ }_{0}\) \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& － \& 0 \& － \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& － \& 0 \& 。 \& 0 \& 0 \& \\
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{16} \& \multirow{4}{*}{Aa1 OXtorrd Road／Wendeleury Road} \& AmAAA1（North） \&  \& \({ }_{749}^{124}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{201}\) \& \({ }_{188}^{0}\) \& \({ }_{105}^{\text {105 }}\) \& \({ }_{12}^{0}\) \& \({ }_{1067}^{124}\) \& \({ }_{1123}^{124}\) \& \({ }_{736}^{25}\) \& \(\stackrel{1}{17}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{111}\) \& \({ }_{62}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{12}\) \& \({ }_{926}^{25}\) \& \({ }_{988}^{25}\) \& \({ }_{\substack{100 \\ 969}}\) \& \({ }_{87}^{2}\) \& \({ }_{40}^{10}\) \& \({ }_{22}^{1}\) \& \({ }_{12}\) \& 102
1000 \& \begin{tabular}{|}
103 \\
1120 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \& \&  \& \({ }^{\text {Amm CiAAI }}\) S South \& （ 346 \& 43
189 \&  \& 70
122 \& － \& － 458 \& \({ }^{514}\) \& \({ }_{383}^{383}\) \& \({ }^{61}\) \& \({ }_{125}^{117}\) \& \({ }^{65}\) \& 0 \& \({ }^{599}\) \& \({ }_{5}^{561}\) \& \({ }^{455}\) \& \({ }^{26}\) \& \({ }^{69}\) \& 38
30
80 \& 0 \& 519 \& 5159 \\
\hline \& \& C：AA1（South） \&  \& 1630 \& \({ }_{0}^{189}\) \& \begin{tabular}{c}
218 \\
0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} \& \({ }_{0}^{122}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{12}\) \& 1953 \& 202 \& \({ }^{1306}\) \& \({ }^{189}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{261}\) \& \({ }^{195}\) \& \({ }_{0}^{12}\) \& 165 \& 1780 \& \& \({ }^{232}\) \& \({ }^{108}\) \& \({ }^{6}\) \& 12 \& \& 2107 \\
\hline \& \& Ammi．Silip to ititle chesteton \& \(A\) AmA Ampl（North） \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 0 \& 0 \& \\
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{17} \& \multirow{4}{*}{Aa1／Ploughley Road} \& Plougher pd \& Left Tum out \& 279 \& \({ }^{55}\) \& 0 \& 0 \& \({ }^{2}\) \& \({ }^{336}\) \& \({ }^{338}\) \& \({ }^{136}\) \& \& \({ }^{60}\) \& \({ }^{33}\) \& \({ }^{2}\) \& \({ }^{183}\) \& \({ }^{212}\) \& \({ }^{358}\) \& \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 2 \& \& \({ }^{114}\) \\
\hline \& \& Ploughey pd \& Reinit Tur out \& 15 \& \& \({ }_{88}\) \& 0 \& \(\bigcirc\) \& 15 \& 15 \& \({ }_{6}^{3}\) \& \({ }_{18}\) \& \({ }_{93}\) \& \({ }_{52}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\begin{array}{r}3 \\ 704 \\ \hline\end{array}\) \& \(7{ }^{3} 4\) \& \(\stackrel{7}{1018}\) \& \({ }_{92}^{0}\) \& \({ }_{61}\) \& \({ }_{34}\) \& \(\bigcirc\) \& \(\stackrel{7}{1144}\) \& \({ }_{172} 7\) \\
\hline \& \&  \&  \& \begin{tabular}{l}
907 \\
307 \\
\hline 9
\end{tabular} \& 125
54 \& 888 \& \({ }_{0}\) \& \({ }_{2}\) \& \({ }_{363}^{1076}\) \& \({ }_{365}^{1115}\) \& 665 \& 48
19 \& \({ }_{60}^{93}\) \& \({ }_{34}^{52}\) \& \(\stackrel{0}{2}\) \& 784

220 \& | 748 |
| :--- |
| 248 |
| 1 | \& ${ }_{349}^{1018}$ \& ${ }_{60}^{92}$ \& ${ }^{61}$ \& ${ }^{34}$ \& 2 \& ${ }_{411}^{1144}$ \& ${ }_{413}^{117}$ <br>

\hline \& \& ${ }_{\text {A41 } 1 \times \mathrm{NB}}$ \& Lef Tum in \& ${ }_{953}$ \& ${ }_{110}$ \& ${ }_{118}^{0}$ \& ${ }_{66}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\stackrel{9}{1129}$ \& ${ }_{1181}{ }^{\text {d }}$ \& ${ }_{580}^{6}$ \& $\stackrel{0}{124}$ \& ${ }_{85}$ \& ${ }_{47}$ \& ： \& ${ }_{751}^{6}$ \& ${ }_{788}^{6}$ \& ${ }_{11}^{11}$ \& $\stackrel{0}{126}$ \& ${ }_{38}$ \& ${ }_{21}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 11
1210 \& ${ }_{12}^{112}$ <br>
\hline \multirow{12}{*}{18} \& \multirow{12}{*}{－imes Lane／Vendee（iviv／Midadeton} \& Howes lane \& Howestane \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& 5 \& 61 \& ${ }^{0}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 3 \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }_{6}$ \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& Midalleto Stoney Rd Esst \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& Howeslane \& Vendeo Oive \& 420 \& 98 \& 94 \& 53 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 571 \& 612 \& 163 \& ${ }^{22}$ \& ${ }^{21}$ \& ${ }^{11}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 197 \& 206 \& 299 \& ${ }^{20}$ \& 6 \& 3 \& 0 \& ${ }^{322}$ \& <br>

\hline \& \&  \& MModeto Stoney hd west \& ${ }_{71}^{129}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{1}$ \& ？ \& ${ }_{0}^{1}$ \& － \& ${ }_{71}^{132}$ \& ${ }_{71}^{133}$ \& ${ }_{50}^{76}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{4}$ \& ${ }_{0}$ \& ？ \& ： \& ${ }_{50}^{81}$ \& ¢0 \& ${ }_{55}^{87}$ \& ${ }_{1}^{11}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{5}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{3}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }_{5}^{101}$ \& | 103 |
| :---: |
| 55 | <br>

\hline \& \& Midideto Stoney RdS Gast \& Middeltoon Stoney Rd Est \& 4 \& 0 \& 0 \& 。 \& － \& 4 \& 4 \& 2 \& － \& 0 \& － \& 。 \& 2 \& 2 \& ${ }^{3}$ \& － \& 0 \& 。 \& － \& 3 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Midaleor Stoner R dast \& Vendee orive $\begin{aligned} & \text { Midilito Stoney } \mathrm{dd} \text { West }\end{aligned}$ \& ${ }_{323}^{187}$ \& ${ }_{41}^{49}$ \& ${ }_{35}$ \& ${ }_{20}$ \& ${ }_{1}^{0}$ \& ${ }_{3}^{237}$ \& ${ }_{401}^{237}$ \& ${ }_{231}^{72}$ \& 11
12 \& ${ }_{10}^{2}$ \& ${ }_{6}^{1}$ \& ${ }_{1}$ \& － 84 \& ${ }_{256} 8$ \& ${ }_{332}^{108}$ \& 11
16 \& ${ }_{3}^{2}$ \& $\frac{1}{2}$ \& ${ }_{1}$ \& 120
351 \& $c$ <br>
\hline \& \& Vendee orive \& Howes lane \& 199 \& 6 \& 11 \& 6 \& 0 \& 211 \& 216 \& 124 \& ${ }^{28}$ \& 18 \& 10 \& － \& 161 \& 170 \& 392 \& ${ }^{51}$ \& 16 \& 9 \& － \& 452 \& ${ }^{459}$ <br>
\hline \& \& Vende orive \& Mididetoo Stoney Rd bast \& 106 \& ${ }^{37}$ \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 144 \& 145 \& 101 \& 21 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 \& 123 \& 124 \& 254 \& ${ }^{38}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 292 \& 292 <br>
\hline \& \& Vendere orive \& Vendeo Dive \& ${ }^{136}$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{0}$ \& ${ }_{6}$ \& ${ }_{5}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& $\stackrel{0}{0}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& <br>
\hline \& \& Vendeeorive \& Mideleto Stoney Cd West \& ${ }_{54}^{136}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{6}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{5}$ \& ${ }_{3}$ \& ： \& ${ }_{59}^{142}$ \& ${ }_{61}^{142}$ \& ${ }_{48}^{156}$ \& ${ }_{6}$ \& ${ }_{4}^{5}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{3}$ \& ： \& ${ }_{51}^{165}$ \& $\underset{168}{\substack{168 \\ 53}}$ \& ${ }_{156}^{286}$ \& ${ }_{13}$ \& ${ }_{3}^{4}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{2}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 288

171 \& | 290 |
| :---: |
| 172 | <br>

\hline \& \& Midideon Stoney R W West \& Midadeten Stoney Rd East \& ${ }_{4}^{438}$ \& ${ }_{4}$ \& ${ }^{15}$ \& ${ }_{8}^{8}$ \& 1 \& ${ }^{489}$ \& ${ }_{29} 9$ \& ${ }_{121}^{291}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{17}$ \& ${ }_{13}^{15}$ \& 8 \& 1 \& ${ }_{317}^{317}$ \& 325 \& ${ }_{221}^{421}$ \& ${ }^{10}$ \& 6 \& 4 \& 1 \& ${ }^{435}$ \& ${ }^{439}$ <br>
\hline \& \& Mideleto Stoney A d West \& Verdee orive $\begin{aligned} & \text { Midideo stoneyd } \mathrm{d} \text { West }\end{aligned}$ \& 247
0 \& 1 \& 138 \& 7 \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }_{0}^{255}$ \& 261 \& ${ }_{0}^{124}$ \& 5 \& －13 \& ？ \& 0 \& 136
0 \& 142 \& ${ }_{0}^{234}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{4}$ \& 1 \& ： \& \& ${ }_{0}^{239}$ \& <br>
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{19} \& \multirow{5}{*}{Howes Lane／Bucknell Road} \& Buckell Rod North \& Bucknell Road South \& 92 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{12}$ \& 104 \& 116 \& ${ }^{47}$ \& 6 \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& 65 \& 77 \& 106 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 \& 12 \& 119 \& 131 <br>
\hline \& \& Bucknell Road \& westan \& ${ }^{174}$ \& \& \& \& \& 190 \& 190 \& \& \& \& \& \& 104 \& 104 \& 164 \& ${ }^{21}$ \& 0 \& － \& \& 185 \& 185 <br>
\hline \& \& $\substack{\text { Buckell } \\ \text { Buckel } \\ \text { Road South } \\ \text { South }}$ \& Suckell Road North \& ${ }_{11}^{61}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{1}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{0}$ \& ${ }_{1}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& 74
12 \& ${ }_{13}^{86}$ \& 30
25 \& ： \& ： \& ： \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{26}^{42}$ \& ${ }_{26}^{54}$ \& ${ }_{48}^{72}$ \& ${ }^{3}$ \& ： \& ： \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& 86
48
48 \& ${ }_{48}^{98}$ <br>
\hline \& \& Howestane \& Bucknell Road North \& 97 \& 10 \& \％ \& $\bigcirc$ \& － \& ${ }_{108}$ \& 108 \& 83 \& 。 \& － \& 。 \& 0 \& ${ }_{83}^{26}$ \& ${ }_{8}^{26}$ \& 186 \& 12 \& 。 \& － \& $\bigcirc$ \& 198 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Howes lane \& Bucknell Road South \& 15 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 15 \& 15 \& 24 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 24 \& 24 \& 49 \& 0 \& 3 \& 2 \& 0 \& 51 \& <br>
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{20} \& \multirow{4}{*}{Lords lane／Buchell Road} \& Buckeli Road North \& Buckell Road South \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{24}$ \& 0 \& O \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{24}$ \& 1 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{13}$ \& <br>
\hline \& \&  \&  \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& ： \& ： \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& － \& $\bigcirc$ \& － \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& <br>
\hline \& \& Lords lane \& Bucknel Road South \& 265 \& ${ }^{17}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& ${ }^{282}$ \& 282 \& 143 \& ${ }^{14}$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& ${ }^{157}$ \& 157 \& 269 \& ${ }^{23}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& ${ }^{292}$ \& ${ }_{2}^{222}$ <br>
\hline \& \&  \& Bucknell Road North
Lorst Lane \& ${ }_{158}^{0}$ \& ${ }_{11}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ： \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& 12
170 \& －${ }_{17}^{24}$ \& ${ }_{113}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& \％ \& ： \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{113}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{113}^{24}$ \& ${ }_{257}^{0}$ \& ${ }_{15}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 12 \& ${ }_{272}^{12}$ \& $\xrightarrow{24}$ <br>

\hline \multirow{5}{*}{22} \& \multirow{5}{*}{AA1 OXtord Road／Tesos} \& Oforar Road N \& Oextord Roads \& ${ }_{8}^{495}$ \& ${ }^{148}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{95}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{53}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& | 788 |
| :--- |
| 888 |
| 8 | \& ${ }_{836}^{762}$ \& ${ }_{543}^{549}$ \& ${ }^{117}$ \& ${ }_{84}^{84}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{47}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& | 276 |
| :--- |
| 543 |
| 125 | \& ${ }_{5}^{735}$ \& ${ }_{7}^{6165}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{101}$ \& ${ }^{28}$ \& ${ }^{16}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{744}$ \& ${ }_{7}^{725}$ <br>

\hline \& \& Oxtord hoad N \& Oresord Road N \& ${ }^{836}$ \& ${ }^{\circ}$ \& O \& \％ \& 0 \& ${ }^{836}$ \& 889 \& \& $\bigcirc$ \& \& 0 \& 0 \& ${ }^{543}$ \& ${ }^{543}$ \& \& 0 \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& － \& ${ }^{25}$ \& <br>
\hline \& \& Tesco \& Oxtrord haoas \& 311 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& 311 \& 311 \& 274 \& － \& － \& 。 \& 。 \& ${ }^{274}$ \& 274 \& ${ }_{738}$ \& 。 \& 。 \& 。 \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }_{738}$ \& ${ }_{738}$ <br>
\hline \& \& Oxtord Road 5 \& Oxtord Road N \& 718 \& 145 \& 130 \& 72 \& 10 \& 945 \& 1013 \& 512 \& 161 \& 133 \& 74 \& 10 \& 757 \& 826 \& 802 \& 131 \& 31 \& ${ }^{17}$ \& 10 \& 961 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Oxtord Roads \& Tesco \& ${ }^{734}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 734 \& 734 \& 378 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 378 \& 378 \& 567 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 567 \& <br>
\hline \multirow{4}{*}{${ }^{23}$} \& \multirow{4}{*}{${ }^{\text {a } 10 \text { Oxtord Road／Premier Inn }}$} \&  \&  \&  \& ${ }_{0}^{148}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{95}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{53}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& $\underset{\substack{874 \\ 144}}{ }$ \& ${ }_{148}^{928}$ \& ${ }_{58}^{765}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{117}$ \& ${ }_{8}^{84}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{47}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{58}^{942}$ \& ${ }_{58}^{991}$ \& ${ }_{1169}^{1186}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{101}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{28}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{16}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{\substack{1314 \\ 169}}$ \& $\underset{\substack{139 \\ 169}}{ }$ <br>
\hline \& \& Premier Inn \& Oxtord Road N \& ${ }^{114}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& ${ }^{114}$ \& 114 \& 77 \& － \& 0 \& － \& － \& 77 \& 77 \& 94 \& － \& 0 \& 。 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 94 \& <br>
\hline \& \& Premier Inn \& Oxtord Road 5 \& 29 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 29 \& 29 \& ${ }^{24}$ \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 24 \& 24 \& \& \& 0 \& 0 \& \& 26 \& 26 <br>
\hline \& \&  \& Otatior Road N \& 1337

13 \& ${ }^{145}$ \& | 130 |
| :---: |
| 0 |
| 0 | \& ${ }_{7}^{72}$ \& 10 \& ${ }_{13}^{1565}$ \& ${ }_{13}^{1632}$ \& 813

30 \& ${ }_{0}^{161}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{133}$ \& 74 \& ${ }_{0}^{10}$ \& 1059
30 \& ${ }_{30}^{1127}$ \& ${ }_{35}^{1276}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{131}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{31}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{17}$ \& ${ }_{10}^{10}$ \& ${ }_{1}^{1434}$ \& <br>
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{${ }^{24}$} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{AA1 OXXtord Road／Wendeleury Road} \& Oxtord Road N \& Oxtorc Roads \& ${ }_{541}^{54}$ \& ${ }^{138}$ \& 95 \& 53 \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{749}$ \& 798 \& 673 \& 106 \& ${ }^{83}$ \& ${ }^{46}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{837}$ \& ${ }^{886}$ \& 994 \& ${ }^{78}$ \& ${ }^{28}$ \& ${ }^{16}$ \& ${ }^{12}$ \& ${ }^{1100}$ \& ${ }^{1125}$ <br>
\hline \& \& Oxtord Road W Wendeburr Rad \& Wendleury c （xad \& 150
101 \& ${ }^{9}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 0 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 159
101 \& ${ }_{101}^{159}$ \& ${ }_{54}^{117}$ \& ${ }_{4}^{11}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{1}$ \& ${ }_{3}^{1}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& 129
60 \& ${ }_{63}^{129}$ \& ${ }_{116}^{218}$ \& ${ }_{0}^{22}$ \& 0 \& ${ }_{2}$ \& $\bigcirc$ \& ${ }_{118}^{240}$ \& （200 <br>
\hline \multirow{5}{*}{25} \& \multirow{5}{*}{} \& ${ }^{84100}$ \& Stiohn Street \& ${ }^{237}$ \& ${ }^{42}$ \& ${ }^{11}$ \& ${ }^{6}$ \& ${ }^{20}$ \& ${ }^{305}$ \& ${ }^{330}$ \& ${ }^{196}$ \& ${ }^{21}$ \& 12 \& 1 \& ${ }^{20}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{239}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{260}$ \& ${ }^{189}$ \& ${ }^{14}$ \& ${ }^{6}$ \& ${ }^{3}$ \& ${ }^{20}$ \& ${ }^{227}$ \& ${ }^{249}$ <br>
\hline \& \&  \& ${ }_{\text {cole }}^{\substack{\text { auens } \\ \text { B400 }}}$ \& 541
176 \& ${ }_{10}$ \& ${ }_{6}^{14}$ \& ${ }_{3}^{8}$ \& ${ }_{20}$ \& 590
209 \& ${ }_{232}^{596}$ \& ${ }_{236}^{474}$ \& 31
16 \& ${ }_{8}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{5}^{6}$ \& ${ }_{20}^{0}$ \& 511

277 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
516 <br>
300 <br>
\hline

 \& ${ }_{339}^{538}$ \& ${ }_{21}^{12}$ \& ${ }_{13}$ \& ${ }_{8}^{\circ}$ \& ${ }_{20}$ \& 

638 <br>
388 <br>
\hline

 \& 

630 <br>
414
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline \& \& St ohn＇s street \& Quens Avenue \& 320 \& 90 \& ${ }^{4}$ \& ${ }^{24}$ \& 15 \& 449 \& 483 \& 380 \& 35 \& 21 \& 12 \& 15 \& 443 \& 467 \& 376 \& 12 \& 4 \& 2 \& 15 \& ${ }_{405}$ \& ${ }_{422}$ <br>
\hline \& \& saverue \& 100 \& 603 \& 76 \& 15 \& 8 \& 0 \& 687 \& 694 \& 440 \& 67 \& 30 \& 17 \& 0 \& ${ }_{5} 5$ \& 537 \& 686 \& 84 \& 0 \& 。 \& $\bigcirc$ \& 770 \& 770 <br>
\hline \& \& Quens Avenue \& Stuohn Street \& 192 \& 11 \& 15 \& 8 \& 15 \& 227 \& 248 \& 223 \& 11 \& 14 \& 8 \& 15 \& 257 \& 278 \& 200 \& 7 \& 18 \& 10 \& 15 \& 232 \& 255 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}





| ＊ | « | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | \％ | w | \％ | w | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | แ | ${ }_{\sim}$ | \％ | ๕ | $\sim$ | \％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ะ， | ジ呂 | 500 \％\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | －ちゃロゴ | 500500 |  |  |  | －岛 |  |  | －Еّ\％ |  |  | 砢～が号の |  | －ローがの\％ |
|  | － | － |  |  |  | $\bigcirc \circ \square$ | 000000 |  | －！00\％ | 宸。 | き००㞻 | ○ロロー\％ | 20\％000 | －○○ロー～ |
| －※ロゴっ。 | －00－0． |  |  |  |  | 00\％ | － | － | －\％00さ0 | －\％ $00 \%$ | ※๐० w | －\％00さ0 | $\bigcirc$ | をーを |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ずっo菖え。 |  |  | －も艺式○ヲ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －号च。㫐め |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $0$ |  |  |  | \| |  | －\％¢ ¢ 0 \％A | －すへ～离告 |  |  |  |  |  |
| い号00 已。 | －0000000 |  |  |  |  | －○を00気 |  |  | －\％0030 | －号～ロを゚ |  | $\bigcirc$－¢ ¢－M |  | －¢ّ \％ |
| \％\％○～w o |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc 80000$ |  |  |  |  | ○ |
| E～OT～0 | ．000000 | 000000 |  | － |  | － 0 A 000 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ ¢ $00 \square_{0} 0$ | －200こ0 | 100200～ | －＊－0い | 500000 | －の |
| － | －Oローロ | －त00号 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5こっちこ0 |  |  |  |  |  | －\％¢ ¢ \％へ | －台幻智号 |  |  | 咜点以苟氛 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －\％\％\％\％t |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 家○以茄。 |  | \％00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 容的出客 |  |  |  |  |
| －号○いこ゚。 |  | 500\％00 |  |  |  | － 0 宮 $00 \%$ |  | －0\％ono |  | －宮～0き気 |  |  | \％ち～0＊ | －○ち号○ |
|  |  |  | － |  |  | －○ 000 号 |  |  | \％ | －W00～0 | －0さんロ～ |  |  | －woちゃの |
| いこロロを0 |  |  | －をか00い○のロ0000000 |  |  |  |  |  | －いootu | こ。 | ち～0に |  |  |  |
|  | －○ロ－ | －500 0 | 10000000000000000 | －00000n0000000no |  |  |  |  | －noono |  |  |  |  | －0ヶ00の |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | \％\％－\％\％ |  |  |  |  | そ | －¢ ！－¢－ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 試さのび。 | －¢ | －\％\％\％\％\％ |  |  | むヶ4～0 |  |  |

APPENDIX L - Preliminary FAST Mitigation Proposal Drawings




## APPENDIX M - Junctions 9 Outputs -

 Reference Case
## Junctions 9

## ARCADY 9 - Roundabout Module

Version: 9.5.0.6896<br>© Copyright TRL Limited, 2018

For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: 1_191021_A4421 Buckingham rd_Buck rd_A4421 Skim Ln_FAST_MITIGATED_V2.j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonklDropbox (mode)\Project\Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
Data\Modelling\200125_EQ\Baseline
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:15:47

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```

Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 24.1 | 56.26 | 0.99 | F | 1.2 | 4.07 | 0.54 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.4 | 5.28 | 0.58 | A | 25.8 | 52.00 | 0.99 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.0 | 7.56 | 0.51 | A | 4.2 | 33.21 | 0.83 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3.4 | 9.48 | 0.78 | A | 4.6 | 14.64 | 0.83 | B |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 26.4 | 60.24 | 1.00 | F | 1.9 | 5.33 | 0.65 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.5 | 5.52 | 0.60 | A | 72.9 | 128.94 | 1.07 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.1 | 8.21 | 0.53 | A | 6.7 | 53.44 | 0.90 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 5.5 | 14.57 | 0.85 | B | 4.9 | 15.67 | 0.84 | C |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 40.5 | 83.52 | 1.03 | F | 3.0 | 7.68 | 0.75 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 2.1 | 6.97 | 0.68 | A | 148.3 | 250.46 | 1.17 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.5 | 10.70 | 0.61 | B | 7.6 | 61.26 | 0.91 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 7.5 | 19.86 | 0.89 | c | 8.3 | 26.04 | 0.91 | D |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 36.9 | 76.85 | 1.02 | F | 2.8 | 7.35 | 0.74 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.8 | 6.34 | 0.65 | A | 112.6 | 194.34 | 1.13 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.4 | 9.81 | 0.59 | A | 8.7 | 68.32 | 0.93 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 6.2 | 16.74 | 0.87 | C | 6.6 | 21.11 | 0.88 | C |

[^4]
## File summary

File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $04 / 05 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3-Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 25.66 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Buckingham Road |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4095 Southwold Lane |  |

Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V-Approach road half-width (m) | E - Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R - Entry radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 3.50 | 9.90 | 50.0 | 48.9 | 50.0 | 15.5 |  |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3.60 | 10.00 | 55.0 | 13.3 | 50.0 | 28.5 |  |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 3.20 | 8.20 | 33.0 | 15.9 | 50.0 | 30.5 |  |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3.80 | 9.30 | 30.0 | 31.4 | 50.0 | 26.0 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.807 | 2629 |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.746 | 2455 |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.654 | 1961 |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.726 | 2271 |

The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1415 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 856 | 100.000 |
| 3- Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 442 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1195 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 35 | 586 | 374 | 420 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 268 | 0 | 17 | 571 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 252 | 91 | 0 | 99 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 245 | 905 | 45 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) |  |  |  |  |  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.99 | 56.26 | 24.1 | F |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.58 | 5.28 | 1.4 | A |
| 3-Buckingham Road | 0.51 | 7.56 | 1.0 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.78 | 9.48 | 3.4 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1065 | 780 | 1856 | 0.574 | 1060 | 1.3 | 4.492 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 644 | 655 | 1849 | 0.349 | 642 | 0.5 | 2.978 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 333 | 970 | 1270 | 0.262 | 331 | 0.4 | 3.831 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 900 | 484 | 1857 | 0.485 | 896 | 0.9 | 3.734 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1272 | 934 | 1737 | 0.732 | 1267 | 2.7 | 7.576 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 770 | 783 | 1750 | 0.440 | 769 | 0.8 | 3.663 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 397 | 1161 | 1138 | 0.349 | 397 | 0.5 | 4.849 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1074 | 580 | 1788 | 0.601 | 1072 | 1.5 | 5.013 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1558 | 1140 | 1576 | 0.989 | 1499 | 17.4 | 33.687 | D |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 942 | 928 | 1638 | 0.575 | 940 | 1.3 | 5.140 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 487 | 1404 | 971 | 0.501 | 485 | 1.0 | 7.372 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1316 | 708 | 1696 | 0.776 | 1308 | 3.3 | 9.118 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1558 | 1146 | 1571 | 0.991 | 1531 | 24.1 | 56.264 | F |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 942 | 946 | 1624 | 0.580 | 942 | 1.4 | 5.281 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 487 | 1416 | 963 | 0.506 | 487 | 1.0 | 7.561 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1316 | 710 | 1694 | 0.777 | 1315 | 3.4 | 9.484 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1272 | 942 | 1730 | 0.735 | 1357 | 2.9 | 11.880 | B |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 770 | 836 | 1709 | 0.450 | 772 | 0.8 | 3.849 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 397 | 1193 | 1116 | 0.356 | 399 | 0.6 | 5.037 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1074 | 585 | 1784 | 0.602 | 1082 | 1.5 | 5.177 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1065 | 786 | 1852 | 0.575 | 1071 | 1.4 | 4.647 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 644 | 662 | 1844 | 0.350 | 646 | 0.5 | 3.009 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 333 | 977 | 1265 | 0.263 | 334 | 0.4 | 3.868 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 900 | 487 | 1854 | 0.485 | 902 | 0.9 | 3.791 | A |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 1 - A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30 m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 29.06 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 960 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1642 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 439 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1061 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 23 | 289 | 329 | 319 |
|  | 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 609 | 0 | 87 | 946 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 44 | 0 | 31 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 371 | 621 | 69 | 0 |

Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) |  |  |  |  |  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.54 | 4.07 | 1.2 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.99 | 52.00 | 25.8 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.83 | 33.21 | 4.2 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.83 | 14.64 | 4.6 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 723 | 550 | 2150 | 0.336 | 721 | 0.5 | 2.515 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 555 | 2018 | 0.613 | 1230 | 1.6 | 4.533 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 331 | 1422 | 995 | 0.332 | 329 | 0.5 | 5.391 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 799 | 779 | 1666 | 0.480 | 795 | 0.9 | 4.117 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 863 | 658 | 2063 | 0.418 | 862 | 0.7 | 2.998 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 664 | 1937 | 0.762 | 1470 | 3.1 | 7.612 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 1699 | 817 | 0.483 | 393 | 0.9 | 8.459 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 954 | 931 | 1555 | 0.613 | 951 | 1.6 | 5.933 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1057 | 800 | 1947 | 0.543 | 1055 | 1.2 | 4.027 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 813 | 1826 | 0.990 | 1745 | 18.9 | 31.610 | D |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2028 | 606 | 0.797 | 473 | 3.4 | 25.389 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1168 | 1112 | 1424 | 0.820 | 1158 | 4.2 | 13.006 | B |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1057 | 807 | 1942 | 0.544 | 1057 | 1.2 | 4.068 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 815 | 1825 | 0.991 | 1780 | 25.8 | 51.996 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2063 | 584 | 0.827 | 480 | 4.2 | 33.214 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1168 | 1132 | 1410 | 0.829 | 1167 | 4.6 | 14.644 | B |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 863 | 669 | 2054 | 0.420 | 865 | 0.7 | 3.031 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 667 | 1935 | 0.763 | 1566 | 3.4 | 12.133 | B |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 1791 | 758 | 0.521 | 407 | 1.1 | 10.600 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 954 | 980 | 1520 | 0.627 | 965 | 1.7 | 6.612 | A |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 723 | 555 | 2146 | 0.337 | 724 | 0.5 | 2.531 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 558 | 2016 | 0.613 | 1243 | 1.6 | 4.697 | A |
| 3-Buckingham Road | 331 | 1435 | 986 | 0.335 | 333 | 0.5 | 5.535 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 799 | 788 | 1659 | 0.481 | 802 | 0.9 | 4.213 | A |

THE FUTURE

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{A} 4421$ Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 28.34 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(\mathbf{H H}: \mathbf{m m})$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1425 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 878 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 457 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1290 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 587 | 375 | 425 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 290 | 0 | 17 | 571 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 267 | 91 | 0 | 99 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 340 | 905 | 45 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 12 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1.00 | 60.24 | 26.4 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.60 | 5.52 | 1.5 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.53 | 8.21 | 1.1 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.85 | 14.57 | 5.5 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1073 | 780 | 1856 | 0.578 | 1067 | 1.4 | 4.532 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 661 | 661 | 1844 | 0.358 | 659 | 0.6 | 3.031 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 344 | 993 | 1254 | 0.274 | 343 | 0.4 | 3.942 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 971 | 514 | 1836 | 0.529 | 967 | 1.1 | 4.120 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1281 | 933 | 1737 | 0.738 | 1276 | 2.7 | 7.711 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 789 | 790 | 1745 | 0.452 | 788 | 0.8 | 3.760 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 411 | 1187 | 1120 | 0.367 | 410 | 0.6 | 5.065 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1160 | 616 | 1763 | 0.658 | 1157 | 1.9 | 5.900 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1569 | 1136 | 1579 | 0.993 | 1507 | 18.3 | 34.918 | D |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 967 | 935 | 1633 | 0.592 | 964 | 1.4 | 5.363 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 503 | 1435 | 950 | 0.530 | 501 | 1.1 | 7.983 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1420 | 751 | 1666 | 0.853 | 1407 | 5.3 | 13.255 | B |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1569 | 1145 | 1572 | 0.998 | 1537 | 26.4 | 60.235 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 967 | 953 | 1619 | 0.597 | 967 | 1.5 | 5.515 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 503 | 1447 | 941 | 0.535 | 503 | 1.1 | 8.211 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1420 | 754 | 1664 | 0.854 | 1419 | 5.5 | 14.565 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1281 | 947 | 1727 | 0.742 | 1375 | 3.0 | 13.017 | B |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 789 | 849 | 1699 | 0.464 | 792 | 0.9 | 3.977 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 411 | 1223 | 1095 | 0.375 | 413 | 0.6 | 5.295 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1160 | 622 | 1759 | 0.659 | 1174 | 2.0 | 6.294 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1073 | 786 | 1852 | 0.579 | 1079 | 1.4 | 4.698 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 661 | 669 | 1839 | 0.359 | 662 | 0.6 | 3.064 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 344 | 1000 | 1249 | 0.275 | 345 | 0.4 | 3.984 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 971 | 518 | 1834 | 0.530 | 975 | 1.1 | 4.206 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 59.91 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1153 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1642 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 439 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1062 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 312 | 345 | 417 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 609 | 0 | 87 | 946 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 44 | 0 | 31 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 372 | 621 | 69 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.65 | 5.33 | 1.9 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.07 | 128.94 | 72.9 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.90 | 53.44 | 6.7 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.84 | 15.67 | 4.9 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 868 | 550 | 2153 | 0.403 | 865 | 0.7 | 2.789 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 683 | 1924 | 0.643 | 1229 | 1.8 | 5.133 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 331 | 1536 | 922 | 0.359 | 328 | 0.6 | 6.045 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 800 | 820 | 1636 | 0.489 | 796 | 0.9 | 4.265 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1037 | 658 | 2066 | 0.502 | 1035 | 1.0 | 3.488 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 817 | 1824 | 0.809 | 1467 | 4.0 | 9.848 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 1835 | 731 | 0.540 | 392 | 1.1 | 10.561 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 955 | 980 | 1521 | 0.628 | 952 | 1.7 | 6.295 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1269 | 799 | 1951 | 0.651 | 1266 | 1.8 | 5.231 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 999 | 1689 | 1.071 | 1659 | 41.2 | 58.815 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2116 | 551 | 0.877 | 467 | 5.2 | 37.354 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1169 | 1136 | 1408 | 0.831 | 1158 | 4.5 | 13.827 | B |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1269 | 807 | 1945 | 0.653 | 1269 | 1.9 | 5.326 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 1002 | 1686 | 1.072 | 1681 | 72.9 | 128.944 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2138 | 537 | 0.900 | 478 | 6.7 | 53.445 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1169 | 1154 | 1394 | 0.839 | 1168 | 4.9 | 15.673 | C |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1037 | 669 | 2057 | 0.504 | 1040 | 1.0 | 3.553 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 821 | 1821 | 0.811 | 1747 | 5.2 | 73.187 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 2102 | 559 | 0.706 | 411 | 2.6 | 26.455 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 955 | 1101 | 1433 | 0.666 | 966 | 2.0 | 7.886 | A |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 868 | 556 | 2148 | 0.404 | 869 | 0.7 | 2.817 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 686 | 1921 | 0.643 | 1250 | 1.8 | 5.462 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 331 | 1557 | 908 | 0.364 | 339 | 0.6 | 6.405 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 800 | 838 | 1624 | 0.492 | 804 | 1.0 | 4.413 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 38.43 | E |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1480 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1007 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 477 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1303 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 639 | 389 | 414 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 340 | 0 | 22 | 645 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 290 | 89 | 0 | 98 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 367 | 887 | 49 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1.03 | 83.52 | 40.5 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.68 | 6.97 | 2.1 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.61 | 10.70 | 1.5 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.89 | 19.86 | 7.5 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1114 | 768 | 1863 | 0.598 | 1108 | 1.5 | 4.732 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 758 | 667 | 1840 | 0.412 | 755 | 0.7 | 3.312 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 359 | 1077 | 1195 | 0.300 | 357 | 0.4 | 4.288 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 981 | 567 | 1799 | 0.545 | 976 | 1.2 | 4.353 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1330 | 919 | 1746 | 0.762 | 1324 | 3.1 | 8.402 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 905 | 796 | 1739 | 0.521 | 904 | 1.1 | 4.302 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 429 | 1288 | 1050 | 0.409 | 428 | 0.7 | 5.779 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1171 | 679 | 1718 | 0.682 | 1168 | 2.1 | 6.497 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1630 | 1114 | 1594 | 1.022 | 1542 | 24.9 | 42.924 | E |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1109 | 930 | 1636 | 0.678 | 1105 | 2.1 | 6.730 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 525 | 1552 | 869 | 0.604 | 522 | 1.5 | 10.278 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1435 | 827 | 1611 | 0.890 | 1415 | 6.9 | 16.935 | C |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1630 | 1127 | 1584 | 1.029 | 1567 | 40.5 | 83.523 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1109 | 945 | 1624 | 0.683 | 1108 | 2.1 | 6.975 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 525 | 1563 | 861 | 0.610 | 525 | 1.5 | 10.699 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1435 | 832 | 1608 | 0.892 | 1432 | 7.5 | 19.855 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1330 | 937 | 1732 | 0.768 | 1478 | 3.5 | 22.868 | C |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 905 | 885 | 1670 | 0.542 | 909 | 1.2 | 4.751 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 429 | 1341 | 1012 | 0.424 | 432 | 0.7 | 6.238 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1171 | 688 | 1712 | 0.684 | 1193 | 2.2 | 7.205 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1114 | 775 | 1858 | 0.600 | 1122 | 1.5 | 4.944 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 758 | 675 | 1833 | 0.414 | 760 | 0.7 | 3.362 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 359 | 1086 | 1189 | 0.302 | 360 | 0.4 | 4.352 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 981 | 572 | 1795 | 0.546 | 985 | 1.2 | 4.463 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 109.52 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1282 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1742 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 435 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1113 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 378 | 364 | 461 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 722 | 0 | 77 | 943 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 366 | 41 | 0 | 28 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 333 | 711 | 69 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane ( E ) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.75 | 7.68 | 3.0 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.17 | 250.46 | 148.3 | F |
| 3-Buckingham Road | 0.91 | 61.26 | 7.6 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.91 | 26.04 | 8.3 | D |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 965 | 615 | 2112 | 0.457 | 962 | 0.8 | 3.120 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1311 | 730 | 1891 | 0.694 | 1303 | 2.2 | 6.035 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 327 | 1650 | 849 | 0.386 | 325 | 0.6 | 6.841 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 838 | 903 | 1572 | 0.533 | 833 | 1.1 | 4.847 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1152 | 735 | 2014 | 0.572 | 1151 | 1.3 | 4.159 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1566 | 873 | 1784 | 0.878 | 1550 | 6.3 | 14.408 | B |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 391 | 1966 | 647 | 0.604 | 388 | 1.5 | 13.700 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1001 | 1076 | 1447 | 0.691 | 996 | 2.2 | 7.909 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1412 | 888 | 1889 | 0.747 | 1405 | 2.9 | 7.347 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1918 | 1066 | 1642 | 1.168 | 1631 | 78.0 | 101.601 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 479 | 2151 | 529 | 0.906 | 460 | 6.2 | 43.974 | E |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1225 | 1193 | 1362 | 0.899 | 1205 | 7.2 | 20.673 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1412 | 900 | 1879 | 0.751 | 1411 | 3.0 | 7.682 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1918 | 1071 | 1638 | 1.171 | 1637 | 148.3 | 250.457 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 479 | 2159 | 524 | 0.914 | 473 | 7.6 | 61.261 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1225 | 1208 | 1351 | 0.907 | 1221 | 8.3 | 26.041 | D |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1152 | 755 | 1998 | 0.577 | 1159 | 1.4 | 4.322 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1566 | 881 | 1779 | 0.880 | 1767 | 98.0 | 250.438 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 391 | 2177 | 512 | 0.764 | 407 | 3.6 | 37.926 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1001 | 1184 | 1369 | 0.731 | 1023 | 2.8 | 10.993 | B |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 965 | 623 | 2105 | 0.458 | 967 | 0.9 | 3.170 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1311 | 734 | 1887 | 0.695 | 1694 | 2.4 | 64.852 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 327 | 2027 | 608 | 0.539 | 337 | 1.2 | 13.763 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 838 | 1077 | 1447 | 0.579 | 844 | 1.4 | 6.022 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 35.38 | E |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1490 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 961 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 483 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1271 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 653 | 398 | 401 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 334 | 0 | 15 | 612 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 291 | 92 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 364 | 860 | 47 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1.02 | 76.85 | 36.9 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.65 | 6.34 | 1.8 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.59 | 9.81 | 1.4 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.87 | 16.74 | 6.2 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1122 | 749 | 1880 | 0.597 | 1116 | 1.5 | 4.678 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 723 | 662 | 1843 | 0.393 | 721 | 0.6 | 3.202 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 1038 | 1222 | 0.298 | 362 | 0.4 | 4.178 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 957 | 566 | 1799 | 0.532 | 952 | 1.1 | 4.230 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1339 | 896 | 1765 | 0.759 | 1333 | 3.0 | 8.212 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 864 | 791 | 1743 | 0.496 | 863 | 1.0 | 4.082 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 434 | 1242 | 1082 | 0.401 | 433 | 0.7 | 5.542 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1143 | 677 | 1719 | 0.665 | 1139 | 1.9 | 6.176 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1641 | 1088 | 1615 | 1.016 | 1559 | 23.5 | 40.683 | E |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1058 | 927 | 1638 | 0.646 | 1055 | 1.8 | 6.138 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 532 | 1498 | 906 | 0.587 | 529 | 1.4 | 9.466 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1399 | 826 | 1612 | 0.868 | 1384 | 5.8 | 14.851 | B |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1641 | 1099 | 1607 | 1.021 | 1587 | 36.9 | 76.854 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1058 | 943 | 1626 | 0.651 | 1058 | 1.8 | 6.338 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 532 | 1509 | 898 | 0.592 | 532 | 1.4 | 9.809 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1399 | 830 | 1609 | 0.870 | 1398 | 6.2 | 16.741 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1339 | 911 | 1754 | 0.764 | 1473 | 3.4 | 19.337 | C |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 864 | 871 | 1682 | 0.514 | 867 | 1.1 | 4.435 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 434 | 1288 | 1049 | 0.414 | 437 | 0.7 | 5.908 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1143 | 685 | 1713 | 0.667 | 1159 | 2.0 | 6.689 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1122 | 755 | 1875 | 0.598 | 1129 | 1.5 | 4.878 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 723 | 670 | 1837 | 0.394 | 725 | 0.7 | 3.244 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 1047 | 1216 | 0.299 | 365 | 0.4 | 4.233 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 957 | 570 | 1796 | 0.533 | 960 | 1.2 | 4.325 | A |

THE FUTURE

## 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{A} 4421$ Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 86.47 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1280 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1674 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 445 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1081 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 375 | 360 | 466 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 690 | 0 | 71 | 913 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 378 | 38 | 0 | 29 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 320 | 690 | 71 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.74 | 7.35 | 2.8 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.13 | 194.34 | 112.6 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.93 | 68.32 | 8.7 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.88 | 21.11 | 6.6 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 964 | 598 | 2126 | 0.453 | 960 | 0.8 | 3.080 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1260 | 732 | 1889 | 0.667 | 1252 | 2.0 | 5.589 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 335 | 1608 | 883 | 0.379 | 333 | 0.6 | 6.513 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 814 | 886 | 1586 | 0.513 | 810 | 1.0 | 4.613 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1151 | 716 | 2030 | 0.567 | 1149 | 1.3 | 4.076 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1505 | 876 | 1782 | 0.844 | 1493 | 5.0 | 11.955 | B |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 400 | 1919 | 683 | 0.586 | 397 | 1.4 | 12.467 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 972 | 1057 | 1463 | 0.664 | 968 | 1.9 | 7.225 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1409 | 867 | 1907 | 0.739 | 1403 | 2.8 | 7.074 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1843 | 1069 | 1639 | 1.125 | 1622 | 60.2 | 81.430 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 490 | 2151 | 533 | 0.919 | 469 | 6.7 | 45.864 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1190 | 1193 | 1365 | 0.872 | 1174 | 5.9 | 17.584 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1409 | 877 | 1898 | 0.742 | 1409 | 2.8 | 7.348 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1843 | 1074 | 1635 | 1.127 | 1634 | 112.6 | 194.339 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 490 | 2164 | 525 | 0.934 | 482 | 8.7 | 68.324 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1190 | 1211 | 1352 | 0.880 | 1187 | 6.6 | 21.110 | C |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1151 | 731 | 2017 | 0.570 | 1157 | 1.3 | 4.211 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1505 | 883 | 1777 | 0.847 | 1762 | 48.4 | 166.132 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 400 | 2179 | 514 | 0.778 | 419 | 4.0 | 42.435 | E |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 972 | 1189 | 1368 | 0.710 | 988 | 2.5 | 9.849 | A |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total <br> Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 964 | 606 | 2119 | 0.455 | 966 | 0.8 | 3.128 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1260 | 737 | 1886 | 0.668 | 1445 | 2.1 | 12.691 | B |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 335 | 1795 | 762 | 0.440 | 348 | 0.8 | 8.951 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 814 | 981 | 1518 | 0.536 | 819 | 1.2 | 5.191 | A |

## Junctions 9

## ARCADY 9 - Roundabout Module

Version: 9.5.0.6896
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2018
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
+44 (0)1344379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: 2_191021_B4100 Banbury Road Roundabout (Hotel Application)_FAST_MITIGATED.j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonk\Dropbox (mode)\Project\Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
DatalModelling\200125_EQ\Baseline
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:10:44

```
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Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 10.8 | 31.58 | 0.93 | D | 4.1 | 15.03 | 0.81 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 10.7 | 30.68 | 0.93 | D | 21.9 | 52.38 | 0.98 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.6 | 13.37 | 0.63 | B | 4.3 | 31.50 | 0.83 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 1.6 | 9.79 | 0.61 | A | 14.4 | 64.31 | 0.97 | F |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 13.8 | 39.24 | 0.95 | E | 3.9 | 14.11 | 0.80 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 14.2 | 40.12 | 0.96 | E | 52.9 | 105.27 | 1.05 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.8 | 14.33 | 0.64 | B | 5.4 | 39.39 | 0.86 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 2.1 | 11.74 | 0.68 | B | 13.5 | 60.69 | 0.97 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 26.2 | 67.29 | 1.00 | F | 9.7 | 32.21 | 0.92 | D |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 54.3 | 124.97 | 1.06 | F | 96.8 | 183.67 | 1.12 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 3.2 | 22.43 | 0.77 | C | 30.7 | 158.27 | 1.07 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 3.3 | 17.83 | 0.77 | C | 17.4 | 78.82 | 0.99 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 16.7 | 46.25 | 0.97 | E | 8.4 | 28.12 | 0.91 | D |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 41.5 | 100.41 | 1.04 | F | 79.6 | 153.22 | 1.09 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 3.4 | 23.18 | 0.79 | C | 25.8 | 136.20 | 1.05 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 2.9 | 16.40 | 0.75 | C | 11.0 | 54.12 | 0.95 | F |

[^5]
## File summary

File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $04 / 05 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 25.70 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  |

## Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V - Approach road half-width (m) | E - Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R - Entry radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 3.45 | 7.50 | 25.0 | 33.7 | 42.0 | 20.5 |  |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3.50 | 7.50 | 30.0 | 26.4 | 42.0 | 28.0 |  |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 3.47 | 6.70 | 22.4 | 15.1 | 42.0 | 38.5 |  |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 3.95 | 5.80 | 20.0 | 33.9 | 42.0 | 29.0 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.703 | 1951 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.691 | 1946 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.612 | 1643 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.638 | 1668 |

The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 30$ | $09: 00$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

THE FUTURE

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1196 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1222 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 410 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 532 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 640 | 390 | 166 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 589 | 0 | 77 | 556 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 263 | 94 | 0 | 53 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 59 | 454 | 19 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.93 | 31.58 | 10.8 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.93 | 30.68 | 10.7 | D |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.63 | 13.37 | 1.6 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.61 | 9.79 | 1.6 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 900 | 425 | 1550 | 0.581 | 895 | 1.4 | 5.454 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 920 | 430 | 1579 | 0.583 | 914 | 1.4 | 5.372 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 309 | 981 | 1006 | 0.307 | 307 | 0.4 | 5.138 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 401 | 708 | 1167 | 0.343 | 398 | 0.5 | 4.672 | A |

THE FUTURE

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1075 | 509 | 1493 | 0.720 | 1071 | 2.5 | 8.435 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1099 | 515 | 1523 | 0.721 | 1094 | 2.5 | 8.306 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 369 | 1174 | 885 | 0.417 | 368 | 0.7 | 6.944 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 478 | 847 | 1077 | 0.444 | 477 | 0.8 | 5.993 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1317 | 621 | 1417 | 0.929 | 1289 | 9.4 | 24.260 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1345 | 620 | 1453 | 0.926 | 1319 | 9.2 | 23.328 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 451 | 1415 | 734 | 0.615 | 448 | 1.5 | 12.464 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 586 | 1026 | 961 | 0.609 | 583 | 1.5 | 9.442 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1317 | 624 | 1415 | 0.931 | 1311 | 10.8 | 31.581 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1345 | 630 | 1446 | 0.931 | 1339 | 10.7 | 30.681 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 451 | 1437 | 720 | 0.627 | 451 | 1.6 | 13.371 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 586 | 1038 | 953 | 0.615 | 586 | 1.6 | 9.787 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1075 | 513 | 1490 | 0.722 | 1108 | 2.7 | 10.176 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1099 | 532 | 1511 | 0.727 | 1130 | 2.8 | 10.199 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 369 | 1213 | 860 | 0.428 | 372 | 0.8 | 7.428 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 478 | 869 | 1063 | 0.450 | 481 | 0.8 | 6.221 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 900 | 428 | 1547 | 0.582 | 906 | 1.4 | 5.652 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 920 | 435 | 1576 | 0.584 | 925 | 1.4 | 5.579 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 309 | 993 | 999 | 0.309 | 310 | 0.5 | 5.236 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 401 | 716 | 1162 | 0.345 | 402 | 0.5 | 4.743 | A |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 42.20 | E |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 929 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1404 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 475 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 755 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 513 | 244 | 172 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 717 | 2 | 79 | 606 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 269 | 156 | 0 | 50 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 72 | 639 | 44 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1 - B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.81 | 15.03 | 4.1 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.98 | 52.38 | 21.9 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.83 | 31.50 | 4.3 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.97 | 64.31 | 14.4 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 699 | 629 | 1451 | 0.482 | 696 | 0.9 | 4.745 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1057 | 344 | 1681 | 0.629 | 1050 | 1.7 | 5.652 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1120 | 943 | 0.379 | 355 | 0.6 | 6.101 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 568 | 856 | 1105 | 0.515 | 564 | 1.0 | 6.612 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 835 | 752 | 1367 | 0.611 | 833 | 1.5 | 6.708 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1262 | 412 | 1634 | 0.772 | 1256 | 3.2 | 9.357 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1339 | 808 | 0.529 | 425 | 1.1 | 9.361 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 679 | 1023 | 997 | 0.681 | 675 | 2.1 | 11.028 | B |

## 17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1023 | 893 | 1271 | 0.805 | 1014 | 3.8 | 13.544 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1546 | 500 | 1573 | 0.982 | 1493 | 16.4 | 33.006 | D |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1597 | 649 | 0.806 | 513 | 3.6 | 24.862 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 831 | 1224 | 869 | 0.957 | 798 | 10.3 | 39.956 | E |

## 17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1023 | 910 | 1259 | 0.812 | 1022 | 4.1 | 15.033 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1546 | 505 | 1570 | 0.984 | 1524 | 21.9 | 52.377 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1627 | 630 | 0.830 | 520 | 4.3 | 31.503 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 831 | 1246 | 854 | 0.973 | 815 | 14.4 | 64.309 | F |

## 17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 835 | 803 | 1332 | 0.627 | 845 | 1.7 | 7.531 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1262 | 421 | 1628 | 0.775 | 1335 | 3.6 | 15.142 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1417 | 760 | 0.562 | 439 | 1.3 | 11.611 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 679 | 1077 | 963 | 0.705 | 726 | 2.5 | 18.029 | C |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 699 | 639 | 1444 | 0.484 | 702 | 0.9 | 4.876 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1057 | 348 | 1678 | 0.630 | 1065 | 1.7 | 5.937 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1135 | 934 | 0.383 | 360 | 0.6 | 6.306 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 568 | 868 | 1097 | 0.518 | 574 | 1.1 | 6.955 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 32.00 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1221 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1227 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 412 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 600 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 665 | 390 | 166 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 590 | 0 | 77 | 560 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 263 | 96 | 0 | 53 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 59 | 522 | 19 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) |  |  |  |  |  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane <br> (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.95 | 39.24 | 13.8 | E |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.96 | 40.12 | 14.2 | E |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.64 | 14.33 | 1.8 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.68 | 11.74 | 2.1 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 919 | 477 | 1568 | 0.586 | 914 | 1.4 | 5.461 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 924 | 430 | 1544 | 0.598 | 918 | 1.5 | 5.697 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 310 | 984 | 996 | 0.311 | 308 | 0.4 | 5.221 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 710 | 1179 | 0.383 | 449 | 0.6 | 4.915 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1098 | 571 | 1502 | 0.731 | 1093 | 2.6 | 8.690 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1103 | 515 | 1489 | 0.741 | 1098 | 2.8 | 9.089 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1178 | 871 | 0.425 | 369 | 0.7 | 7.155 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 539 | 850 | 1089 | 0.495 | 538 | 1.0 | 6.519 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1344 | 697 | 1415 | 0.950 | 1309 | 11.4 | 27.876 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1351 | 617 | 1422 | 0.950 | 1316 | 11.4 | 27.949 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 454 | 1412 | 720 | 0.630 | 450 | 1.6 | 13.165 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 661 | 1025 | 975 | 0.677 | 656 | 2.0 | 11.144 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1344 | 701 | 1412 | 0.952 | 1335 | 13.8 | 39.235 | E |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1351 | 629 | 1414 | 0.956 | 1340 | 14.2 | 40.117 | E |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 454 | 1437 | 703 | 0.645 | 453 | 1.8 | 14.334 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 661 | 1039 | 966 | 0.684 | 660 | 2.1 | 11.744 | B |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1098 | 577 | 1498 | 0.733 | 1141 | 2.9 | 11.277 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1103 | 537 | 1474 | 0.748 | 1147 | 3.1 | 12.411 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1231 | 837 | 0.443 | 374 | 0.8 | 7.841 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 539 | 878 | 1070 | 0.504 | 544 | 1.0 | 6.892 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 919 | 481 | 1564 | 0.588 | 925 | 1.4 | 5.678 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 924 | 436 | 1541 | 0.600 | 930 | 1.5 | 5.956 | A |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 310 | 997 | 988 | 0.314 | 312 | 0.5 | 5.334 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 719 | 1174 | 0.385 | 453 | 0.6 | 5.008 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 64.21 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 930 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1501 | 100.000 |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 475 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 756 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 514 | 244 | 172 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 742 | 2 | 81 | 676 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 269 | 156 | 0 | 50 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 72 | 640 | 44 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.80 | 14.11 | 3.9 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.05 | 105.27 | 52.9 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.86 | 39.39 | 5.4 | E |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.97 | 60.69 | 13.5 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 700 | 629 | 1472 | 0.476 | 697 | 0.9 | 4.619 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1130 | 344 | 1689 | 0.669 | 1122 | 2.0 | 6.267 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1190 | 901 | 0.397 | 355 | 0.6 | 6.560 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 569 | 874 | 1097 | 0.519 | 565 | 1.1 | 6.709 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 836 | 752 | 1387 | 0.603 | 834 | 1.5 | 6.473 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1349 | 412 | 1642 | 0.822 | 1340 | 4.3 | 11.579 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1422 | 759 | 0.563 | 425 | 1.3 | 10.691 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 680 | 1044 | 988 | 0.688 | 675 | 2.1 | 11.366 | B |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1024 | 895 | 1289 | 0.795 | 1015 | 3.6 | 12.792 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1653 | 501 | 1580 | 1.046 | 1543 | 31.6 | 52.286 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1648 | 620 | 0.844 | 510 | 4.4 | 29.985 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 832 | 1222 | 875 | 0.952 | 801 | 9.9 | 38.780 | E |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1024 | 913 | 1276 | 0.802 | 1023 | 3.9 | 14.105 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1653 | 505 | 1577 | 1.048 | 1568 | 52.9 | 105.266 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1672 | 605 | 0.865 | 519 | 5.4 | 39.394 | E |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 832 | 1242 | 862 | 0.966 | 818 | 13.5 | 60.691 | F |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 836 | 799 | 1355 | 0.617 | 845 | 1.6 | 7.181 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1349 | 420 | 1637 | 0.825 | 1539 | 5.5 | 56.901 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1612 | 642 | 0.665 | 440 | 2.1 | 18.832 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 680 | 1156 | 916 | 0.742 | 721 | 3.1 | 21.775 | C |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 700 | 643 | 1463 | 0.479 | 703 | 0.9 | 4.754 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1130 | 348 | 1686 | 0.670 | 1144 | 2.1 | 6.795 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1212 | 888 | 0.403 | 363 | 0.7 | 6.933 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 569 | 892 | 1085 | 0.525 | 577 | 1.1 | 7.193 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 74.01 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1264 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1287 | 100.000 |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 492 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 621 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 576 | 514 | 174 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 674 | 0 | 64 | 549 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 337 | 101 | 0 | 54 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 46 | 555 | 20 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane <br> (W) |  |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1.00 | 67.29 | 26.2 | F |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.06 | 124.97 | 54.3 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.77 | 22.43 | 3.2 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.77 | 17.83 | 3.3 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 952 | 506 | 1556 | 0.612 | 945 | 1.5 | 5.843 | A |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 969 | 530 | 1483 | 0.653 | 962 | 1.8 | 6.810 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1044 | 958 | 0.387 | 368 | 0.6 | 6.077 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 468 | 831 | 1104 | 0.424 | 465 | 0.7 | 5.609 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1136 | 605 | 1486 | 0.765 | 1130 | 3.1 | 9.943 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1157 | 633 | 1415 | 0.818 | 1148 | 4.2 | 13.026 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 442 | 1246 | 827 | 0.535 | 440 | 1.1 | 9.256 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 558 | 993 | 1000 | 0.559 | 556 | 1.2 | 8.083 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1392 | 736 | 1395 | 0.998 | 1332 | 18.1 | 39.239 | E |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1417 | 747 | 1341 | 1.057 | 1310 | 31.0 | 59.709 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 542 | 1428 | 710 | 0.763 | 534 | 2.9 | 19.731 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 684 | 1162 | 891 | 0.767 | 676 | 3.1 | 16.226 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1392 | 743 | 1390 | 1.001 | 1359 | 26.2 | 67.292 | F |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1417 | 762 | 1331 | 1.065 | 1324 | 54.3 | 124.966 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 542 | 1445 | 699 | 0.775 | 541 | 3.2 | 22.428 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 684 | 1174 | 883 | 0.774 | 683 | 3.3 | 17.830 | C |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1136 | 615 | 1479 | 0.768 | 1227 | 3.5 | 19.129 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1157 | 686 | 1380 | 0.838 | 1345 | 7.2 | 85.210 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 442 | 1447 | 697 | 0.635 | 448 | 1.8 | 14.766 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 558 | 1103 | 928 | 0.602 | 565 | 1.6 | 10.105 | B |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 952 | 513 | 1551 | 0.614 | 959 | 1.6 | 6.164 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 969 | 537 | 1478 | 0.656 | 990 | 1.9 | 7.686 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1073 | 939 | 0.394 | 375 | 0.7 | 6.431 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 468 | 852 | 1090 | 0.429 | 471 | 0.8 | 5.843 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 119.38 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1055 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1536 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 605 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 736 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 587 | 293 | 175 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 739 | 2 | 81 | 714 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 378 | 178 | 0 | 49 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 31 | 650 | 55 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.92 | 32.21 | 9.7 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.12 | 183.67 | 96.8 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.07 | 158.27 | 30.7 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.99 | 78.82 | 17.4 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 794 | 661 | 1449 | 0.548 | 789 | 1.2 | 5.424 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1156 | 391 | 1640 | 0.705 | 1147 | 2.3 | 7.176 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 455 | 1218 | 877 | 0.520 | 451 | 1.1 | 8.381 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 554 | 968 | 1029 | 0.538 | 550 | 1.1 | 7.438 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 948 | 788 | 1360 | 0.697 | 944 | 2.2 | 8.567 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 468 | 1587 | 0.870 | 1366 | 5.9 | 15.386 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 544 | 1451 | 732 | 0.743 | 537 | 2.7 | 17.957 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1153 | 910 | 0.727 | 656 | 2.5 | 13.893 | B |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1162 | 919 | 1270 | 0.915 | 1138 | 8.1 | 23.986 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1691 | 563 | 1522 | 1.111 | 1505 | 52.4 | 79.796 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 666 | 1615 | 630 | 1.057 | 604 | 18.1 | 79.374 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 810 | 1281 | 827 | 0.980 | 772 | 12.1 | 47.452 | E |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1162 | 939 | 1256 | 0.925 | 1155 | 9.7 | 32.211 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1691 | 571 | 1516 | 1.116 | 1514 | 96.8 | 183.673 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 666 | 1625 | 623 | 1.069 | 616 | 30.7 | 158.270 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 810 | 1296 | 818 | 0.991 | 789 | 17.4 | 78.819 | F |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 948 | 859 | 1312 | 0.723 | 977 | 2.7 | 11.577 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 486 | 1574 | 0.877 | 1558 | 52.4 | 173.855 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 544 | 1638 | 615 | 0.884 | 596 | 17.6 | 149.160 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1300 | 815 | 0.812 | 711 | 5.0 | 42.876 | E |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 794 | 699 | 1422 | 0.558 | 800 | 1.3 | 5.837 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1156 | 397 | 1636 | 0.707 | 1356 | 2.5 | 25.117 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 455 | 1417 | 753 | 0.605 | 520 | 1.6 | 19.850 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 554 | 1132 | 923 | 0.600 | 568 | 1.5 | 10.490 | B |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 57.66 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1236 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1254 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 507 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 601 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 561 | 505 | 170 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 646 | 0 | 76 | 532 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 357 | 96 | 0 | 54 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 45 | 536 | 20 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.97 | 46.25 | 16.7 | E |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.04 | 100.41 | 41.5 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.79 | 23.18 | 3.4 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.75 | 16.40 | 2.9 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 931 | 488 | 1566 | 0.594 | 925 | 1.4 | 5.566 | A |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 944 | 520 | 1482 | 0.637 | 937 | 1.7 | 6.530 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 382 | 1008 | 977 | 0.391 | 379 | 0.6 | 5.993 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 822 | 1107 | 0.409 | 450 | 0.7 | 5.453 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1111 | 584 | 1499 | 0.741 | 1106 | 2.8 | 9.037 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1127 | 622 | 1415 | 0.796 | 1119 | 3.7 | 11.859 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 456 | 1204 | 850 | 0.536 | 454 | 1.1 | 9.041 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 540 | 982 | 1003 | 0.539 | 538 | 1.1 | 7.715 | A |

## 08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1361 | 711 | 1411 | 0.965 | 1320 | 13.1 | 30.876 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 743 | 1337 | 1.033 | 1296 | 25.0 | 51.179 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 558 | 1399 | 724 | 0.771 | 550 | 3.1 | 19.956 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1159 | 889 | 0.744 | 655 | 2.7 | 15.009 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1361 | 717 | 1406 | 0.968 | 1346 | 16.7 | 46.253 | E |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 757 | 1327 | 1.041 | 1315 | 41.5 | 100.411 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 558 | 1420 | 710 | 0.787 | 557 | 3.4 | 23.183 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1175 | 879 | 0.753 | 661 | 2.9 | 16.404 | C |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1111 | 593 | 1493 | 0.744 | 1166 | 3.0 | 12.756 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1127 | 655 | 1394 | 0.809 | 1274 | 4.8 | 47.929 | E |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 456 | 1357 | 750 | 0.608 | 463 | 1.6 | 12.843 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 540 | 1070 | 946 | 0.571 | 546 | 1.4 | 9.155 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 931 | 494 | 1562 | 0.596 | 937 | 1.5 | 5.816 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 944 | 527 | 1478 | 0.639 | 956 | 1.8 | 7.058 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 382 | 1027 | 965 | 0.396 | 385 | 0.7 | 6.255 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 837 | 1097 | 0.412 | 455 | 0.7 | 5.631 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 98.26 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1046 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1511 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 598 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 705 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 574 | 299 | 173 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 733 | 2 | 80 | 696 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 373 | 176 | 0 | 49 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 26 | 624 | 55 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.91 | 28.12 | 8.4 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.09 | 153.22 | 79.6 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.05 | 136.20 | 25.8 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.95 | 54.12 | 11.0 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 787 | 640 | 1461 | 0.539 | 783 | 1.2 | 5.276 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1138 | 394 | 1653 | 0.688 | 1129 | 2.2 | 6.767 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 450 | 1199 | 894 | 0.503 | 446 | 1.0 | 7.968 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 531 | 959 | 1042 | 0.509 | 527 | 1.0 | 6.934 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 940 | 765 | 1375 | 0.684 | 937 | 2.1 | 8.144 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1358 | 472 | 1599 | 0.850 | 1346 | 5.1 | 13.659 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 538 | 1430 | 752 | 0.715 | 532 | 2.4 | 16.013 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 634 | 1143 | 924 | 0.686 | 629 | 2.1 | 12.038 | B |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1152 | 903 | 1279 | 0.900 | 1131 | 7.2 | 21.852 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1664 | 569 | 1531 | 1.087 | 1508 | 44.0 | 68.904 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 658 | 1616 | 637 | 1.033 | 605 | 15.6 | 70.338 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 776 | 1290 | 831 | 0.934 | 751 | 8.5 | 36.730 | E |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1152 | 922 | 1266 | 0.909 | 1147 | 8.4 | 28.118 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1664 | 577 | 1525 | 1.091 | 1521 | 79.6 | 153.217 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 658 | 1630 | 628 | 1.049 | 618 | 25.8 | 136.197 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 776 | 1307 | 820 | 0.947 | 766 | 11.0 | 54.117 | F |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 940 | 817 | 1339 | 0.702 | 964 | 2.4 | 10.186 | B |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1358 | 487 | 1588 | 0.855 | 1568 | 27.1 | 125.534 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 538 | 1645 | 620 | 0.868 | 600 | 10.3 | 117.409 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 634 | 1313 | 816 | 0.777 | 663 | 3.8 | 26.738 | D |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 787 | 666 | 1443 | 0.546 | 792 | 1.2 | 5.577 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1138 | 400 | 1649 | 0.690 | 1237 | 2.3 | 11.003 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 450 | 1302 | 831 | 0.542 | 487 | 1.2 | 11.568 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 531 | 1048 | 985 | 0.539 | 541 | 1.2 | 8.297 | A |

## Junctions 9

## ARCADY 9 - Roundabout Module

Version: 9.5.0.6896
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2018
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
+44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: 3_191021_Launton Rd_A4421_Care Home Rdbt (Final Scenarios)_FAST_MITIGATED.j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonk\Dropbox (mode)\Project|Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
DatalModelling\200125_EQ\Baseline
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:12:22

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```

Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Care Home | 0.1 | 22.85 | 0.10 | C | 0.1 | 18.37 | 0.13 | C |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 6.1 | 16.21 | 0.87 | C | 10.7 | 26.13 | 0.93 | D |
| 3-Launton Road | 1.0 | 5.10 | 0.50 | A | 12.8 | 41.63 | 0.95 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 17.3 | 43.49 | 0.97 | E | 5.2 | 15.19 | 0.85 | C |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Care Home | 0.1 | 22.99 | 0.10 | C | 0.2 | 19.69 | 0.14 | C |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 6.7 | 17.83 | 0.88 | C | 10.9 | 26.59 | 0.93 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1.0 | 5.24 | 0.51 | A | 12.8 | 41.56 | 0.95 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 17.6 | 44.20 | 0.97 | E | 5.9 | 16.91 | 0.86 | C |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Care Home | 0.1 | 27.30 | 0.12 | D | 0.3 | 39.96 | 0.26 | E |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 10.7 | 26.54 | 0.93 | D | 35.8 | 74.76 | 1.02 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1.5 | 6.67 | 0.60 | A | 38.5 | 104.62 | 1.04 | F |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 28.3 | 66.10 | 1.00 | F | 23.3 | 56.47 | 0.99 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Care Home | 0.1 | 27.24 | 0.12 | D | 0.3 | 34.46 | 0.23 | D |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 8.2 | 20.90 | 0.90 | C | 27.4 | 59.90 | 1.00 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1.4 | 6.36 | 0.59 | A | 22.3 | 65.60 | 1.00 | F |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 27.2 | 64.13 | 1.00 | F | 15.1 | 39.72 | 0.96 | E |

[^6]
## File summary

File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $03 / 05 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3 - Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 25.32 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Care Home |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | A4421 (S) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Launton Road |  |
| 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  |

## Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V - Approach road half-width (m) | E-Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length ( m ) | R-Entry radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 2.70 | 6.10 | 6.0 | 20.9 | 50.0 | 25.0 |  |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 3.40 | 7.80 | 36.5 | 12.0 | 50.0 | 16.0 |  |
| 3 - Launton Road | 3.60 | 7.00 | 40.0 | 57.1 | 50.0 | 9.0 |  |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 3.50 | 8.50 | 24.0 | 18.0 | 50.0 | 34.5 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.521 | 1207 |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.674 | 2024 |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.714 | 2100 |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.646 | 1928 |

The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

THE FUTURE

| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 16 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1282 | 100.000 |
| 3 - Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 653 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1366 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 16 | 0 | 542 | 724 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 18 | 398 | 0 | 237 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 12 | 904 | 432 | 18 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1 - Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1- Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 - A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 4- A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.10 | 22.85 | 0.1 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.87 | 16.21 | 6.1 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.50 | 5.10 | 1.0 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.97 | 43.49 | 17.3 | E |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1311 | 500 | 0.024 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.367 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 965 | 343 | 1738 | 0.555 | 960 | 1.2 | 4.602 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 492 | 572 | 1611 | 0.305 | 490 | 0.4 | 3.207 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1028 | 324 | 1651 | 0.623 | 1022 | 1.6 | 5.667 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1569 | 362 | 0.040 | 14 | 0.0 | 10.361 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1152 | 411 | 1691 | 0.682 | 1149 | 2.1 | 6.601 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 587 | 685 | 1533 | 0.383 | 586 | 0.6 | 3.803 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1228 | 388 | 1610 | 0.763 | 1222 | 3.1 | 9.134 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 18 | 1885 | 191 | 0.092 | 17 | 0.1 | 20.688 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1412 | 491 | 1635 | 0.863 | 1397 | 5.7 | 14.349 | B |
| 3 - Launton Road | 719 | 832 | 1430 | 0.503 | 717 | 1.0 | 5.042 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1504 | 474 | 1556 | 0.967 | 1461 | 13.8 | 29.642 | D |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1915 | 175 | 0.101 | 18 | 0.1 | 22.854 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1412 | 501 | 1628 | 0.867 | 1410 | 6.1 | 16.210 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 719 | 840 | 1424 | 0.505 | 719 | 1.0 | 5.102 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1504 | 476 | 1555 | 0.967 | 1490 | 17.3 | 43.487 | E |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1631 | 328 | 0.044 | 15 | 0.0 | 11.494 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1152 | 431 | 1677 | 0.687 | 1168 | 2.3 | 7.278 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 587 | 696 | 1524 | 0.385 | 589 | 0.6 | 3.852 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1228 | 390 | 1609 | 0.763 | 1284 | 3.4 | 12.812 | B |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1326 | 493 | 0.024 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.494 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 965 | 348 | 1735 | 0.556 | 969 | 1.3 | 4.727 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 492 | 578 | 1607 | 0.306 | 492 | 0.4 | 3.233 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1028 | 326 | 1650 | 0.623 | 1035 | 1.7 | 5.921 | A |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3 - Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 27.06 |  |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 27 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1426 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1066 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1176 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-Care Home | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 2 - A4421 (S) | 0 | 10 | 14 | 3 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 1 | 0 | 481 | 944 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 6 | 519 | 0 | 543 |

## Vehicle Mix

THE FUTURE

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-Care Home | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3-Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.13 | 18.37 | 0.1 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.93 | 26.13 | 10.7 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.95 | 41.63 | 12.8 | E |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.85 | 15.19 | 5.2 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 20 | 1265 | 537 | 0.038 | 20 | 0.0 | 6.959 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1074 | 303 | 1790 | 0.600 | 1068 | 1.5 | 4.944 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 803 | 801 | 1500 | 0.535 | 798 | 1.1 | 5.095 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 885 | 392 | 1644 | 0.539 | 881 | 1.2 | 4.689 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 24 | 1513 | 406 | 0.060 | 24 | 0.1 | 9.435 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1282 | 363 | 1749 | 0.733 | 1277 | 2.7 | 7.546 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 958 | 958 | 1388 | 0.690 | 954 | 2.2 | 8.211 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1057 | 469 | 1594 | 0.663 | 1054 | 1.9 | 6.627 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 30 | 1832 | 237 | 0.126 | 29 | 0.1 | 17.338 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1570 | 442 | 1696 | 0.926 | 1543 | 9.5 | 20.665 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1174 | 1159 | 1246 | 0.942 | 1142 | 10.1 | 28.526 | D |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1295 | 561 | 1534 | 0.844 | 1283 | 4.9 | 13.696 | B |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 30 | 1853 | 226 | 0.132 | 30 | 0.1 | 18.370 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1570 | 445 | 1693 | 0.927 | 1565 | 10.7 | 26.130 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1174 | 1175 | 1235 | 0.950 | 1163 | 12.8 | 41.625 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1295 | 572 | 1528 | 0.848 | 1294 | 5.2 | 15.192 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 24 | 1551 | 386 | 0.063 | 25 | 0.1 | 9.984 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1282 | 368 | 1746 | 0.734 | 1313 | 2.9 | 8.896 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 958 | 984 | 1370 | 0.699 | 1000 | 2.4 | 10.766 | B |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1057 | 491 | 1580 | 0.669 | 1070 | 2.1 | 7.230 | A |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 20 | 1277 | 531 | 0.038 | 20 | 0.0 | 7.057 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1074 | 306 | 1788 | 0.600 | 1079 | 1.5 | 5.111 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 803 | 809 | 1494 | 0.537 | 807 | 1.2 | 5.278 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 885 | 397 | 1641 | 0.540 | 889 | 1.2 | 4.810 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3-Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 26.20 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | $09: 15$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 16 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1301 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 657 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1368 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-Care Home | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 2 - A4421 (S) | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 16 | 0 | 542 | 743 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 18 | 398 | 0 | 241 |
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.10 | 22.99 | 0.1 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.88 | 17.83 | 6.7 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.51 | 5.24 | 1.0 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.97 | 44.20 | 17.6 | E |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 12 | 1313 | 500 | 0.024 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.379 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 979 | 344 | 1737 | 0.564 | 974 | 1.3 | 4.688 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 495 | 586 | 1601 | 0.309 | 493 | 0.4 | 3.244 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1030 | 324 | 1651 | 0.624 | 1023 | 1.6 | 5.681 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total <br> Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1571 | 361 | 0.040 | 14 | 0.0 | 10.390 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1170 | 412 | 1690 | 0.692 | 1166 | 2.2 | 6.816 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 591 | 702 | 1520 | 0.388 | 590 | 0.6 | 3.865 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1230 | 388 | 1610 | 0.764 | 1224 | 3.1 | 9.174 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1887 | 190 | 0.093 | 17 | 0.1 | 20.782 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1432 | 492 | 1634 | 0.876 | 1416 | 6.2 | 15.470 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 723 | 852 | 1416 | 0.511 | 722 | 1.0 | 5.177 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1506 | 474 | 1556 | 0.968 | 1462 | 14.0 | 29.950 | D |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1917 | 174 | 0.101 | 18 | 0.1 | 22.986 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1432 | 502 | 1628 | 0.880 | 1430 | 6.7 | 17.826 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 723 | 861 | 1410 | 0.513 | 723 | 1.0 | 5.245 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1506 | 476 | 1555 | 0.969 | 1492 | 17.6 | 44.202 | E |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1634 | 326 | 0.044 | 15 | 0.0 | 11.558 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1170 | 432 | 1676 | 0.698 | 1187 | 2.4 | 7.615 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 591 | 715 | 1511 | 0.391 | 592 | 0.6 | 3.925 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1230 | 390 | 1609 | 0.764 | 1287 | 3.4 | 12.993 | B |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1328 | 492 | 0.025 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.507 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 979 | 349 | 1734 | 0.565 | 984 | 1.3 | 4.822 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 495 | 592 | 1597 | 0.310 | 495 | 0.5 | 3.273 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1030 | 326 | 1650 | 0.624 | 1037 | 1.7 | 5.937 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3-Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 27.71 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 27 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1426 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1066 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1199 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1 - Care Home | 0 | 10 | 14 | 3 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 1 | 0 | 481 | 944 |
|  | 3 - Launton Road | 4 | 519 | 0 | 543 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 6 | 801 | 270 | 122 |

## Vehicle Mix
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 - A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.14 | 19.69 | 0.2 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.93 | 26.59 | 10.9 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.95 | 41.56 | 12.8 | E |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.86 | 16.91 | 5.9 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 20 | 1282 | 528 | 0.038 | 20 | 0.0 | 7.083 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1074 | 306 | 1788 | 0.600 | 1068 | 1.5 | 4.956 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 803 | 801 | 1500 | 0.535 | 798 | 1.1 | 5.095 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 903 | 392 | 1644 | 0.549 | 898 | 1.2 | 4.795 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 24 | 1534 | 395 | 0.061 | 24 | 0.1 | 9.710 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1282 | 367 | 1747 | 0.734 | 1277 | 2.7 | 7.584 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 958 | 958 | 1389 | 0.690 | 954 | 2.2 | 8.211 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1078 | 469 | 1594 | 0.676 | 1075 | 2.0 | 6.881 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 30 | 1856 | 224 | 0.133 | 29 | 0.1 | 18.436 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1570 | 446 | 1693 | 0.927 | 1542 | 9.6 | 20.903 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1174 | 1158 | 1247 | 0.942 | 1142 | 10.1 | 28.476 | D |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1320 | 561 | 1534 | 0.860 | 1306 | 5.5 | 14.945 | B |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 30 | 1878 | 212 | 0.140 | 30 | 0.2 | 19.693 | C |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1570 | 450 | 1690 | 0.929 | 1565 | 10.9 | 26.590 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1174 | 1174 | 1235 | 0.950 | 1163 | 12.8 | 41.558 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1320 | 572 | 1528 | 0.864 | 1318 | 5.9 | 16.913 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 24 | 1574 | 373 | 0.065 | 25 | 0.1 | 10.332 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1282 | 373 | 1743 | 0.736 | 1314 | 2.9 | 8.988 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 958 | 985 | 1370 | 0.700 | 1000 | 2.4 | 10.775 | B |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1078 | 491 | 1580 | 0.682 | 1093 | 2.2 | 7.611 | A |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 20 | 1295 | 521 | 0.039 | 20 | 0.0 | 7.192 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1074 | 309 | 1786 | 0.601 | 1079 | 1.5 | 5.130 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 803 | 810 | 1494 | 0.537 | 807 | 1.2 | 5.278 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 903 | 397 | 1641 | 0.550 | 907 | 1.2 | 4.928 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30 m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3-Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 37.93 | $E$ |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | $09: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 16 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1406 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 741 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1389 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-Care Home | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 2 - A4421 (S) | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 16 | 0 | 570 | 820 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 19 | 436 | 0 | 286 |
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.12 | 27.30 | 0.1 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.93 | 26.54 | 10.7 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.60 | 6.67 | 1.5 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1.00 | 66.10 | 28.3 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1356 | 476 | 0.025 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.758 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1059 | 306 | 1762 | 0.601 | 1053 | 1.5 | 5.032 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 558 | 644 | 1564 | 0.357 | 556 | 0.6 | 3.561 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1046 | 353 | 1630 | 0.642 | 1039 | 1.8 | 6.018 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1621 | 333 | 0.043 | 14 | 0.0 | 11.305 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1264 | 366 | 1720 | 0.735 | 1259 | 2.7 | 7.723 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 666 | 770 | 1476 | 0.451 | 665 | 0.8 | 4.433 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1249 | 423 | 1586 | 0.787 | 1242 | 3.5 | 10.243 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1929 | 167 | 0.106 | 17 | 0.1 | 24.039 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1548 | 431 | 1674 | 0.925 | 1522 | 9.3 | 20.713 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 816 | 930 | 1364 | 0.598 | 813 | 1.5 | 6.511 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1529 | 517 | 1527 | 1.002 | 1464 | 19.8 | 38.789 | E |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1961 | 149 | 0.118 | 18 | 0.1 | 27.299 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1548 | 440 | 1668 | 0.928 | 1542 | 10.7 | 26.538 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 816 | 943 | 1355 | 0.602 | 816 | 1.5 | 6.668 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1529 | 518 | 1526 | 1.002 | 1495 | 28.3 | 66.105 | F |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1727 | 276 | 0.052 | 15 | 0.1 | 13.815 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1264 | 396 | 1699 | 0.744 | 1295 | 3.0 | 9.536 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 666 | 793 | 1460 | 0.456 | 669 | 0.8 | 4.562 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1249 | 425 | 1584 | 0.788 | 1346 | 4.0 | 20.667 | C |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1373 | 466 | 0.026 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.926 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1059 | 310 | 1759 | 0.602 | 1064 | 1.5 | 5.224 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 558 | 651 | 1559 | 0.358 | 559 | 0.6 | 3.605 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1046 | 355 | 1629 | 0.642 | 1054 | 1.8 | 6.358 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4421 (S) - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30 m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3-Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 76.57 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 29 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1502 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1114 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1370 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-Care Home | 1-Care Home | 2 - A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 11 | 14 | 4 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 1 | 0 | 476 | 1025 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 6 | 552 | 0 | 558 |
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.26 | 39.96 | 0.3 | E |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1.02 | 74.76 | 35.8 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1.04 | 104.62 | 38.5 | F |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.99 | 56.47 | 23.3 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 22 | 1433 | 449 | 0.049 | 22 | 0.1 | 8.416 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1131 | 379 | 1740 | 0.650 | 1124 | 1.8 | 5.771 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 839 | 881 | 1443 | 0.581 | 833 | 1.4 | 5.851 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1031 | 417 | 1631 | 0.632 | 1025 | 1.7 | 5.873 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 26 | 1712 | 301 | 0.087 | 26 | 0.1 | 13.059 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1350 | 453 | 1690 | 0.799 | 1342 | 3.8 | 10.134 | B |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1001 | 1053 | 1321 | 0.758 | 995 | 3.0 | 10.819 | B |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1232 | 497 | 1579 | 0.780 | 1225 | 3.4 | 9.987 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 32 | 2017 | 140 | 0.227 | 31 | 0.3 | 32.752 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1654 | 538 | 1632 | 1.013 | 1576 | 23.2 | 40.806 | E |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1227 | 1238 | 1190 | 1.031 | 1148 | 22.5 | 52.067 | F |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1508 | 574 | 1529 | 0.987 | 1454 | 16.9 | 34.783 | D |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 32 | 2053 | 121 | 0.263 | 32 | 0.3 | 39.959 | E |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1654 | 549 | 1625 | 1.018 | 1603 | 35.8 | 74.759 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1227 | 1260 | 1175 | 1.044 | 1163 | 38.5 | 104.620 | F |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1508 | 581 | 1524 | 0.990 | 1483 | 23.3 | 56.474 | F |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 26 | 1865 | 221 | 0.118 | 27 | 0.1 | 18.642 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1350 | 483 | 1670 | 0.809 | 1475 | 4.6 | 27.998 | D |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1001 | 1153 | 1251 | 0.801 | 1137 | 4.6 | 49.959 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1232 | 569 | 1532 | 0.804 | 1307 | 4.4 | 20.418 | C |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 22 | 1459 | 435 | 0.050 | 22 | 0.1 | 8.719 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1131 | 386 | 1736 | 0.651 | 1142 | 1.9 | 6.166 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 839 | 895 | 1433 | 0.585 | 851 | 1.4 | 6.318 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1031 | 426 | 1625 | 0.635 | 1042 | 1.8 | 6.281 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-\mathrm{A} 4421(\mathrm{~S})-$ <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3 - Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 34.97 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | $09: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 16 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1357 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 747 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1382 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 7 | 3 | 6 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 16 | 0 | 565 | 776 |
|  | 3 - Launton Road | 19 | 440 | 0 | 288 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 13 | 955 | 396 | 18 |
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.12 | 27.24 | 0.1 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 0.90 | 20.90 | 8.2 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 0.59 | 6.36 | 1.4 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1.00 | 64.13 | 27.2 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1354 | 477 | 0.025 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.742 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1022 | 316 | 1755 | 0.582 | 1016 | 1.4 | 4.838 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 562 | 611 | 1587 | 0.354 | 560 | 0.5 | 3.497 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1040 | 356 | 1627 | 0.639 | 1033 | 1.7 | 5.993 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1619 | 334 | 0.043 | 14 | 0.0 | 11.265 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1220 | 378 | 1711 | 0.713 | 1216 | 2.4 | 7.203 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 672 | 731 | 1504 | 0.447 | 671 | 0.8 | 4.316 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1242 | 426 | 1583 | 0.785 | 1235 | 3.5 | 10.155 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1928 | 167 | 0.105 | 17 | 0.1 | 23.990 | C |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1494 | 447 | 1663 | 0.898 | 1474 | 7.4 | 17.446 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 822 | 886 | 1395 | 0.589 | 820 | 1.4 | 6.231 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1522 | 521 | 1523 | 0.999 | 1459 | 19.2 | 38.061 | E |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 18 | 1960 | 150 | 0.118 | 18 | 0.1 | 27.240 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1494 | 456 | 1657 | 0.902 | 1491 | 8.2 | 20.898 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 822 | 896 | 1388 | 0.592 | 822 | 1.4 | 6.359 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1522 | 523 | 1522 | 1.000 | 1490 | 27.2 | 64.131 | F |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 14 | 1720 | 279 | 0.052 | 15 | 0.1 | 13.634 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1220 | 408 | 1690 | 0.722 | 1242 | 2.7 | 8.405 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 672 | 748 | 1492 | 0.450 | 674 | 0.8 | 4.414 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1242 | 429 | 1582 | 0.786 | 1335 | 3.9 | 19.667 | C |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 12 | 1371 | 468 | 0.026 | 12 | 0.0 | 7.908 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1022 | 321 | 1751 | 0.583 | 1027 | 1.4 | 5.001 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 562 | 617 | 1583 | 0.355 | 563 | 0.6 | 3.537 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1040 | 358 | 1626 | 0.640 | 1049 | 1.8 | 6.326 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-\mathrm{A} 4421(\mathrm{~S})-$ <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 3 - Launton Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | A4421/Launton Road/Care Home | Standard Roundabout |  | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 54.59 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home |  | $\checkmark$ | 29 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1494 | 100.000 |
| 3-Launton Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1110 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1318 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 11 | 14 | 4 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 1 | 0 | 521 | 972 |
|  | 3 - Launton Road | 4 | 551 | 0 | 555 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 6 | 858 | 332 | 122 |

## Vehicle Mix
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|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-Care Home | 2-A4421 (S) | 3 - Launton Road | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) |
|  | 1-Care Home | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 (S) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | 3-Launton Road | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 0.23 | 34.46 | 0.3 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1.00 | 59.90 | 27.4 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1.00 | 65.60 | 22.3 | F |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 0.96 | 39.72 | 15.1 | E |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 22 | 1394 | 470 | 0.046 | 22 | 0.0 | 8.030 | A |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1125 | 353 | 1757 | 0.640 | 1118 | 1.7 | 5.571 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 836 | 822 | 1485 | 0.563 | 831 | 1.3 | 5.461 | A |
| 4 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 992 | 416 | 1631 | 0.608 | 986 | 1.5 | 5.530 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 26 | 1667 | 325 | 0.080 | 26 | 0.1 | 12.014 | B |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1343 | 422 | 1710 | 0.785 | 1336 | 3.5 | 9.447 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 998 | 983 | 1371 | 0.728 | 993 | 2.6 | 9.386 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1185 | 497 | 1578 | 0.751 | 1179 | 2.9 | 8.899 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total <br> Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 32 | 1990 | 155 | 0.207 | 31 | 0.3 | 29.052 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1645 | 507 | 1653 | 0.995 | 1582 | 19.2 | 35.336 | E |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1222 | 1166 | 1241 | 0.985 | 1172 | 15.0 | 37.893 | E |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1451 | 587 | 1520 | 0.955 | 1414 | 12.1 | 27.543 | D |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 32 | 2025 | 136 | 0.235 | 32 | 0.3 | 34.460 | D |
| 2 - A4421 (S) | 1645 | 515 | 1647 | 0.999 | 1612 | 27.4 | 59.897 | F |
| 3 - Launton Road | 1222 | 1187 | 1226 | 0.997 | 1193 | 22.3 | 65.604 | F |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1451 | 598 | 1513 | 0.959 | 1439 | 15.1 | 39.724 | E |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - Care Home | 26 | 1759 | 276 | 0.094 | 27 | 0.1 | 14.469 | B |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1343 | 441 | 1698 | 0.791 | 1437 | 4.0 | 18.355 | C |
| 3 - Launton Road | 998 | 1053 | 1321 | 0.755 | 1074 | 3.3 | 18.787 | C |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 1185 | 538 | 1552 | 0.763 | 1232 | 3.4 | 12.766 | B |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-Care Home | 22 | 1414 | 459 | 0.048 | 22 | 0.1 | 8.237 | A |
| 2-A4421 (S) | 1125 | 358 | 1754 | 0.641 | 1134 | 1.8 | 5.885 | A |
| 3 - Launton Road | 836 | 834 | 1477 | 0.566 | 843 | 1.3 | 5.754 | A |
| 4-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (N) | 992 | 422 | 1627 | 0.610 | 999 | 1.6 | 5.800 | A |

THE FUTURE

## Junctions 9

| PICADY 9 - Priority Intersection Module |
| :---: | :---: |
| Version: 9.5.0.6896 <br> © Copyright TRL Limited, 2018 |
| For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL: <br> $+44(0) 1344$ 379777 $\quad$ software@trl.co.uk $\quad$ 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: 4_191021_A4421_Bicester Rd Priority (Final Scenarios).j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonk\Dropbox (mode)\Project\Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
DatalModelling\200125_EQ\Baseline
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:13:34

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
»2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```

Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.5 | 16.79 | 0.35 | C | 0.2 | 8.35 | 0.16 | A |
| Stream C-AB | 2.4 | 7.82 | 0.47 | A | 37.6 | 80.57 | 0.99 | F |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.6 | 18.20 | 0.37 | C | 0.2 | 8.36 | 0.16 | A |
| Stream C-AB | 2.7 | 8.34 | 0.50 | A | 51.6 | 110.36 | 1.02 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 1.6 | 28.49 | 0.63 | D | 0.2 | 9.45 | 0.20 | A |
| Stream C-AB | 3.9 | 9.04 | 0.58 | A | 95.3 | 200.24 | 1.11 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 1.6 | 28.33 | 0.62 | D | 0.2 | 9.32 | 0.19 | A |
| Stream C-AB | 3.7 | 8.81 | 0.56 | A | 92.7 | 196.22 | 1.11 | F |

[^11]
## File summary

File Description

| Title | Bicester Heritage Masterplan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | Bicester |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $26 / 04 / 2019$ |
| Version |  |
| Status |  |
| Identifier | EHC |
| Client | Bicester Heritage |
| Jobnumber | J323684 |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 2.06 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | Bicester Road |  | Minor |
| C | A4421 Buckingham Road |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Has right turn <br> bay | Visibility for right turn <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Blocks? | Blocking queue <br> $($ (PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C-A4421 Buckingham Road | 6.50 |  |  | 147.0 | $\checkmark$ |  |

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

## Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B - Bicester Road | One lane | 3.70 | 250 | 130 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | B-A | 674 | 0.120 | 0.303 | 0.191 | 0.433 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | B-C | 755 | 0.113 | 0.286 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | C-B | 659 | 0.250 | 0.250 | - | - |

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 segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |

THE FUTURE

| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1160 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 106 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 709 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1160 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 106 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 629 | 80 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 4 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.35 | 16.79 | 0.5 | C |
| C-AB | 0.47 | 7.82 | 2.4 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 443 | 0.180 | 79 | 0.2 | 9.862 |  |
| C-AB | 152 | 783 | 0.195 | 150 | 0.5 | 5.695 | A |
| C-A | 381 |  |  | 381 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 873 |  | 873 |  |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 396 | 0.241 | 95 | 0.3 | 11.932 | B |
| C-AB | 233 | 823 | 0.283 | 231 | 0.9 | 6.103 | A |
| C-A | 405 |  |  | 405 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1043 |  |  | 1043 |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 331 | 0.353 | 116 | 0.5 | 16.666 | C |
| C-AB | 413 | 885 | 0.467 | 408 | 2.3 | 7.615 | A |
| C-A | 367 |  |  | 367 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1277 |  | 1277 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 331 | 0.353 | 117 | 0.5 | 16.794 | C |
| C-AB | 418 | 889 | 0.470 | 417 | 2.4 | 7.823 | A |
| C-A | 363 |  |  | 363 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1277 |  |  | 1277 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 396 | 0.241 | 96 | 0.3 | 12.033 | B |
| C-AB | 236 | 827 | 0.286 | 242 | 1.0 | 6.280 | A |
| C-A | 401 |  |  | 401 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1043 |  |  | 1043 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 443 | 0.180 | 80 | 0.2 | 9.922 | A |
| C-AB | 155 | 785 | 0.197 | 156 | 0.6 | 5.784 | A |
| C-A | 379 |  |  | 379 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 873 |  |  | 873 |  |  |  |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 34.85 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 748 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 76 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1270 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 748 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 76 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1165 | 105 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | B - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 5 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.16 | 8.35 | 0.2 | A |
| C-AB | 0.99 | 80.57 | 37.6 | F |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| A-C |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 591 | 0.097 | 57 | 0.1 | 6.731 |  |
| C-AB | 357 | 1126 | 0.317 | 352 | 1.1 | 4.656 |  |
| C-A | 599 |  | 599 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 563 |  | 563 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 559 | 0.122 | 68 | 0.1 | 7.334 |  |
| C-AB | 619 | 1242 | 0.498 | 613 | 2.5 |  |  |
| C-A | 523 |  | 523 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 672 |  | 672 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 515 | 0.163 | 83 | 0.2 | 8.342 |  |
| C-AB | 1390 | 1409 | 0.987 | 1294 | 26.7 | 35.628 |  |
| C-A | 8 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 824 |  | 824 |  |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 515 | 0.163 | 84 | 0.2 | 8.350 |  |
| C-AB | 1398 | 1412 | 0.990 | 1355 | 37.6 | 80.572 |  |
| C-A | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 824 |  | 824 |  |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 559 | 0.122 | 69 | 0.1 | 7.343 | A |
| C-AB | 814 | 1341 | 0.607 | 948 | 4.0 | 13.813 | B |
| C-A | 328 |  |  | 328 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 672 |  |  | 672 |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 591 | 0.097 | 57 | 0.1 | 6.751 | A |
| C-AB | 368 | 1137 | 0.324 | 379 | 1.2 | 4.839 | A |
| C-A | 588 |  |  | 588 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 563 |  |  | 563 |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 2.19 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1214 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 106 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 711 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1214 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 106 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 631 | 80 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C-A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 4 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.37 | 18.20 | 0.6 | C |
| C-AB | 0.50 | 8.34 | 2.7 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 432 | 0.185 | 79 | 0.2 | 10.168 | B |
| C-AB | 155 | 776 | 0.200 | 153 | 0.6 | 5.781 | A |
| C-A | 380 |  |  | 380 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 914 |  | 914 |  |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 383 | 0.249 | 95 | 0.3 | 12.491 | B |
| C-AB | 239 | 815 | 0.294 | 237 | 1.0 | 6.249 | A |
| C-A | 400 |  |  | 400 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1091 |  | 1091 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 314 | 0.371 | 116 | 0.6 | 18.027 |  |
| C-AB | 432 | 878 | 0.493 | 426 | 2.6 | 8.068 |  |
| C-A | 350 |  | 350 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1337 |  | 1337 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 314 | 0.371 | 117 | 0.6 | 18.199 |  |
| C-AB | 438 | 882 | 0.496 | 437 | 2.7 | 8.338 |  |
| C-A | 345 |  |  | 345 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1337 |  | 1337 |  |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 383 | 0.249 | 96 | 0.3 | 12.609 | B |
| C-AB | 243 | 821 | 0.297 | 250 | 1.1 | 6.459 | A |
| C-A | 396 |  |  | 396 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1091 |  |  | 1091 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 432 | 0.185 | 80 | 0.2 | 10.245 | B |
| C-AB | 158 | 778 | 0.202 | 160 | 0.6 | 5.879 | A |
| C-A | 378 |  |  | 378 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 914 |  |  | 914 |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 50.81 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 749 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 76 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1324 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 749 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 76 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1219 | 105 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C-A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 5 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.16 | 8.36 | 0.2 | A |
| C-AB | 1.02 | 110.36 | 51.6 | F |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 591 | 0.097 | 57 | 0.1 | 6.734 | A |
| C-AB | 384 | 1156 | 0.332 | 379 | 1.2 | 4.640 | A |
| C-A | 613 |  |  | 613 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 564 |  | 564 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 559 | 0.122 | 68 | 0.1 | 7.338 | A |
| C-AB | 683 | 1278 | 0.534 | 676 | 2.9 | 6.068 | A |
| C-A | 508 |  |  | 508 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 673 |  | 673 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 514 | 0.163 | 83 | 0.2 | 8.348 | A |
| C-AB | 1458 | 1423 | 1.025 | 1332 | 34.4 | 46.081 | E |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 825 |  |  | 825 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 514 | 0.163 | 84 | 0.2 | 8.356 | A |
| C-AB | 1458 | 1424 | 1.023 | 1389 | 51.7 | 110.362 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 825 |  |  | 825 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 559 | 0.122 | 69 | 0.1 | 7.347 | A |
| C-AB | 1034 | 1415 | 0.730 | 1210 | 7.5 | 40.623 | E |
| C-A | 157 |  |  | 157 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 673 |  |  | 673 |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 591 | 0.097 | 57 | 0.1 | 6.754 | A |
| C-AB | 404 | 1176 | 0.344 | 429 | 1.4 | 5.000 | A |
| C-A | 592 |  |  | 592 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 564 |  |  | 564 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 4.03 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1184 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 191 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 814 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 1184 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 191 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.63 | 28.49 | 1.6 | D |
| C-AB | 0.58 | 9.04 | 3.9 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 144 | 455 | 0.316 | 142 | 0.5 | 11.438 | B |
| C-AB | 188 | 837 | 0.224 | 185 | 0.7 | 5.526 | A |
| C-A | 425 |  |  | 425 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 891 |  |  | 891 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 172 | 405 | 0.424 | 171 | 0.7 | 15.296 | C |
| C-AB | 296 | 890 | 0.333 | 294 | 1.3 | 6.065 | A |
| C-A | 436 |  |  | 436 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  | 1064 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 210 | 336 | 0.626 | 207 | 1.6 | 27.247 |  |
| C-AB | 554 | 973 | 0.570 | 544 | 3.7 | 8.570 |  |
| C-A | 342 |  |  | 342 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1304 |  | 1304 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 210 | 336 | 0.626 | 210 | 1.6 | 28.494 |  |
| C-AB | 564 | 980 | 0.576 | 563 | 3.9 | 9.043 |  |
| C-A | 332 |  |  | 332 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1304 |  | 1304 |  |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 172 | 405 | 0.424 | 175 | 0.8 | 15.885 | C |
| C-AB | 303 | 899 | 0.337 | 313 | 1.4 | 6.340 | A |
| C-A | 429 |  |  | 429 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  |  | 1064 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 144 | 455 | 0.316 | 145 | 0.5 | 11.657 | B |
| C-AB | 191 | 840 | 0.227 | 193 | 0.7 | 5.628 | A |
| C-A | 422 |  |  | 422 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 891 |  |  | 891 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 99.40 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 878 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 86 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1391 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 878 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 86 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 4 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.20 | 9.45 | 0.2 | A |
| C-AB | 1.11 | 200.24 | 95.3 | F |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 65 | 564 | 0.115 | 64 | 0.1 | 7.193 | A |
| C-AB | 471 | 1178 | 0.400 | 464 | 1.7 | 5.054 | A |
| C-A | 576 |  |  | 576 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 661 |  | 661 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 527 | 0.147 | 77 | 0.2 | 7.999 | A |
| C-AB | 877 | 1308 | 0.671 | 864 | 5.1 | 8.321 | A |
| C-A | 373 |  |  | 373 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 789 |  | 789 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 476 | 0.199 | 94 | 0.2 | 9.432 | A |
| C-AB | 1532 | 1381 | 1.109 | 1330 | 55.4 | 79.740 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 967 |  |  | 967 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 476 | 0.199 | 95 | 0.2 | 9.446 |  |
| C-AB | 1532 | 1383 | 1.108 | 1372 | 95.3 | 200.244 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 967 |  |  | 967 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 527 | 0.147 | 78 | 0.2 | 8.016 | A |
| C-AB | 1250 | 1423 | 0.879 | 1386 | 61.5 | 195.875 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 789 |  | 789 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 65 | 564 | 0.115 | 65 | 0.1 | 7.212 | A |
| C-AB | 740 | 1344 | 0.551 | 974 | 3.0 | 21.375 | C |
| C-A | 307 |  |  | 307 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 661 |  |  | 661 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 3.90 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> (ength (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1192 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 188 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 806 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 1192 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 188 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.62 | 28.33 | 1.6 | D |
| C-AB | 0.56 | 8.81 | 3.7 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 142 | 453 | 0.312 | 140 | 0.4 | 11.424 | B |
| C-AB | 182 | 832 | 0.219 | 180 | 0.7 | 5.519 | A |
| C-A | 425 |  |  | 425 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 897 |  |  | 897 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 169 | 403 | 0.420 | 168 | 0.7 | 15.259 | C |
| C-AB | 288 | 885 | 0.325 | 285 | 1.2 | 6.036 | A |
| C-A | 437 |  |  | 437 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1072 |  | 1072 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 207 | 333 | 0.621 | 204 | 1.5 | 27.123 |  |
| C-AB | 538 | 966 | 0.557 | 529 | 3.5 | 8.384 |  |
| C-A | 350 |  |  | 350 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1312 |  | 1312 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughhput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 207 | 333 | 0.621 | 207 | 1.6 | 28.331 |  |
| C-AB | 547 | 973 | 0.562 | 546 | 3.7 | 8.808 |  |
| C-A | 341 |  |  | 341 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1312 |  |  | 1312 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 169 | 403 | 0.420 | 172 | 0.7 | 15.830 | C |
| C-AB | 294 | 893 | 0.329 | 303 | 1.3 | 6.292 | A |
| C-A | 430 |  |  | 430 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1072 |  |  | 1072 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 142 | 453 | 0.312 | 143 | 0.5 | 11.634 | B |
| C-AB | 185 | 835 | 0.222 | 188 | 0.7 | 5.619 | A |
| C-A | 422 |  |  | 422 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 897 |  |  | 897 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 97.02 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> (ength (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 876 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 82 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1379 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 876 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 82 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C-A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 4 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.19 | 9.32 | 0.2 | A |
| C-AB | 1.11 | 196.22 | 92.7 | F |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 62 | 565 | 0.109 | 61 | 0.1 | 7.147 | A |
| C-AB | 470 | 1171 | 0.401 | 463 | 1.7 | 5.097 | A |
| C-A | 568 |  |  | 568 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 659 |  | 659 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 74 | 528 | 0.140 | 74 | 0.2 | 7.927 | A |
| C-AB | 868 | 1299 | 0.668 | 855 | 5.0 | 8.320 | A |
| C-A | 372 |  |  | 372 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 788 |  | 788 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 476 | 0.190 | 90 | 0.2 | 9.310 | A |
| C-AB | 1518 | 1373 | 1.105 | 1322 | 54.1 | 78.352 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 964 |  |  | 964 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 476 | 0.190 | 90 | 0.2 | 9.323 | A |
| C-AB | 1518 | 1375 | 1.104 | 1364 | 92.7 | 196.215 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 964 |  |  | 964 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 74 | 528 | 0.140 | 74 | 0.2 | 7.943 | A |
| C-AB | 1240 | 1416 | 0.876 | 1378 | 58.1 | 189.250 | F |
| C-A | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 788 |  | 788 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 62 | 565 | 0.109 | 62 | 0.1 | 7.163 | A |
| C-AB | 715 | 1327 | 0.539 | 936 | 2.9 | 18.502 | C |
| C-A | 323 |  |  | 323 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 659 |  |  | 659 |  |  |  |

## Junctions 9

## ARCADY 9 - Roundabout Module
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Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.2 | 2.53 | 0.19 | A | 0.3 | 2.64 | 0.23 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.2 | 2.71 | 0.17 | A | 0.3 | 2.84 | 0.22 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.0 | 4.96 | 0.01 | A | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | A |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 0.2 | 2.54 | 0.20 | A | 0.4 | 2.79 | 0.27 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.3 | 2.85 | 0.21 | A | 0.3 | 2.84 | 0.22 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.0 | 5.13 | 0.01 | A | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | A |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.3 | 2.61 | 0.21 | A | 0.4 | 2.84 | 0.28 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.3 | 2.90 | 0.21 | A | 0.3 | 2.94 | 0.22 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.0 | 5.14 | 0.02 | A | 0.0 | 4.99 | 0.02 | A |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.3 | 2.60 | 0.21 | A | 0.3 | 2.68 | 0.23 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.3 | 2.91 | 0.21 | A | 0.3 | 2.95 | 0.23 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.0 | 5.15 | 0.02 | A | 0.0 | 5.00 | 0.02 | A |
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## File summary

File Description

| Title | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | Bicester |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $29 / 04 / 2019$ |
| Version |  |
| Status |  |
| Identifier | EHC |
| Client | Bicester Heritage |
| Jobnumber | J323684 |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

| Distance units | Speed units | Traffic units input | Traffic units results | Flow units | Average delay units | Total delay units | Rate of delay units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| m | kph | Veh | Veh | perHour | S | -Min | perMin |

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) , AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.66 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | A4095 Lords Lane |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | Bucknell Road (S) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Bucknell Road (N) |  |

## Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V - Approach road half- <br> width (m) | E - Entry <br> width (m) | I' - Effective flare <br> length (m) | R - Entry <br> radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle <br> diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) <br> angle (deg) | Exit <br> only |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 4.02 | 6.23 | 16.9 | 29.8 | 29.8 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3.75 | 7.40 | 7.7 | 16.6 | 29.8 |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 3.00 | 9.00 | 10.3 | 43.9 | 16.0 |  |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 0.688 | 1773 |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.657 | 1636 |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.665 | 1639 |

The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | 09 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

THE FUTURE

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 311 | 100.000 |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 244 | 100.000 |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 6 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 311 | 0 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 238 | 0 | 6 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.19 | 2.53 | 0.2 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.17 | 2.71 | 0.2 | A |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0.01 | 4.96 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 234 | 4 | 1767 | 0.133 | 234 | 0.2 | 2.346 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 184 | 0 | 1597 | 0.115 | 183 | 0.1 | 2.546 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 179 | 760 | 0.006 | 4 | 0.0 | 4.763 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 280 | 5 | 1766 | 0.158 | 279 | 0.2 | 2.422 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 219 | 0 | 1597 | 0.137 | 219 | 0.2 | 2.612 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 214 | 749 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 4.843 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 342 | 7 | 1764 | 0.194 | 342 | 0.2 | 2.531 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 269 | 0 | 1597 | 0.168 | 268 | 0.2 | 2.709 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 7 | 262 | 733 | 0.009 | 7 | 0.0 | 4.958 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) <br> (sevel of service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 342 | 7 | 1764 | 0.194 | 0.2 | 2.532 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 269 | 0 | 1597 | 0.168 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 7 | 262 | 733 | 0.009 | 269 | 7 | 0.2 | 0.709 |

## 08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 280 | 5 | 1766 | 0.158 | 280 | 0.2 | 2.422 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 219 | 0 | 1597 | 0.137 | 220 | 0.2 | 2.612 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 214 | 748 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 4.846 | A |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 234 | 5 | 1767 | 0.133 | 234 | 0.2 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 184 | 0 | 1597 | 0.115 | 184 |  |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 179 | 760 | 0.006 | 0.1 | 2.546 |  |  |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.73 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 372 | 100.000 |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 316 | 100.000 |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 372 | 0 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 312 | 0 | 4 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.23 | 2.64 | 0.3 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.22 | 2.84 | 0.3 | A |
| 3- Bucknell Road (N) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 280 | 0 | 1773 | 0.158 | 279 | 0.2 | 2.408 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 238 | 0 | 1616 | 0.147 | 237 | 0.2 | 2.609 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 234 | 742 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 334 | 0 | 1773 | 0.189 | 334 | 0.2 | 2.501 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 284 | 0 | 1616 | 0.176 | 284 | 0.2 | 2.702 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 280 | 726 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 410 | 0 | 1773 | 0.231 | 409 | 0.3 | 2.639 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 348 | 0 | 1616 | 0.215 | 348 | 0.3 | 2.838 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 343 | 706 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

## 17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 410 | 0 | 1773 | 0.231 | 410 | 0.3 | 2.639 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 348 | 0 | 1616 | 0.215 | 348 | 0.3 | 2.838 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 344 | 705 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 334 | 0 | 1773 | 0.189 | 335 | 0.2 | 2.502 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 284 | 0 | 1616 | 0.176 | 284 | 0.2 | 2.705 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 281 | 726 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 280 | 0 | 1773 | 0.158 | 280 | 0.2 | 2.413 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 238 | 0 | 1616 | 0.147 | 238 | 0.2 | 2.612 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 235 | 742 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.74 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 315 | 100.000 |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 311 | 100.000 |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 6 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 315 | 0 |
|  | 2- Bucknell Road (S) | 305 | 0 | 6 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 6 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3-Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.20 | 2.54 | 0.2 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.21 | 2.85 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.01 | 5.13 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 237 | 4 | 1767 | 0.134 | 237 | 0.2 | 2.351 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 234 | 0 | 1605 | 0.146 | 233 | 0.2 | 2.622 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 229 | 744 | 0.006 | 4 | 0.0 | 4.870 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 283 | 5 | 1766 | 0.160 | 283 | 0.2 | 2.427 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 280 | 0 | 1605 | 0.174 | 279 | 0.2 | 2.714 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 274 | 729 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 4.977 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 347 | 7 | 1764 | 0.197 | 347 | 0.2 | 2.539 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 342 | 0 | 1605 | 0.213 | 342 | 0.3 | 2.849 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 7 | 336 | 708 | 0.009 | 7 | 0.0 | 5.131 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 347 | 7 | 1764 | 0.197 | 347 | 0.2 | 2.539 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 342 | 0 | 1605 | 0.213 | 342 | 0.3 | 2.849 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 7 | 336 | 708 | 0.009 | 7 | 0.0 | 5.132 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 283 | 5 | 1766 | 0.160 | 283 | 0.2 | 2.430 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 280 | 0 | 1605 | 0.174 | 280 | 0.2 | 2.717 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 274 | 728 | 0.007 | 5 | 0.0 | 4.980 | A |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 237 | 5 | 1767 | 0.134 | 237 | 0.2 | 2.353 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 234 | 0 | 1605 | 0.146 | 234 | 0.2 | 2.627 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 5 | 230 | 743 | 0.006 | 5 | 0.0 | 4.872 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.81 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 439 | 100.000 |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 316 | 100.000 |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 439 | 0 |
|  | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 312 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.27 | 2.79 | 0.4 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.22 | 2.84 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 331 | 0 | 1773 | 0.186 | 330 | 0.2 | 2.493 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 238 | 0 | 1616 | 0.147 | 237 | 0.2 | 2.609 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 234 | 742 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 395 | 0 | 1773 | 0.223 | 394 | 0.3 | 2.611 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 284 | 0 | 1616 | 0.176 | 284 | 0.2 | 2.702 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 280 | 726 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 483 | 0 | 1773 | 0.273 | 483 | 0.4 | 2.790 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 348 | 0 | 1616 | 0.215 | 348 | 0.3 | 2.838 | A |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 343 | 706 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 483 | 0 | 1773 | 0.273 | 483 | 0.4 | 2.790 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 348 | 0 | 1616 | 0.215 | 348 | 0.3 | 2.838 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 344 | 705 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) <br> (level of service |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 395 | 0 | 1773 | 0.223 | 395 | 0.3 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 284 | 0 | 1616 | 0.176 | 2.612 |  |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 281 | 726 | 0.000 | 284 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.705 |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 331 | 0 | 1773 | 0.186 | 331 | 0.2 | 2.497 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 238 | 0 | 1616 | 0.147 | 238 | 0.2 | 2.612 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 235 | 742 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.83 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 340 | 100.000 |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 302 | 100.000 |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 12 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 340 | 0 |
|  | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 290 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 12 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.21 | 2.61 | 0.3 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.21 | 2.90 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.02 | 5.14 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 256 | 9 | 1761 | 0.145 | 255 | 0.2 | 2.390 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 227 | 0 | 1574 | 0.144 | 227 | 0.2 | 2.670 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 9 | 218 | 747 | 0.012 | 9 | 0.0 | 4.875 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 306 | 11 | 1758 | 0.174 | 305 | 0.2 | 2.477 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 271 | 0 | 1574 | 0.173 | 271 | 0.2 | 2.763 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 11 | 261 | 733 | 0.015 | 11 | 0.0 | 4.984 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 374 | 13 | 1755 | 0.213 | 374 | 0.3 | 2.607 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 333 | 0 | 1574 | 0.211 | 332 | 0.3 | 2.899 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 13 | 319 | 714 | 0.019 | 13 | 0.0 | 5.139 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) <br> (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 374 | 13 | 1755 | 0.213 | 374 | 0.3 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 333 | 0 | 1574 | 0.211 | 3.607 |  |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 13 | 319 | 713 | 0.019 | 0.3 |  |  |  |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 306 | 11 | 1758 | 0.174 | 306 | 0.2 | 2.480 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 271 | 0 | 1574 | 0.173 | 272 | 0.2 | 2.766 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 11 | 261 | 733 | 0.015 | 11 | 0.0 | 4.987 | A |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 256 | 9 | 1761 | 0.145 | 256 | 0.2 | 2.394 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 227 | 0 | 1574 | 0.144 | 228 | 0.2 | 2.675 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 9 | 218 | 747 | 0.012 | 9 | 0.0 | 4.879 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.95 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 442 | 100.000 |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 322 | 100.000 |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 13 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 442 | 0 |
|  | 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 310 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 13 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3 - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 92 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.28 | 2.84 | 0.4 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.22 | 2.94 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.02 | 4.99 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 333 | 10 | 1760 | 0.189 | 332 | 0.2 | 2.519 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 242 | 0 | 1578 | 0.154 | 242 | 0.2 | 2.693 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 233 | 773 | 0.013 | 10 | 0.0 | 4.715 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 397 | 12 | 1758 | 0.226 | 397 | 0.3 | 2.646 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 289 | 0 | 1578 | 0.183 | 289 | 0.2 | 2.794 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 279 | 757 | 0.015 | 12 | 0.0 | 4.827 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 487 | 14 | 1754 | 0.277 | 486 | 0.4 | 2.839 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 355 | 0 | 1578 | 0.225 | 354 | 0.3 | 2.942 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 14 | 341 | 736 | 0.019 | 14 | 0.0 | 4.990 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 487 | 14 | 1754 | 0.277 | 487 | 0.4 | 2.839 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 355 | 0 | 1578 | 0.225 | 355 | 0.3 | 2.942 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 14 | 341 | 736 | 0.019 | 14 | 0.0 | 4.990 | A |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 397 | 12 | 1758 | 0.226 | 398 | 0.3 | 2.647 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 289 | 0 | 1578 | 0.183 | 290 | 0.2 | 2.795 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 279 | 757 | 0.015 | 12 | 0.0 | 4.828 | A |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 333 | 10 | 1760 | 0.189 | 333 | 0.2 | 2.522 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 242 | 0 | 1578 | 0.154 | 243 | 0.2 | 2.696 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 234 | 773 | 0.013 | 10 | 0.0 | 4.718 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.83 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | $09: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 338 | 100.000 |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 305 | 100.000 |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 12 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3-Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 338 | 0 |
|  | 2- Bucknell Road (S) | 293 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 3- Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 12 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3-Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2- Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3- Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 100 | 0 |

THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.21 | 2.60 | 0.3 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.21 | 2.91 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.02 | 5.15 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 254 | 9 | 1761 | 0.145 | 254 | 0.2 | 2.387 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 230 | 0 | 1574 | 0.146 | 229 | 0.2 | 2.674 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 9 | 220 | 747 | 0.012 | 9 | 0.0 | 4.880 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 304 | 11 | 1758 | 0.173 | 304 | 0.2 | 2.474 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 274 | 0 | 1574 | 0.174 | 274 | 0.2 | 2.768 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 11 | 263 | 732 | 0.015 | 11 | 0.0 | 4.990 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 372 | 13 | 1755 | 0.212 | 372 | 0.3 | 2.603 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 336 | 0 | 1574 | 0.213 | 336 | 0.3 | 2.905 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 13 | 322 | 712 | 0.019 | 13 | 0.0 | 5.147 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 372 | 13 | 1755 | 0.212 | 372 | 0.3 | 2.603 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 336 | 0 | 1574 | 0.213 | 336 | 0.3 | 2.905 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 13 | 323 | 712 | 0.019 | 13 | 0.0 | 5.148 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 304 | 11 | 1758 | 0.173 | 304 | 0.2 | 2.475 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 274 | 0 | 1574 | 0.174 | 274 | 0.2 | 2.769 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 11 | 264 | 732 | 0.015 | 11 | 0.0 | 4.991 | A |

09:00-09:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 254 | 9 | 1761 | 0.145 | 255 | 0.2 | 2.390 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 230 | 0 | 1574 | 0.146 | 230 | 0.2 | 2.676 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 9 | 221 | 746 | 0.012 | 9 | 0.0 | 4.884 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | A4095 Lords Lane/Bucknell Road | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3$ | 2.88 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 373 | 100.000 |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 326 | 100.000 |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 13 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3-Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 373 | 0 |
|  | 2- Bucknell Road (S) | 314 | 0 | 12 |
|  | 3- Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 13 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 3-Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2- Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 3- Bucknell Road (N) | 0 | 92 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 0.23 | 2.68 | 0.3 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 0.23 | 2.95 | 0.3 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 0.02 | 5.00 | 0.0 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 281 | 10 | 1760 | 0.160 | 280 | 0.2 | 2.431 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 245 | 0 | 1578 | 0.156 | 245 | 0.2 | 2.698 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 236 | 772 | 0.013 | 10 | 0.0 | 4.721 | A |

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 335 | 12 | 1758 | 0.191 | 335 | 0.2 |  |  |
| 2-Bucknell Road (S) | 293 | 0 | 1578 | 0.186 | 2.530 |  |  |  |
| 3-Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 282 | 756 | 0.015 | 0.2 |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 411 | 14 | 1754 | 0.234 | 410 | 0.3 | 2.679 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 359 | 0 | 1578 | 0.227 | 359 | 0.3 | 2.951 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 14 | 345 | 734 | 0.020 | 14 | 0.0 | 5.000 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4095 Lords Lane | 411 | 14 | 1754 | 0.234 | 411 | 0.3 | 2.679 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 359 | 0 | 1578 | 0.227 | 359 | 0.3 | 2.951 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 14 | 346 | 734 | 0.020 | 14 | 0.0 | 5.001 | A |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 335 | 12 | 1758 | 0.191 | 336 | 0.2 | 2.533 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 293 | 0 | 1578 | 0.186 | 293 | 0.2 | 2.801 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 283 | 756 | 0.015 | 12 | 0.0 | 4.838 | A |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4095 Lords Lane | 281 | 10 | 1760 | 0.160 | 281 | 0.2 | 2.435 | A |
| 2 - Bucknell Road (S) | 245 | 0 | 1578 | 0.156 | 246 | 0.2 | 2.701 | A |
| 3 - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 237 | 772 | 0.013 | 10 | 0.0 | 4.723 | A |
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Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.5 | 8.25 | 0.35 | A | 0.7 | 9.35 | 0.41 | A |
| Stream B-A | 0.1 | 8.79 | 0.06 | A | 0.2 | 10.13 | 0.14 | B |
| Stream C-AB | 0.7 | 8.50 | 0.40 | A | 1.0 | 9.62 | 0.48 | A |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.8 | 9.86 | 0.45 | A | 0.7 | 9.42 | 0.41 | A |
| Stream B-A | 0.1 | 8.82 | 0.06 | A | 0.2 | 10.91 | 0.15 | B |
| Stream C-AB | 0.8 | 8.60 | 0.41 | A | 1.7 | 12.61 | 0.60 | B |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.7 | 9.41 | 0.43 | A | 0.7 | 9.50 | 0.41 | A |
| Stream B-A | 0.0 | 8.98 | 0.04 | A | 0.2 | 11.26 | 0.15 | B |
| Stream C-AB | 1.0 | 9.56 | 0.46 | A | 1.9 | 13.90 | 0.63 | B |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.7 | 9.46 | 0.43 | A | 0.7 | 9.53 | 0.41 | A |
| Stream B-A | 0.0 | 8.96 | 0.04 | A | 0.2 | 11.75 | 0.15 | B |
| Stream C-AB | 0.9 | 9.42 | 0.46 | A | 1.9 | 13.84 | 0.63 | B |

[^13]
## File summary

File Description

| Title | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road Priority |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | Bicester |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $29 / 04 / 2019$ |
| Version |  |
| Status |  |
| Identifier | EHC |
| Client | Bicester Heritage |
| Jobnumber | J323684 |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJMMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST), AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 6.38 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Bucknell Road (S) |  | Major |
| B | Howes Lane |  | Minor |
| C | Bucknell Road (N) |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Has right turn <br> bay | Visibility for right turn <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ | Blocks? | Blocking queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C-Bucknell Road (N) | 7.55 |  |  | 154.0 | $\checkmark$ |  |

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

## Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B - Howes Lane | Two lanes | 3.72 | 3.62 | 68 | 47 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | B-A | 556 | 0.094 | 0.239 | 0.150 | 0.341 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | B-C | 701 | 0.100 | 0.253 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | C-B | 663 | 0.240 | 0.240 | - | - |

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 segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D1 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |

THE FUTURE

| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A- Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 79 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 234 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 316 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 11 | 68 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 23 | 0 | 211 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 98 | 218 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 9 | 9 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 6 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.35 | 8.25 | 0.5 | A |
| B-A | 0.06 | 8.79 | 0.1 | A |
| C-AB | 0.40 | 8.50 | 0.7 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 159 | 679 | 0.234 | 158 | 0.3 | 6.884 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 474 | 0.037 | 17 | 0.0 | 7.881 | A |
| C-AB | 184 | 693 | 0.265 | 182 | 0.4 | 7.025 | A |
| C-A | 54 |  | 54 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 8 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 190 | 675 | 0.281 | 189 | 0.4 | 7.407 | A |
| B-A | 21 | 457 | 0.045 | 21 | 0.0 | 8.242 | A |
| C-AB | 224 | 699 | 0.321 | 224 | 0.5 | 7.564 | A |
| C-A | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| AC | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 232 | 669 | 0.347 | 232 | 0.5 | 8.225 | A |
| B-A | 25 | 435 | 0.058 | 25 | 0.1 | 8.778 | A |
| C-AB | 284 | 708 | 0.401 | 283 | 0.7 | 8.452 | A |
| C-A | 64 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| AC | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 232 | 669 | 0.347 | 232 | 0.5 | 8.247 | A |
| B-A | 25 | 435 | 0.058 | 25 | 0.1 | 8.786 | A |
| C-AB | 284 | 708 | 0.401 | 284 | 0.7 | 8.497 | A |
| C-A | 64 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| AC | 75 |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |

08:45-09:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 190 | 675 | 0.281 | 190 | 0.4 | 7.433 | A |
| B-A | 21 | 457 | 0.045 | 21 | 0.0 | 8.252 | A |
| C-AB | 225 | 699 | 0.321 | 225 | 0.5 | 7.626 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| AC | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |

09:00-09:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 159 | 679 | 0.234 | 159 | 0.3 | 6.927 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 473 | 0.037 | 17 | 0.0 | 7.899 | A |
| C-AB | 184 | 693 | 0.265 | 184 | 0.4 | 7.089 | A |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 7.17 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D2 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A- Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 119 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 294 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 376 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 45 | 74 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 53 | 0 | 241 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 124 | 252 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 3 | 0 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.41 | 9.35 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.14 | 10.13 | 0.2 | B |
| C-AB | 0.48 | 9.62 | 1.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 668 | 0.272 | 180 | 0.4 | 7.358 |  |
| B-A | 40 | 459 | 0.087 | 40 | 0.1 | 8.566 | A |
| C-AB | 219 | 700 | 0.313 | 217 | 0.5 | 7.427 | A |
| C-A | 64 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| AB | 34 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |
| AC | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 217 | 661 | 0.328 | 216 | 0.5 | 8.094 |  |
| B-A | 48 | 440 | 0.108 | 48 | 0.1 |  |  |
| C-AB | 269 | 708 | 0.380 | 269 | 0.169 | A | 8.189 |
| C-A | 69 |  |  | 69 |  |  |  |
| AB | 40 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 67 |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 265 | 650 | 0.408 | 265 | 0.7 | 9.315 | A |
| B-A | 58 | 414 | 0.141 | 58 | 0.2 | 10.112 | B |
| C-AB | 343 | 718 | 0.478 | 342 | 1.0 | 9.543 | A |
| C-A | 71 |  |  | 71 |  |  |  |
| AB | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| AC | 81 |  |  | 81 |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 265 | 650 | 0.408 | 265 | 0.7 | 9.354 | A |
| B-A | 58 | 414 | 0.141 | 58 | 0.2 | 10.132 | B |
| C-AB | 343 | 719 | 0.478 | 343 | 1.0 | 9.617 | A |
| C-A | 71 |  |  | 71 |  |  |  |
| AB | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| AC | 81 |  |  | 81 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 217 | 660 | 0.328 | 217 | 0.5 | 8.140 |  |
| B-A | 48 | 439 | 0.108 | 48 | 0.1 | 9.195 | A |
| C-AB | 270 | 708 | 0.381 | 271 | 0.7 | 8.279 | A |
| C-A | 68 |  |  | 68 |  |  |  |
| AB | 40 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 67 |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 668 | 0.272 | 182 | 0.4 | 7.422 | A |
| B-A | 40 | 459 | 0.087 | 40 | 0.1 | 8.605 | A |
| C-AB | 219 | 700 | 0.313 | 220 | 0.5 | 7.519 | A |
| C-A | 64 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| AB | 34 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |
| AC | 56 |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 7.24 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 79 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 299 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 320 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 11 | 68 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 23 | 0 | 276 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 98 | 222 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 9 | 9 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 6 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.45 | 9.86 | 0.8 | A |
| B-A | 0.06 | 8.82 | 0.1 | A |
| C-AB | 0.41 | 8.60 | 0.8 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 208 | 679 | 0.306 | 206 | 0.4 | 7.577 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 473 | 0.037 | 17 | 0.0 | 7.899 | A |
| C-AB | 187 | 693 | 0.270 | 185 | 0.4 | 7.071 | A |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 248 | 675 | 0.368 | 248 | 0.6 | 8.411 | A |
| B-A | 21 | 456 | 0.045 | 21 | 0.0 | 8.266 | A |
| C-AB | 229 | 699 | 0.327 | 228 | 0.5 | 7.630 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| AC | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 304 | 669 | 0.454 | 303 | 0.8 | 9.812 | A |
| B-A | 25 | 434 | 0.058 | 25 | 0.1 | 8.811 | A |
| C-AB | 289 | 708 | 0.408 | 288 | 0.8 | 8.555 | A |
| C-A | 64 |  |  | 64 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| AC | 75 |  |  | 75 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 304 | 669 | 0.454 | 304 | 0.8 | 9.863 | A |
| B-A | 25 | 434 | 0.058 | 25 | 0.1 | 8.819 | A |
| C-AB | 289 | 708 | 0.408 | 289 | 0.8 | 8.601 | A |
| C-A | 63 |  |  | 63 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| AC | 75 |  | 75 |  |  |  |  |

08:45-09:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 248 | 675 | 0.368 | 249 | 0.6 | 8.470 | A |
| B-A | 21 | 456 | 0.045 | 21 | 0.0 | 8.278 | A |
| C-AB | 229 | 699 | 0.327 | 230 | 0.5 | 7.692 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 61 |  | 61 |  |  |  |  |

09:00-09:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 208 | 679 | 0.306 | 208 | 0.4 | 7.651 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 472 | 0.037 | 17 | 0.0 | 7.918 | A |
| C-AB | 187 | 693 | 0.270 | 188 | 0.4 | 7.140 | A |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 8 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| AC | 51 |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 8.90 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 119 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 295 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 443 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 45 | 74 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 53 | 0 | 242 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 126 | 317 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.41 | 9.42 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.15 | 10.91 | 0.2 | B |
| C-AB | 0.60 | 12.61 | 1.7 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 182 | 667 | 0.273 | 181 | 0.4 | 7.378 | A |
| B-A | 40 | 442 | 0.090 | 40 | 0.1 | 8.926 | A |
| C-AB | 276 | 701 | 0.394 | 273 | 0.7 | 8.373 | A |
| C-A | 58 |  |  | 58 |  |  |  |
| AB | 34 |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |
| AC | 56 |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 218 | 660 | 0.330 | 217 | 0.5 | 8.127 | A |
| B-A | 48 | 420 | 0.114 | 48 | 0.1 | 9.671 | A |
| C-AB | 340 | 709 | 0.479 | 338 | 1.0 | 9.699 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  |  |
| AB | 40 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 67 |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 266 | 649 | 0.411 | 266 | 0.7 | 9.380 | A |
| B-A | 58 | 389 | 0.150 | 58 | 0.2 | 10.876 | B |
| C-AB | 433 | 720 | 0.602 | 431 | 1.6 | 12.385 | B |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| AC | 81 |  |  | 81 |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 266 | 649 | 0.411 | 266 | 0.7 | 9.420 | A |
| B-A | 58 | 388 | 0.150 | 58 | 0.2 | 10.915 | B |
| C-AB | 434 | 720 | 0.602 | 434 | 1.7 | 12.608 | B |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| AC | 81 |  | 81 |  |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 218 | 659 | 0.330 | 218 | 0.5 | 8.175 |  |
| B-A | 48 | 418 | 0.114 | 48 | 0.1 | 9.719 |  |
| C-AB | 340 | 710 | 0.480 | 343 | 1.1 | 9.916 |  |
| C-A | 58 |  |  | 58 | A |  |  |
| AB | 40 |  | 40 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 67 |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 182 | 667 | 0.273 | 183 | 0.4 | 7.443 |  |
| B-A | 40 | 441 | 0.090 | 40 | 0.1 | 8.978 |  |
| C-AB | 277 | 701 | 0.394 | 278 | 0.7 | 8.541 |  |
| C-A | 57 |  |  | 57 | A |  |  |
| AB | 34 |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 56 |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 7.27 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:45 | 09:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 90 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 274 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 351 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 13 | 77 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 15 | 0 | 259 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 102 | 249 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 8 | 16 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.43 | 9.41 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.04 | 8.98 | 0.0 | A |
| C-AB | 0.46 | 9.56 | 1.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 195 | 679 | 0.287 | 193 | 0.4 | 7.397 | A |
| B-A | 11 | 462 | 0.024 | 11 | 0.0 | 7.987 | A |
| C-AB | 211 | 690 | 0.305 | 209 | 0.5 | 7.452 | A |
| C-A | 53 |  |  | 53 |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| AC | 58 |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 233 | 674 | 0.345 | 232 | 0.5 | 8.143 | A |
| B-A | 13 | 443 | 0.030 | 13 | 0.0 | 8.381 | A |
| C-AB | 258 | 696 | 0.371 | 257 | 0.6 | 8.186 | A |
| C-A | 57 |  |  | 57 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |
| AC | 69 |  |  | 69 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 285 | 668 | 0.427 | 284 | 0.7 | 9.370 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 418 | 0.040 | 16 | 0.0 | 8.973 | A |
| C-AB | 327 | 704 | 0.464 | 325 | 1.0 | 9.475 | A |
| C-A | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |
| AC | 85 |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 285 | 668 | 0.427 | 285 | 0.7 | 9.411 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 417 | 0.040 | 17 | 0.0 | 8.983 | A |
| C-AB | 327 | 704 | 0.464 | 327 | 1.0 | 9.559 | A |
| C-A | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  |  |
| AB | 14 |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |
| AC | 85 |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |

08:45-09:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 233 | 674 | 0.345 | 234 | 0.5 | 8.193 | A |
| B-A | 13 | 442 | 0.030 | 14 | 0.0 | 8.394 | A |
| C-AB | 258 | 696 | 0.371 | 260 | 0.7 | 8.298 | A |
| C-A | 57 |  |  | 57 |  |  |  |
| AB | 12 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 69 |  | 69 |  |  |  |  |

09:00-09:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $($ Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 195 | 678 | 0.287 | 195 | 0.4 | 7.464 | A |
| B-A | 11 | 461 | 0.025 | 11 | 0.0 | 8.006 | A |
| C-AB | 211 | 691 | 0.306 | 212 | 0.5 | 7.553 | A |
| C-A | 53 |  |  | 53 |  |  |  |
| AB | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |
| AC | 58 |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 9.37 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:30 | 18:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 132 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 292 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 455 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 50 | 82 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 52 | 0 | 240 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 126 | 329 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.41 | 9.50 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.15 | 11.26 | 0.2 | B |
| C-AB | 0.63 | 13.90 | 1.9 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 664 | 0.272 | 179 | 0.4 | 7.407 | A |
| B-A | 39 | 435 | 0.090 | 39 | 0.1 | 9.077 | A |
| C-AB | 287 | 695 | 0.413 | 284 | 0.8 | 8.703 | A |
| C-A | 56 |  | 56 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 38 |  |  | 38 |  |  |  |
| AC | 62 |  | 62 |  |  |  |  |

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 216 | 655 | 0.329 | 215 | 0.5 | 8.171 | A |
| B-A | 47 | 411 | 0.114 | 47 | 0.1 | 9.885 | A |
| C-AB | 353 | 702 | 0.503 | 352 | 1.1 | 10.249 | B |
| C-A | 56 |  |  | 56 |  |  |  |
| AB | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |
| AC | 74 |  |  | 74 |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 264 | 643 | 0.411 | 263 | 0.7 | 9.453 | A |
| B-A | 57 | 378 | 0.151 | 57 | 0.2 | 11.212 | B |
| C-AB | 451 | 711 | 0.634 | 448 | 1.9 | 13.543 | B |
| C-A | 50 |  |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| AB | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AC | 90 |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 264 | 643 | 0.411 | 264 | 0.7 | 9.496 | A |
| B-A | 57 | 377 | 0.152 | 57 | 0.2 | 11.257 | B |
| C-AB | 452 | 712 | 0.635 | 451 | 1.9 | 13.901 | B |
| C-A | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AB | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AC | 90 |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 216 | 655 | 0.329 | 217 | 0.5 | 8.220 |  |
| B-A | 47 | 409 | 0.114 | 47 | 0.1 |  |  |
| C-AB | 354 | 702 | 0.504 | 357 | 1.2 | 10.939 |  |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |
| AC | 74 |  | 74 |  |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 663 | 0.272 | 181 | 0.4 | 7.473 |  |
| B-A | 39 | 434 | 0.090 | 39 | 0.1 | 9.131 |  |
| C-AB | 287 | 695 | 0.413 | 289 | 0.8 | 8.926 |  |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 38 |  |  | 68 |  |  |  |
| AC | 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 7.21 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 45$ | $09: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 90 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 276 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 349 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 12 | 78 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 15 | 0 | 261 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 104 | 245 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 8 | 15 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 12 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.43 | 9.46 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.04 | 8.96 | 0.0 | A |
| C-AB | 0.46 | 9.42 | 0.9 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 196 | 679 | 0.290 | 195 | 0.4 | 7.420 | A |
| B-A | 11 | 463 | 0.024 | 11 | 0.0 | 7.973 | A |
| C-AB | 208 | 692 | 0.301 | 206 | 0.5 | 7.395 | A |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |
| AC | 59 |  | 59 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 235 | 674 | 0.348 | 234 | 0.5 | 8.175 | A |
| B-A | 13 | 444 | 0.030 | 13 | 0.0 | 8.363 | A |
| C-AB | 255 | 697 | 0.365 | 254 | 0.6 | 8.102 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  |  |
| AB | 11 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |
| AC | 70 |  |  | 70 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 287 | 668 | 0.430 | 287 | 0.7 | 9.424 |  |
| B-A | 17 | 419 | 0.039 | 16 | 0.0 | 8 |  |
| C-AB | 322 | 705 | 0.457 | 321 | 0.9 | 9.336 | A |
| C-A | 62 |  |  | 62 |  |  | A |
| AB | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |
| AC | 86 |  |  | 86 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 287 | 668 | 0.430 | 287 | 0.7 | 9.465 | A |
| B-A | 17 | 418 | 0.039 | 17 | 0.0 | 8.957 | A |
| C-AB | 323 | 706 | 0.457 | 323 | 0.9 | 9.417 | A |
| C-A | 62 |  |  | 62 |  |  |  |
| AB | 13 |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |
| AC | 86 |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |

08:45-09:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 235 | 674 | 0.348 | 235 | 0.5 | 8.227 | A |
| B-A | 13 | 443 | 0.030 | 14 | 0.0 | 8.377 | A |
| C-AB | 255 | 697 | 0.365 | 256 | 0.7 | 8.210 | A |
| C-A | 59 |  | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| AB | 11 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 70 |  | 70 |  |  |  |  |

09:00-09:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 196 | 678 | 0.290 | 197 | 0.4 | 7.484 | A |
| B-A | 11 | 462 | 0.024 | 11 | 0.0 | 7.992 | A |
| C-AB | 208 | 692 | 0.301 | 209 | 0.5 | 7.491 | A |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 9 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |
| AC | 59 |  |  | 59 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | Howes Lane/Bucknell Road | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 9.37 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (Inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 30$ | $18: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - Bucknell Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 134 | 100.000 |
| B - Howes Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 291 | 100.000 |
| C - Bucknell Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 452 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 48 | 86 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 51 | 0 | 240 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 124 | 328 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | B - Howes Lane | C - Bucknell Road (N) |
|  | A - Bucknell Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 14 |
|  | B - Howes Lane | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - Bucknell Road (N) | 10 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.41 | 9.53 | 0.7 | A |
| B-A | 0.15 | 11.75 | 0.2 | B |
| C-AB | 0.63 | 13.84 | 1.9 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:30-16:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 663 | 0.273 | 179 | 0.4 | 7.420 | A |
| B-A | 38 | 418 | 0.092 | 38 | 0.1 | 9.456 | A |
| C-AB | 285 | 694 | 0.411 | 282 | 0.8 | 8.698 | A |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 36 |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |
| AC | 65 |  |  | 65 |  |  |  |

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 216 | 654 | 0.330 | 215 | 0.5 | 8.189 | A |
| B-A | 46 | 395 | 0.116 | 46 | 0.1 | 10.307 | B |
| C-AB | 351 | 700 | 0.502 | 350 | 1.1 | 10.233 | B |
| C-A | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  |  |
| AB | 43 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |
| AC | 77 |  |  | 77 |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 264 | 642 | 0.412 | 263 | 0.7 | 9.486 | A |
| B-A | 56 | 363 | 0.155 | 56 | 0.2 | 11.703 | B |
| C-AB | 448 | 709 | 0.632 | 445 | 1.9 | 13.494 | B |
| C-A | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AB | 53 |  |  | 53 |  |  |  |
| AC | 95 |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r )}$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 264 | 642 | 0.412 | 264 | 0.7 | 9.529 | A |
| B-A | 56 | 363 | 0.155 | 56 | 0.2 | 11.750 | B |
| C-AB | 449 | 710 | 0.632 | 449 | 1.9 | 13.843 | B |
| C-A | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AB | 53 |  |  | 53 |  |  |  |
| AC | 95 |  | 95 |  |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 216 | 654 | 0.330 | 217 | 0.5 | 8.240 |  |
| B-A | 46 | 394 | 0.116 | 46 | 0.1 | 10.364 |  |
| C-AB | 352 | 701 | 0.502 | 355 | 1.2 | 10.561 |  |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 |  |  |  |
| AB | 43 |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |
| AC | 77 |  | 77 |  |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 181 | 663 | 0.273 | 181 | 0.4 | 7.486 |  |
| B-A | 38 | 417 | 0.092 | 39 | 0.1 |  |  |
| C-AB | 286 | 694 | 0.412 | 287 | 0.8 |  |  |
| C-A | 54 |  |  | 54 | 8 |  |  |
| AB | 36 |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 65 |  | 65 |  |  |  |  |


| Junctons |
| :---: |
| PICADY 9 - Priority Intersection Module |
| Version: 9.5.0.6896 <br> © Copyright TRL Limited, 2018 |
| For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL: +44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: A_200117_A4421 Buckingham Rd_Site Access Priority.j9
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Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |  |  |  |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.0 | 14.16 | 0.04 | B | 1.0 | 17.30 | 0.51 | C |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 1.0 | 24.54 | 0.50 | C | 0.0 | 7.46 | 0.00 | A |  |  |  |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.0 | 14.92 | 0.04 | B | 1.2 | 21.12 | 0.56 | C |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 1.1 | 27.22 | 0.53 | D | 0.0 | 8.20 | 0.00 | A |  |  |  |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.0 | 15.29 | 0.04 | C | 1.2 | 21.00 | 0.55 | C |  |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 1.2 | 28.62 | 0.54 | D | 0.0 | 8.18 | 0.00 | A |  |  |  |

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

| Title | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | Bicester |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $30 / 04 / 2019$ |
| Version |  |
| Status |  |
| Identifier | EHC |
| Client | Bicester Heritage |
| Jobnumber | J323684 |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJIMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |
| D8 | 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ | 15 |
| D11 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ | 15 |
| D12 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | 15 |  |

## Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.50 | A |

Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | Site Access |  | Minor |
| C | A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right turn bay | Width for right turn (m) | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 6.00 |  | $\checkmark$ | 3.50 | 150.0 | $\checkmark$ | 10.00 |

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

## Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B - Site Access | One lane | 3.00 | 50 | 50 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> A-B | Slope <br> for <br> A-C | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | B-A | 519 | 0.094 | 0.239 | 0.150 | 0.341 |
| SA 4 | B-C | 655 | 0.100 | 0.254 | - | - |
| SA 4 | C-B | 754 | 0.292 | 0.292 | - | - |

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> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1327 | 100.000 |
| B-Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 10 | 100.000 |
| C-A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 842 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | B - Site Access | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  |  |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 55 | 1272 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 10 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.04 | 14.16 | 0.0 | B |
| C-AB | 0.50 | 24.54 | 1.0 | C |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 389 | 0.019 | 7 | 0.0 | 9.441 | A |
| C-AB | 102 | 440 | 0.231 | 100 | 0.3 | 10.567 | B |
| C-A | 532 |  |  | 532 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |
| AC | 958 |  | 958 |  |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 337 | 0.027 | 9 | 0.0 | 10.980 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 379 | 0.320 | 121 | 0.5 | 13.904 | B |
| C-A | 636 |  |  | 636 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1144 |  | 1144 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 265 | 0.042 | 11 | 0.0 | 14.154 | B |
| C-AB | 149 | 295 | 0.505 | 147 | 1.0 | 23.941 | C |
| C-A | 778 |  |  | 778 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1400 |  |  | 1400 |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 265 | 0.042 | 11 | 0.0 | 14.159 | B |
| C-AB | 149 | 295 | 0.505 | 149 | 1.0 | 24.541 | C |
| C-A | 778 |  |  | 778 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1400 |  |  | 1400 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 337 | 0.027 | 9 | 0.0 | 10.984 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 379 | 0.320 | 123 | 0.5 | 14.196 | B |
| C-A | 636 |  |  | 636 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1144 |  | 1144 |  |  |  |  |

## 08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 389 | 0.019 | 8 | 0.0 | 9.447 |  |
| C-AB | 102 | 440 | 0.231 | 102 | 0.3 | 10.686 | B |
| C-A | 532 |  |  | 532 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |
| AC | 958 |  |  | 958 |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.44 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2026 SATURN Base + Comm (inc FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 833 | 100.000 |
| B - Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 193 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1259 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 832 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 193 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 1258 | 1 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

| From | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.51 | 17.30 | 1.0 | C |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 7.46 | 0.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 495 | 0.294 | 144 | 0.4 | 10.210 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 569 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.332 | A |
| C-A | 947 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 626 |  | 626 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 463 | 0.374 | 173 | 0.6 | 12.353 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 533 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 6.761 | A |
| C-A | 1131 |  |  | 1131 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 748 |  | 748 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 420 | 0.506 | 211 | 1.0 | 17.053 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 484 | 0.002 | 1 | 0.0 | 7.460 | A |
| C-A | 1385 |  |  | 1385 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 916 |  |  | 916 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 420 | 0.506 | 212 | 1.0 | 17.297 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 484 | 0.002 | 1 | 0.0 | 7.460 | A |
| C-A | 1385 |  |  | 1385 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 916 |  |  | 916 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 463 | 0.374 | 175 | 0.6 | 12.547 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 533 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 6.763 | A |
| C-A | 1131 |  |  | 1131 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 748 |  | 748 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 495 | 0.294 | 146 | 0.4 | 10.348 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 569 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.334 | A |
| C-A | 947 |  |  | 947 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 626 |  | 626 |  |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.57 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1382 | 100.000 |
| B - Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 10 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 943 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 55 | 1327 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 808 | 135 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

| From | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.04 | 14.92 | 0.0 | B |
| C-AB | 0.53 | 27.22 | 1.1 | D |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 380 | 0.020 | 7 | 0.0 | 9.666 |  |
| C-AB | 102 | 430 | 0.236 | 100 | 0.3 | 10.890 | B |
| C-A | 608 |  |  | 608 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  | 41 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 999 |  |  | 999 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 326 | 0.028 | 9 | 0.0 | 11.342 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 367 | 0.331 | 121 | 0.5 | 14.583 | B |
| C-A | 726 |  |  | 726 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1193 |  | 1193 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 252 | 0.044 | 11 | 0.0 | 14.910 |  |
| C-AB | 149 | 281 | 0.531 | 147 | 1.1 | 26.381 |  |
| C-A | 889 |  |  | 889 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1461 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughhput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 252 | 0.044 | 11 | 0.0 | 14.916 |  |
| C-AB | 149 | 281 | 0.531 | 149 | 1.1 | 27.218 |  |
| C-A | 889 |  |  | 889 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1461 |  |  | 1461 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 326 | 0.028 | 9 | 0.0 | 11.349 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 367 | 0.331 | 124 | 0.5 | 14.951 | B |
| C-A | 726 |  |  | 726 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1193 |  |  | 1193 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 380 | 0.020 | 8 | 0.0 | 9.673 | A |
| C-AB | 102 | 430 | 0.236 | 102 | 0.3 | 11.020 | B |
| C-A | 608 |  |  | 608 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |
| AC | 999 |  |  | 999 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.62 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 967 | 100.000 |
| B - Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 193 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1324 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Site Access | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 966 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 193 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 1323 | 1 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A44421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.56 | 21.12 | 1.2 | C |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 8.20 | 0.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 469 | 0.310 | 144 | 0.4 | 11.009 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 539 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.682 | A |
| C-A | 996 |  |  | 996 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 727 |  | 727 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 433 | 0.401 | 173 | 0.7 | 13.801 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 498 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 7.245 | A |
| C-A | 1189 |  |  | 1189 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 868 |  | 868 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 383 | 0.556 | 210 | 1.2 | 20.651 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 440 | 0.003 | 1 | 0.0 | 8.201 | A |
| C-A | 1457 |  |  | 1457 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  |  | 1064 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 383 | 0.556 | 212 | 1.2 | 21.122 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 440 | 0.003 | 1 | 0.0 | 8.201 | A |
| C-A | 1457 |  |  | 1457 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  |  | 1064 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 433 | 0.401 | 176 | 0.7 | 14.121 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 498 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 7.248 | A |
| C-A | 1189 |  |  | 1189 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 868 |  | 868 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r ) ~}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 469 | 0.310 | 146 | 0.5 | 11.192 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 539 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.682 | A |
| C-A | 996 |  |  | 996 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 727 |  | 727 |  |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.63 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> (ength (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D11 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1389 | 100.000 |
| B - Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 10 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 936 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 55 | 1334 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 801 | 135 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

| From | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 8 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.04 | 15.29 | 0.0 | C |
| C-AB | 0.54 | 28.62 | 1.2 | D |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 376 | 0.020 | 7 | 0.0 | 9.770 | A |
| C-AB | 102 | 425 | 0.239 | 100 | 0.3 | 11.042 | B |
| C-A | 603 |  |  | 603 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1004 |  | 1004 |  |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 322 | 0.028 | 9 | 0.0 | 11.515 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 361 | 0.336 | 121 | 0.5 | 14.909 | B |
| C-A | 720 |  |  | 720 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1199 |  | 1199 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 247 | 0.045 | 11 | 0.0 | 15.276 |  |
| C-AB | 150 | 275 | 0.544 | 147 | 1.1 | 27.641 |  |
| C-A | 881 |  |  | 881 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  | 61 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1469 |  |  | 1469 |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 11 | 247 | 0.045 | 11 | 0.0 | 15.285 |  |
| C-AB | 150 | 275 | 0.544 | 150 | 1.2 | 28.620 |  |
| C-A | 881 |  |  | 881 |  |  |  |
| AB | 61 |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1469 |  |  | 1469 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 9 | 322 | 0.028 | 9 | 0.0 | 11.524 | B |
| C-AB | 121 | 361 | 0.336 | 124 | 0.5 | 15.321 | C |
| C-A | 720 |  |  | 720 |  |  |  |
| AB | 49 |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1199 |  |  | 1199 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 8 | 376 | 0.020 | 8 | 0.0 | 9.778 | A |
| C-AB | 102 | 425 | 0.239 | 102 | 0.3 | 11.179 | B |
| C-A | 603 |  |  | 603 |  |  |  |
| AB | 41 |  |  | 41 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1004 |  |  | 1004 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SA 4 | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane/Site Access | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.65 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> Iength (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D12 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 954 | 100.000 |
| B - Site Access |  | $\checkmark$ | 193 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1287 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 953 |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 193 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 1286 | 1 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

| From | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Site Access | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) |
|  | B - Site Access | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road (S) | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.55 | 21.00 | 1.2 | C |
| C-AB | 0.00 | 8.18 | 0.0 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 469 | 0.309 | 144 | 0.4 | 10.986 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 540 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.672 | A |
| C-A | 968 |  |  | 968 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 717 |  | 717 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 433 | 0.400 | 173 | 0.7 | 13.760 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 499 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 7.231 | A |
| C-A | 1156 |  |  | 1156 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 857 |  | 857 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 384 | 0.554 | 210 | 1.2 | 20.535 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 441 | 0.003 | 1 | 0.0 | 8.179 | A |
| C-A | 1416 |  |  | 1416 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1049 |  |  | 1049 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 212 | 384 | 0.554 | 212 | 1.2 | 20.997 | C |
| C-AB | 1 | 441 | 0.003 | 1 | 0.0 | 8.179 | A |
| C-A | 1416 |  |  | 1416 |  |  |  |
| AB | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1049 |  |  | 1049 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 174 | 433 | 0.400 | 176 | 0.7 | 14.076 | B |
| C-AB | 0.90 | 499 | 0.002 | 0.90 | 0.0 | 7.234 | A |
| C-A | 1156 |  |  | 1156 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.90 |  |  | 0.90 |  |  |  |
| AC | 857 |  | 857 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $\mathbf{( V e h / h r ) ~}$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 145 | 469 | 0.309 | 146 | 0.5 | 11.168 | B |
| C-AB | 0.75 | 540 | 0.001 | 0.75 | 0.0 | 6.675 | A |
| C-A | 968 |  |  | 968 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0.75 |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| AC | 717 |  | 717 |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX N - Junctions 9 Outputs Mitigation Proposals

## Junctions 9

## ARCADY 9 -Roundabout Module

## Version: 9.5.0.6896

© Copyright TRL Limited, 2018
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
+44 (0)1344379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: 1_191021_A4421 Buckingham rd_Buckingham rd_A4421 Skimmingdish Ln_EQ_MITIGATED_V2.j9
Path: C:IUsers\JamesMonklDropbox (mode)\Project|Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
DatalModelling\201125_EQ\EQ Mitigation
Report generation date: 16/12/2020 16:01:42

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```


## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 16.5 | 39.97 | 0.96 | E | 1.7 | 4.87 | 0.63 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.2 | 4.68 | 0.56 | A | 27.4 | 54.79 | 0.99 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.9 | 6.52 | 0.48 | A | 4.6 | 36.56 | 0.84 | E |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 5.5 | 14.55 | 0.85 | B | 5.5 | 17.66 | 0.86 | C |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 25.1 | 55.72 | 0.99 | F | 2.6 | 6.76 | 0.73 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.7 | 5.74 | 0.64 | A | 86.4 | 142.66 | 1.09 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.2 | 8.13 | 0.54 | A | 6.2 | 49.84 | 0.89 | E |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 7.5 | 19.87 | 0.89 | C | 10.7 | 33.62 | 0.93 | D |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 22.8 | 50.99 | 0.99 | F | 2.5 | 6.51 | 0.72 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.5 | 5.29 | 0.61 | A | 55.3 | 98.13 | 1.04 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 1.1 | 7.55 | 0.53 | A | 6.7 | 52.45 | 0.90 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 6.2 | 16.75 | 0.87 | C | 8.1 | 26.09 | 0.90 | D |

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

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

## File summary

File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $04 / 05 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJMMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{A} 4421$ Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 20.68 | C |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | Buckingham Road |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4095 Southwold Lane |  |

## Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V - Approach road half-width (m) | E - Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R - Entry radius ( $m$ ) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 3.50 | 9.90 | 60.0 | 48.9 | 50.0 | 15.5 |  |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3.60 | 10.30 | 76.0 | 13.3 | 50.0 | 29.0 |  |
| 3-Buckingham Road | 3.20 | 8.60 | 46.0 | 15.9 | 50.0 | 30.0 |  |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3.80 | 9.20 | 30.0 | 31.4 | 50.0 | 24.0 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.821 | 2705 |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.776 | 2618 |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.687 | 2132 |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.728 | 2274 |

The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1425 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 878 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 457 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1290 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 587 | 375 | 425 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 290 | 0 | 17 | 571 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 267 | 91 | 0 | 99 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 340 | 905 | 45 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 12 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.96 | 39.97 | 16.5 | E |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.56 | 4.68 | 1.2 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.48 | 6.52 | 0.9 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.85 | 14.55 | 5.5 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1073 | 780 | 1916 | 0.560 | 1068 | 1.3 | 4.218 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 661 | 662 | 1979 | 0.334 | 659 | 0.5 | 2.723 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 344 | 993 | 1388 | 0.248 | 343 | 0.3 | 3.439 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 971 | 515 | 1837 | 0.529 | 967 | 1.1 | 4.114 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1281 | 933 | 1795 | 0.714 | 1276 | 2.4 | 6.881 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 789 | 791 | 1875 | 0.421 | 788 | 0.7 | 3.308 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 411 | 1188 | 1247 | 0.329 | 410 | 0.5 | 4.298 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1160 | 616 | 1764 | 0.657 | 1157 | 1.9 | 5.891 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1569 | 1136 | 1634 | 0.960 | 1527 | 13.0 | 26.686 | D |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 967 | 947 | 1750 | 0.552 | 965 | 1.2 | 4.570 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 503 | 1442 | 1064 | 0.473 | 502 | 0.9 | 6.387 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1420 | 752 | 1666 | 0.853 | 1407 | 5.3 | 13.254 | B |

## 08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1569 | 1145 | 1627 | 0.964 | 1555 | 16.5 | 39.973 | E |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 967 | 964 | 1736 | 0.557 | 967 | 1.2 | 4.676 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 503 | 1453 | 1055 | 0.477 | 503 | 0.9 | 6.519 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1420 | 755 | 1664 | 0.854 | 1419 | 5.5 | 14.546 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1281 | 947 | 1784 | 0.718 | 1337 | 2.6 | 9.026 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 789 | 827 | 1846 | 0.427 | 791 | 0.8 | 3.417 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 411 | 1210 | 1230 | 0.334 | 412 | 0.5 | 4.408 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1160 | 620 | 1761 | 0.658 | 1174 | 2.0 | 6.273 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1073 | 786 | 1912 | 0.561 | 1078 | 1.3 | 4.346 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 661 | 668 | 1974 | 0.335 | 662 | 0.5 | 2.747 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 344 | 999 | 1384 | 0.249 | 345 | 0.3 | 3.469 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 971 | 517 | 1835 | 0.529 | 974 | 1.1 | 4.198 | A |

THE FUTURE

## 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{A} 4421$ Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 30.32 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(\mathbf{H H}: \mathbf{m m})$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1153 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1642 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 439 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1062 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 312 | 345 | 417 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 609 | 0 | 87 | 946 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 44 | 0 | 31 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 372 | 621 | 69 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.63 | 4.87 | 1.7 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.99 | 54.79 | 27.4 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.84 | 36.56 | 4.6 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.86 | 17.66 | 5.5 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 868 | 550 | 2220 | 0.391 | 865 | 0.6 | 2.653 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 683 | 2064 | 0.599 | 1230 | 1.5 | 4.289 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 331 | 1537 | 1037 | 0.319 | 329 | 0.5 | 5.067 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 800 | 821 | 1636 | 0.489 | 796 | 0.9 | 4.265 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1037 | 658 | 2131 | 0.486 | 1035 | 0.9 | 3.283 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 817 | 1960 | 0.753 | 1470 | 3.0 | 7.259 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 1838 | 835 | 0.472 | 393 | 0.9 | 8.105 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 955 | 981 | 1520 | 0.628 | 952 | 1.7 | 6.307 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1269 | 798 | 2015 | 0.630 | 1267 | 1.7 | 4.791 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 999 | 1819 | 0.994 | 1741 | 19.7 | 32.464 | D |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2194 | 596 | 0.810 | 472 | 3.7 | 26.919 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1169 | 1171 | 1382 | 0.846 | 1156 | 5.0 | 15.135 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1269 | 806 | 2008 | 0.632 | 1269 | 1.7 | 4.870 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1808 | 1002 | 1817 | 0.995 | 1777 | 27.4 | 54.790 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 483 | 2229 | 573 | 0.844 | 480 | 4.6 | 36.562 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1169 | 1192 | 1367 | 0.855 | 1167 | 5.5 | 17.663 | C |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1037 | 671 | 2120 | 0.489 | 1039 | 1.0 | 3.338 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1476 | 821 | 1957 | 0.754 | 1573 | 3.2 | 11.809 | B |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 395 | 1937 | 769 | 0.513 | 409 | 1.1 | 10.376 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 955 | 1035 | 1481 | 0.645 | 969 | 1.9 | 7.219 | A |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 868 | 555 | 2216 | 0.392 | 869 | 0.6 | 2.677 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1236 | 686 | 2061 | 0.600 | 1243 | 1.5 | 4.434 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 331 | 1551 | 1028 | 0.321 | 333 | 0.5 | 5.195 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 800 | 830 | 1630 | 0.491 | 803 | 1.0 | 4.374 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 28.00 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(\mathbf{H H}: \mathbf{m m})$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1480 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1007 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 477 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1303 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 639 | 389 | 414 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 340 | 0 | 22 | 645 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 290 | 89 | 0 | 98 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 367 | 887 | 49 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.99 | 55.72 | 25.1 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.64 | 5.74 | 1.7 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.54 | 8.13 | 1.2 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.89 | 19.87 | 7.5 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1114 | 768 | 1923 | 0.579 | 1109 | 1.4 | 4.391 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 758 | 667 | 1974 | 0.384 | 756 | 0.6 | 2.948 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 359 | 1078 | 1326 | 0.271 | 358 | 0.4 | 3.713 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 981 | 568 | 1800 | 0.545 | 976 | 1.2 | 4.347 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1330 | 919 | 1804 | 0.737 | 1325 | 2.7 | 7.430 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 905 | 797 | 1869 | 0.484 | 904 | 0.9 | 3.724 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 429 | 1289 | 1173 | 0.366 | 428 | 0.6 | 4.826 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1171 | 679 | 1719 | 0.681 | 1168 | 2.1 | 6.489 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1630 | 1114 | 1649 | 0.988 | 1570 | 17.6 | 32.733 | D |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1109 | 945 | 1750 | 0.634 | 1106 | 1.7 | 5.563 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 525 | 1561 | 977 | 0.538 | 523 | 1.1 | 7.890 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1435 | 829 | 1611 | 0.891 | 1415 | 6.9 | 16.976 | C |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1630 | 1127 | 1639 | 0.994 | 1599 | 25.1 | 55.721 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1109 | 963 | 1736 | 0.639 | 1109 | 1.7 | 5.736 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 525 | 1573 | 968 | 0.543 | 525 | 1.2 | 8.126 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1435 | 833 | 1608 | 0.892 | 1432 | 7.5 | 19.875 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1330 | 937 | 1789 | 0.744 | 1419 | 3.0 | 12.086 | B |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 905 | 851 | 1826 | 0.496 | 908 | 1.0 | 3.938 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 429 | 1322 | 1148 | 0.373 | 431 | 0.6 | 5.035 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1171 | 686 | 1714 | 0.683 | 1193 | 2.2 | 7.166 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1114 | 775 | 1918 | 0.581 | 1121 | 1.4 | 4.549 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 758 | 674 | 1969 | 0.385 | 760 | 0.6 | 2.982 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 359 | 1085 | 1321 | 0.272 | 360 | 0.4 | 3.753 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 981 | 571 | 1797 | 0.546 | 985 | 1.2 | 4.455 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 69.10 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1282 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1742 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 435 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1113 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 378 | 364 | 461 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 722 | 0 | 77 | 943 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 366 | 41 | 0 | 28 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 333 | 711 | 69 | 0 |

THE FUTURE

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.73 | 6.76 | 2.6 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.09 | 142.66 | 86.4 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.89 | 49.84 | 6.2 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.93 | 33.62 | 10.7 | D |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 965 | 615 | 2178 | 0.443 | 962 | 0.8 | 2.952 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1311 | 730 | 2029 | 0.646 | 1304 | 1.8 | 4.917 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 327 | 1652 | 960 | 0.341 | 325 | 0.5 | 5.651 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 838 | 904 | 1571 | 0.533 | 833 | 1.1 | 4.850 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1152 | 735 | 2079 | 0.554 | 1151 | 1.2 | 3.873 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1566 | 873 | 1919 | 0.816 | 1556 | 4.2 | 9.680 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 391 | 1972 | 745 | 0.525 | 389 | 1.1 | 10.041 | B |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1001 | 1080 | 1444 | 0.693 | 996 | 2.2 | 7.957 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1412 | 884 | 1955 | 0.722 | 1406 | 2.5 | 6.481 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1918 | 1066 | 1770 | 1.083 | 1744 | 47.6 | 62.727 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 479 | 2260 | 552 | 0.867 | 463 | 5.0 | 35.751 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1225 | 1243 | 1326 | 0.924 | 1199 | 8.8 | 24.465 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1412 | 898 | 1943 | 0.726 | 1411 | 2.6 | 6.762 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1918 | 1071 | 1767 | 1.086 | 1763 | 86.4 | 142.664 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 479 | 2279 | 539 | 0.888 | 474 | 6.2 | 49.842 | E |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1225 | 1261 | 1313 | 0.933 | 1218 | 10.7 | 33.618 | D |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1152 | 761 | 2057 | 0.560 | 1158 | 1.3 | 4.026 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1566 | 880 | 1913 | 0.818 | 1886 | 6.5 | 91.932 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 391 | 2290 | 531 | 0.736 | 404 | 3.1 | 30.350 | D |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1001 | 1230 | 1336 | 0.749 | 1031 | 3.1 | 12.876 | B |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 965 | 624 | 2170 | 0.445 | 967 | 0.8 | 2.998 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1311 | 734 | 2026 | 0.647 | 1330 | 1.9 | 5.308 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 327 | 1679 | 942 | 0.348 | 338 | 0.5 | 6.048 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 838 | 927 | 1555 | 0.539 | 846 | 1.2 | 5.130 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 25.52 | D |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1490 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 961 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 483 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1271 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 38 | 653 | 398 | 401 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 334 | 0 | 15 | 612 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 291 | 92 | 0 | 100 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 364 | 860 | 47 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 2 | 3 | 9 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.99 | 50.99 | 22.8 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 0.61 | 5.29 | 1.5 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.53 | 7.55 | 1.1 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.87 | 16.75 | 6.2 | C |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1122 | 749 | 1940 | 0.578 | 1116 | 1.4 | 4.341 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 723 | 662 | 1978 | 0.366 | 721 | 0.6 | 2.860 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 1039 | 1354 | 0.268 | 362 | 0.4 | 3.624 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 957 | 566 | 1800 | 0.532 | 952 | 1.1 | 4.225 | A |

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1339 | 896 | 1824 | 0.734 | 1334 | 2.7 | 7.273 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 864 | 792 | 1874 | 0.461 | 863 | 0.8 | 3.558 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 434 | 1242 | 1207 | 0.360 | 433 | 0.6 | 4.648 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1143 | 678 | 1720 | 0.664 | 1139 | 1.9 | 6.168 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1641 | 1088 | 1671 | 0.982 | 1585 | 16.6 | 31.010 | D |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1058 | 942 | 1753 | 0.604 | 1055 | 1.5 | 5.141 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 532 | 1506 | 1017 | 0.523 | 530 | 1.1 | 7.361 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1399 | 827 | 1612 | 0.868 | 1384 | 5.9 | 14.878 | B |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1641 | 1099 | 1663 | 0.987 | 1616 | 22.8 | 50.992 | F |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1058 | 959 | 1739 | 0.609 | 1058 | 1.5 | 5.286 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 532 | 1517 | 1008 | 0.527 | 532 | 1.1 | 7.552 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1399 | 830 | 1609 | 0.870 | 1398 | 6.2 | 16.748 | C |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1339 | 910 | 1812 | 0.739 | 1419 | 2.9 | 11.034 | B |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 864 | 840 | 1835 | 0.471 | 866 | 0.9 | 3.729 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 434 | 1271 | 1185 | 0.366 | 436 | 0.6 | 4.819 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1143 | 683 | 1716 | 0.666 | 1159 | 2.0 | 6.660 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1122 | 755 | 1935 | 0.580 | 1128 | 1.4 | 4.491 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 723 | 669 | 1972 | 0.367 | 725 | 0.6 | 2.887 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 364 | 1046 | 1349 | 0.269 | 364 | 0.4 | 3.660 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 957 | 570 | 1798 | 0.532 | 960 | 1.1 | 4.317 | A |

THE FUTURE

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-$ A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $2-$ A4421 <br> Skimmingdish Lane (E) <br> - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | $3-$ Buckingham Road - <br> Roundabout Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 50.01 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1280 | 100.000 |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1674 | 100.000 |
| 3-Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 445 | 100.000 |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |  | $\checkmark$ | 1081 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 3 - Buckingham Road | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 79 | 375 | 360 | 466 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 690 | 0 | 71 | 913 |
|  | 3 - Buckingham Road | 378 | 38 | 0 | 29 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 320 | 690 | 71 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-A4421 Buckingham <br> Road (N) | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish <br> Lane (E) | 3-Buckingham <br> Road | 4-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane |
|  | 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-Buckingham Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0.72 | 6.51 | 2.5 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1.04 | 98.13 | 55.3 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 0.90 | 52.45 | 6.7 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 0.90 | 26.09 | 8.1 | D |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 964 | 598 | 2192 | 0.440 | 961 | 0.8 | 2.916 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1260 | 732 | 2028 | 0.622 | 1254 | 1.6 | 4.615 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 335 | 1610 | 997 | 0.336 | 333 | 0.5 | 5.407 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 814 | 887 | 1586 | 0.513 | 810 | 1.0 | 4.615 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1151 | 716 | 2095 | 0.549 | 1149 | 1.2 | 3.800 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1505 | 876 | 1917 | 0.785 | 1497 | 3.5 | 8.432 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 400 | 1923 | 785 | 0.510 | 398 | 1.0 | 9.263 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 972 | 1060 | 1461 | 0.665 | 968 | 1.9 | 7.252 | A |

17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1409 | 864 | 1971 | 0.715 | 1404 | 2.4 | 6.295 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1843 | 1070 | 1767 | 1.043 | 1725 | 32.9 | 47.698 | E |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 490 | 2250 | 563 | 0.870 | 474 | 5.1 | 35.469 | E |
| 4 - A4095 Southwold Lane | 1190 | 1241 | 1331 | 0.895 | 1170 | 6.9 | 20.339 | C |

17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1409 | 876 | 1962 | 0.718 | 1409 | 2.5 | 6.510 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1843 | 1074 | 1764 | 1.045 | 1753 | 55.3 | 98.128 | F |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 490 | 2279 | 544 | 0.901 | 483 | 6.7 | 52.446 | F |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 1190 | 1262 | 1316 | 0.905 | 1186 | 8.1 | 26.085 | D |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 1151 | 736 | 2078 | 0.554 | 1156 | 1.3 | 3.926 | A |
| 2 - A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1505 | 882 | 1912 | 0.787 | 1710 | 4.0 | 34.718 | D |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 400 | 2130 | 644 | 0.621 | 420 | 1.7 | 17.344 | C |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 972 | 1169 | 1383 | 0.703 | 994 | 2.4 | 9.783 | A |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 964 | 606 | 2186 | 0.441 | 965 | 0.8 | 2.955 | A |
| 2-A4421 Skimmingdish Lane (E) | 1260 | 736 | 2025 | 0.623 | 1270 | 1.7 | 4.827 | A |
| 3 - Buckingham Road | 335 | 1627 | 985 | 0.340 | 340 | 0.5 | 5.617 | A |
| 4-A4095 Southwold Lane | 814 | 901 | 1576 | 0.516 | 819 | 1.1 | 4.789 | A |

## Junctions 9

| ARCADY 9 - Roundabout Module |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Version: 9.5.0.6896(c) Copyright TRL Limited, 2018 |  |  |  |
| For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:$+44(0) 1344379777 \quad$ software@trl.co.uk www.trlsoftware.co.uk |  |  |  |
| The users oft this computer program for the solution of an engineering probilem mex in in wowy relieved of their responsibility for the correctness of the |  |  |  |

Filename: 2_191021_B4100 Banbury Road Roundabout (Hotel Application)_EQ_MITIGATED.j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonk\Dropbox (mode)\Project\Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
Data\Modelling\200125_EQ\EQ Mitigation
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:06:38

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```


## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |
|  | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 7.5 | 21.09 | 0.89 | C | 2.9 | 10.53 | 0.75 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 7.8 | 21.86 | 0.90 | C | 22.3 | 50.03 | 0.98 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.5 | 11.98 | 0.60 | B | 4.6 | 33.89 | 0.84 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 1.8 | 9.86 | 0.64 | A | 9.0 | 41.57 | 0.92 | E |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 11.7 | 32.18 | 0.94 | D | 5.9 | 19.22 | 0.87 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 26.4 | 66.39 | 1.00 | F | 53.3 | 103.58 | 1.05 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 2.9 | 20.41 | 0.76 | C | 29.7 | 150.66 | 1.07 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 2.8 | 14.96 | 0.74 | B | 12.1 | 56.63 | 0.96 | F |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 8.5 | 23.80 | 0.91 | C | 5.3 | 17.23 | 0.85 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 18.5 | 49.94 | 0.98 | E | 39.4 | 80.69 | 1.02 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 3.0 | 20.05 | 0.76 | C | 23.7 | 123.20 | 1.04 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 2.5 | 13.73 | 0.72 | B | 8.1 | 40.00 | 0.91 | E |

There are warnings associated with one or more model runs - see the 'Data Errors and Warnings' tables for each Analysis or Demand Set.
Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.

## File summary

File Description

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location |  |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $04 / 05 / 2018$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJJMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 18.41 | C |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  |

Roundabout Geometry

| Arm | V-Approach road half-width (m) | E - Entry width (m) | I' - Effective flare length (m) | R - Entry radius (m) | D - Inscribed circle diameter (m) | PHI - Conflict (entry) angle (deg) | Exit only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 3.45 | 7.70 | 38.0 | 33.7 | 42.0 | 26.0 |  |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3.50 | 7.80 | 40.0 | 26.4 | 42.0 | 29.0 |  |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 3.47 | 7.10 | 26.0 | 15.1 | 42.0 | 40.0 |  |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 3.95 | 6.10 | 26.0 | 33.9 | 42.0 | 30.0 |  |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Roundabout Slope and Intercept used in model

| Arm | Final slope | Final intercept (PCU/hr) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.719 | 2061 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.713 | 2061 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.626 | 1720 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.652 | 1746 |

[^14]
## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:30 | 09:00 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1221 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1227 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 412 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 600 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 665 | 390 | 166 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 590 | 0 | 77 | 560 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 263 | 96 | 0 | 53 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 59 | 522 | 19 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.89 | 21.09 | 7.5 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.90 | 21.86 | 7.8 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.60 | 11.98 | 1.5 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.64 | 9.86 | 1.8 | A |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 919 | 477 | 1666 | 0.552 | 914 | 1.2 | 4.757 | A |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 924 | 431 | 1643 | 0.562 | 919 | 1.3 | 4.935 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 310 | 985 | 1058 | 0.293 | 309 | 0.4 | 4.793 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 711 | 1246 | 0.363 | 449 | 0.6 | 4.509 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1098 | 571 | 1599 | 0.686 | 1094 | 2.1 | 7.069 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1103 | 515 | 1586 | 0.696 | 1099 | 2.2 | 7.339 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1179 | 930 | 0.398 | 369 | 0.7 | 6.413 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 539 | 850 | 1153 | 0.468 | 538 | 0.9 | 5.843 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1344 | 698 | 1510 | 0.890 | 1325 | 6.9 | 17.950 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1351 | 624 | 1512 | 0.894 | 1332 | 7.0 | 18.312 | C |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 454 | 1428 | 765 | 0.593 | 451 | 1.4 | 11.342 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 661 | 1033 | 1032 | 0.640 | 657 | 1.7 | 9.515 | A |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1344 | 701 | 1507 | 0.892 | 1342 | 7.5 | 21.093 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1351 | 632 | 1507 | 0.897 | 1348 | 7.8 | 21.862 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 454 | 1446 | 753 | 0.602 | 453 | 1.5 | 11.980 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 661 | 1043 | 1025 | 0.644 | 660 | 1.8 | 9.858 | A |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1098 | 577 | 1596 | 0.688 | 1118 | 2.3 | 7.856 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1103 | 526 | 1578 | 0.699 | 1125 | 2.4 | 8.290 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1206 | 912 | 0.406 | 374 | 0.7 | 6.723 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 539 | 866 | 1142 | 0.472 | 543 | 0.9 | 6.037 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 919 | 481 | 1664 | 0.553 | 923 | 1.2 | 4.888 | A |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 924 | 435 | 1640 | 0.563 | 928 | 1.3 | 5.084 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 310 | 995 | 1051 | 0.295 | 311 | 0.4 | 4.871 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 717 | 1241 | 0.364 | 453 | 0.6 | 4.575 | A |

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 36.07 | E |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## 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: $\mathbf{m m}$ ) | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 930 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1501 | 100.000 |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 475 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 756 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 514 | 244 | 172 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 742 | 2 | 81 | 676 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 269 | 156 | 0 | 50 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 72 | 640 | 44 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.75 | 10.53 | 2.9 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.98 | 50.03 | 22.3 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.84 | 33.89 | 4.6 | D |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.92 | 41.57 | 9.0 | E |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 700 | 630 | 1569 | 0.446 | 697 | 0.8 | 4.113 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1130 | 345 | 1795 | 0.629 | 1123 | 1.7 | 5.308 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1192 | 961 | 0.372 | 355 | 0.6 | 5.923 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 569 | 875 | 1161 | 0.490 | 565 | 0.9 | 6.042 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 836 | 753 | 1482 | 0.564 | 834 | 1.3 | 5.542 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1349 | 412 | 1747 | 0.773 | 1343 | 3.3 | 8.780 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1425 | 814 | 0.525 | 425 | 1.1 | 9.206 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 680 | 1046 | 1049 | 0.648 | 676 | 1.8 | 9.559 | A |

## 17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1024 | 904 | 1375 | 0.745 | 1018 | 2.8 | 9.907 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1653 | 502 | 1682 | 0.982 | 1598 | 16.8 | 31.631 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1700 | 641 | 0.816 | 512 | 3.8 | 26.055 | D |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 832 | 1250 | 916 | 0.909 | 811 | 7.2 | 29.573 | D |

## 17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1024 | 919 | 1364 | 0.751 | 1023 | 2.9 | 10.534 | B |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1653 | 506 | 1680 | 0.984 | 1630 | 22.3 | 50.031 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 523 | 1732 | 621 | 0.842 | 520 | 4.6 | 33.891 | D |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 832 | 1273 | 901 | 0.924 | 825 | 9.0 | 41.567 | E |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Circulating <br> flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity <br> (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue <br> (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 836 | 786 | 1458 | 0.573 | 842 | 1.4 | 5.901 |  |
| ( - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1349 | 418 | 1743 | 0.774 | 1424 | 3.6 | 13.836 |  |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 427 | 1503 | 765 | 0.558 | 440 | 1.3 | 11.525 |  |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 680 | 1100 | 1014 | 0.670 | 707 | 2.1 | 12.708 | B |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 700 | 639 | 1563 | 0.448 | 702 | 0.8 | 4.196 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1130 | 348 | 1793 | 0.630 | 1138 | 1.7 | 5.553 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 358 | 1206 | 952 | 0.376 | 360 | 0.6 | 6.114 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 569 | 886 | 1154 | 0.493 | 574 | 1.0 | 6.252 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 40.13 | E |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 30$ | $09: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1264 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1287 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 492 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 621 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 576 | 514 | 174 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 674 | 0 | 64 | 549 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 337 | 101 | 0 | 54 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 46 | 555 | 20 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.94 | 32.18 | 11.7 | D |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.00 | 66.39 | 26.4 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.76 | 20.41 | 2.9 | C |
| 4- A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.74 | 14.96 | 2.8 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 952 | 506 | 1654 | 0.575 | 946 | 1.3 | 5.047 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 969 | 530 | 1580 | 0.613 | 963 | 1.6 | 5.776 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1045 | 1018 | 0.364 | 368 | 0.6 | 5.517 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 468 | 832 | 1168 | 0.400 | 465 | 0.7 | 5.101 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1136 | 606 | 1583 | 0.718 | 1132 | 2.5 | 7.894 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1157 | 634 | 1510 | 0.766 | 1151 | 3.1 | 9.855 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 442 | 1249 | 884 | 0.501 | 441 | 1.0 | 8.095 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 558 | 995 | 1061 | 0.526 | 557 | 1.1 | 7.112 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1392 | 737 | 1489 | 0.935 | 1362 | 9.9 | 24.088 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1417 | 763 | 1422 | 0.996 | 1358 | 18.0 | 38.403 | E |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 542 | 1478 | 733 | 0.739 | 535 | 2.6 | 17.627 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 684 | 1187 | 934 | 0.732 | 678 | 2.6 | 13.717 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1392 | 743 | 1485 | 0.937 | 1385 | 11.7 | 32.182 | D |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1417 | 776 | 1414 | 1.002 | 1383 | 26.4 | 66.394 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 542 | 1505 | 715 | 0.758 | 540 | 2.9 | 20.415 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 684 | 1206 | 922 | 0.741 | 683 | 2.8 | 14.961 | B |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1136 | 615 | 1577 | 0.721 | 1172 | 2.7 | 9.652 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1157 | 656 | 1495 | 0.774 | 1248 | 3.6 | 19.601 | C |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 442 | 1347 | 819 | 0.540 | 449 | 1.2 | 9.916 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 558 | 1053 | 1022 | 0.546 | 564 | 1.2 | 7.966 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 952 | 511 | 1651 | 0.577 | 957 | 1.4 | 5.227 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 969 | 536 | 1576 | 0.615 | 977 | 1.6 | 6.089 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 370 | 1060 | 1009 | 0.367 | 373 | 0.6 | 5.684 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 468 | 844 | 1160 | 0.403 | 470 | 0.7 | 5.227 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 79.22 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Time segment length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1055 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1536 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 605 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 736 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 587 | 293 | 175 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 739 | 2 | 81 | 714 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 378 | 178 | 0 | 49 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 31 | 650 | 55 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 - B 4 1 0 0}$ Banbury Road (N) | 0.87 | 19.22 | 5.9 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.05 | 103.58 | 53.3 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.07 | 150.66 | 29.7 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.96 | 56.63 | 12.1 | F |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 794 | 661 | 1545 | 0.514 | 790 | 1.0 | 4.746 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1156 | 392 | 1744 | 0.663 | 1149 | 1.9 | 5.970 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 455 | 1219 | 935 | 0.487 | 452 | 0.9 | 7.391 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 554 | 969 | 1092 | 0.507 | 550 | 1.0 | 6.595 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 948 | 790 | 1454 | 0.652 | 945 | 1.8 | 7.038 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 468 | 1690 | 0.817 | 1372 | 4.2 | 11.019 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 544 | 1456 | 785 | 0.693 | 539 | 2.1 | 14.373 | B |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1157 | 968 | 0.683 | 657 | 2.1 | 11.430 | B |

## 17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1162 | 930 | 1355 | 0.857 | 1148 | 5.3 | 16.382 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1691 | 568 | 1619 | 1.044 | 1581 | 31.7 | 51.143 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 666 | 1688 | 637 | 1.045 | 608 | 16.7 | 73.027 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 810 | 1321 | 860 | 0.942 | 782 | 9.1 | 37.385 | E |

## 17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1162 | 948 | 1342 | 0.865 | 1159 | 5.9 | 19.225 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1691 | 574 | 1615 | 1.047 | 1605 | 53.3 | 103.575 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 666 | 1712 | 622 | 1.071 | 614 | 29.7 | 150.662 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 810 | 1339 | 848 | 0.955 | 799 | 12.1 | 56.627 | F |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 948 | 854 | 1408 | 0.673 | 964 | 2.1 | 8.351 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 479 | 1682 | 0.821 | 1573 | 5.3 | 53.690 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 544 | 1650 | 662 | 0.822 | 636 | 6.7 | 108.752 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1343 | 846 | 0.783 | 694 | 4.0 | 27.509 | D |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 794 | 684 | 1529 | 0.520 | 798 | 1.1 | 4.956 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1156 | 396 | 1741 | 0.664 | 1170 | 2.0 | 6.441 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 455 | 1240 | 922 | 0.494 | 478 | 1.0 | 8.520 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 554 | 1004 | 1070 | 0.518 | 566 | 1.1 | 7.299 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 31.03 | $D$ |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D9 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 30$ | $09: 00$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1236 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1254 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 507 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 601 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 561 | 505 | 170 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 646 | 0 | 76 | 532 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 357 | 96 | 0 | 54 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 45 | 536 | 20 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 5 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.91 | 23.80 | 8.5 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 0.98 | 49.94 | 18.5 | E |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 0.76 | 20.05 | 3.0 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.72 | 13.73 | 2.5 | B |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:30-07:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 931 | 488 | 1665 | 0.559 | 926 | 1.3 | 4.834 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 944 | 520 | 1579 | 0.598 | 938 | 1.5 | 5.572 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 382 | 1009 | 1038 | 0.368 | 379 | 0.6 | 5.444 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 822 | 1172 | 0.386 | 450 | 0.6 | 4.971 | A |

07:45-08:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1111 | 584 | 1596 | 0.696 | 1107 | 2.2 | 7.300 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1127 | 623 | 1510 | 0.747 | 1122 | 2.8 | 9.149 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 456 | 1206 | 907 | 0.502 | 454 | 1.0 | 7.914 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 540 | 984 | 1065 | 0.507 | 539 | 1.0 | 6.819 | A |

08:00-08:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1361 | 712 | 1506 | 0.904 | 1339 | 7.6 | 19.541 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 753 | 1422 | 0.971 | 1336 | 14.0 | 32.145 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 558 | 1439 | 753 | 0.742 | 551 | 2.7 | 17.355 | C |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1181 | 935 | 0.708 | 657 | 2.3 | 12.715 | B |

08:15-08:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1361 | 717 | 1502 | 0.906 | 1357 | 8.5 | 23.802 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1381 | 763 | 1415 | 0.976 | 1363 | 18.5 | 49.944 | E |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 558 | 1467 | 734 | 0.760 | 557 | 3.0 | 20.053 | C |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 662 | 1200 | 922 | 0.718 | 661 | 2.5 | 13.735 | B |

08:30-08:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1111 | 593 | 1591 | 0.699 | 1136 | 2.4 | 8.311 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1127 | 638 | 1499 | 0.752 | 1189 | 3.2 | 13.743 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 456 | 1273 | 863 | 0.528 | 463 | 1.1 | 9.160 | A |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 540 | 1026 | 1037 | 0.521 | 546 | 1.1 | 7.411 | A |

08:45-09:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 931 | 493 | 1662 | 0.560 | 935 | 1.3 | 4.984 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 944 | 526 | 1575 | 0.599 | 951 | 1.5 | 5.826 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 382 | 1022 | 1030 | 0.371 | 384 | 0.6 | 5.591 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 452 | 833 | 1165 | 0.388 | 454 | 0.6 | 5.081 | A |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

Data Errors and Warnings

| Severity | Area | Item |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Warning | Geometry | $1-\mathrm{B} 4100$ Banbury <br> Road (N) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |
| Warning | Geometry | 2-A4095 Southwold <br> Lane (E) - Roundabout <br> Geometry | Effective flare length is over 30m, which is outside the normal range. Treat capacities with increasing caution. |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Use circulating lanes | Arm order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | untitled | Standard Roundabout |  | $1,2,3,4$ | 62.42 | F |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> (HH:mm) | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D10 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1046 | 100.000 |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1511 | 100.000 |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) |  | $\checkmark$ | 598 | 100.000 |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |  | $\checkmark$ | 705 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane <br> (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 574 | 299 | 173 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 733 | 2 | 80 | 696 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 373 | 176 | 0 | 49 |
|  | 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 26 | 624 | 55 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (N) | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 3-B4100 Banbury Road <br> (S) | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) |
|  | 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
|  | 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Arm | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 0.85 | 17.23 | 5.3 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1.02 | 80.69 | 39.4 | F |
| 3-B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 1.04 | 123.20 | 23.7 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 0.91 | 40.00 | 8.1 | E |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 787 | 641 | 1557 | 0.506 | 783 | 1.0 | 4.630 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1138 | 395 | 1758 | 0.647 | 1130 | 1.8 | 5.674 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 450 | 1200 | 953 | 0.472 | 447 | 0.9 | 7.059 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 531 | 960 | 1105 | 0.480 | 527 | 0.9 | 6.190 | A |

17:00-17:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 940 | 766 | 1469 | 0.640 | 937 | 1.7 | 6.739 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1358 | 472 | 1702 | 0.798 | 1351 | 3.8 | 10.024 | B |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 538 | 1434 | 806 | 0.667 | 533 | 1.9 | 13.018 | B |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 634 | 1147 | 983 | 0.644 | 630 | 1.8 | 10.099 | B |

## 17:15-17:30

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1152 | 911 | 1366 | 0.843 | 1139 | 4.9 | 15.098 | C |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1664 | 573 | 1629 | 1.021 | 1578 | 25.1 | 43.074 | E |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 658 | 1683 | 649 | 1.015 | 611 | 13.8 | 62.719 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 776 | 1329 | 865 | 0.897 | 757 | 6.6 | 29.291 | D |

## 17:30-17:45

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 1152 | 926 | 1356 | 0.850 | 1150 | 5.3 | 17.227 | C |
| 2-A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1664 | 579 | 1625 | 1.024 | 1607 | 39.4 | 80.694 | F |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 658 | 1712 | 631 | 1.044 | 619 | 23.7 | 123.196 | F |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 776 | 1350 | 851 | 0.912 | 770 | 8.1 | 39.995 | E |

17:45-18:00

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 940 | 815 | 1434 | 0.656 | 954 | 1.9 | 7.695 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1358 | 481 | 1695 | 0.801 | 1498 | 4.4 | 29.114 | D |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 538 | 1577 | 716 | 0.751 | 619 | 3.4 | 53.852 | F |
| 4-A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 634 | 1297 | 886 | 0.716 | 655 | 2.7 | 16.932 | C |

18:00-18:15

| Arm | Total Demand (Veh/hr) | Circulating flow (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-B4100 Banbury Road (N) | 787 | 655 | 1547 | 0.509 | 791 | 1.0 | 4.785 | A |
| 2 - A4095 Southwold Lane (E) | 1138 | 399 | 1755 | 0.648 | 1148 | 1.9 | 6.026 | A |
| 3 - B4100 Banbury Road (S) | 450 | 1218 | 942 | 0.478 | 460 | 0.9 | 7.614 | A |
| 4 - A4095 Lords Lane (W) | 531 | 981 | 1092 | 0.486 | 538 | 1.0 | 6.572 | A |


| JUnctions |
| :---: |
| PICADY 9 - Priority Intersection Module |
| Version: 9.5.0.6896 <br> © Copyright TRL Limited, 2018 |
| For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL: +44 (0)1344 379777 software@trl.co.uk 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: 4_191021_A4421_Bicester Rd Priority_EQ_MITIGATED.j9
Path: C:\Users\JamesMonk\Dropbox (mode)\Project|Birmingham\2. Projects\J323684_Bicester Heritage Masterplan\4.
Data\Modelling\200125_EQ\EQ Mitigation
Report generation date: 25/11/2020 17:03:03

```
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM
"2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM
"2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM
»2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM
»2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM
```

Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | RFC | Los |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 2 6}$ SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 0.7 | 22.18 | 0.42 | C | 0.2 | 9.47 | 0.18 | A |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.4 | 14.55 | 0.26 | B | 0.3 | 9.80 | 0.24 | A |  |  |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 2.2 | 40.15 | 0.71 | E | 0.3 | 10.81 | 0.22 | B |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.4 | 14.34 | 0.27 | B | 0.4 | 11.18 | 0.28 | B |  |  |
|  | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-AC | 2.2 | 39.76 | 0.70 | E | 0.3 | 10.65 | 0.21 | B |  |  |
| Stream C-AB | 0.4 | 14.37 | 0.27 | B | 0.4 | 11.23 | 0.29 | B |  |  |

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

| Title | Bicester Heritage Masterplan |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location | Bicester |
| Site number |  |
| Date | $26 / 04 / 2019$ |
| Version |  |
| Status |  |
| Identifier | EHC |
| Client | Bicester Heritage |
| Jobnumber | J323684 |
| Enumerator | DESKTOP-499K8KJMMode |
| Description |  |

## Units

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

## Analysis Options

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

## Demand Set Summary

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |

## Analysis Set Details

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

THE FUTURE
THE FUTURE
OF TRANSPORT

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 1.74 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Name | Description | Arm type |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | Bicester Road |  | Minor |
| C | A4421 Buckingham Road |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central reserve | Has right turn bay | Width for right turn (m) | Visibility for right turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking queue (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 6.00 |  | $\checkmark$ | 3.50 | 147.0 | $\checkmark$ | 10.00 |

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

## Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor arm type | Lane width (m) | Visibility to left (m) | Visibility to right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B - Bicester Road | One lane | 3.70 | 30 | 30 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (Veh/hr) | Slope <br> for <br> AB | Slope <br> for <br> AC | Slope <br> for <br> C-A | Slope <br> for <br> C-B |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | B-A | 537 | 0.098 | 0.247 | 0.156 | 0.353 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | B-C | 688 | 0.105 | 0.267 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | C-B | 752 | 0.292 | 0.292 | - | - |

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 segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1214 | 100.000 |
| B-Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 106 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 711 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  |  |  |
|  | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  |  |
|  | A - Bicester Road Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1214 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 106 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 10 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 4 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.42 | 22.18 | 0.7 | C |
| C-AB | 0.26 | 14.55 | 0.4 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 388 | 0.205 | 79 | 0.3 | 11.590 | B |
| C-AB | 60 | 467 | 0.129 | 60 | 0.1 | 8.819 | A |
| C-A | 475 |  |  | 475 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 914 |  |  | 914 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 342 | 0.278 | 95 | 0.4 | 14.510 | B |
| C-AB | 72 | 412 | 0.175 | 72 | 0.2 | 10.572 | B |
| C-A | 567 |  |  | 567 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1091 |  |  | 1091 |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 279 | 0.419 | 115 | 0.7 | 21.866 |  |
| C-AB | 88 | 335 | 0.263 | 88 | 0.3 | 14.487 | B |
| C-A | 695 |  |  | 695 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1337 |  |  | 1337 |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 117 | 279 | 0.419 | 117 | 0.7 | 22.180 |  |
| C-AB | 88 | 335 | 0.263 | 88 | 0.4 | 14.549 | B |
| C-A | 695 |  |  | 695 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1337 |  |  | 1337 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 342 | 0.278 | 97 | 0.4 | 14.715 | B |
| C-AB | 72 | 412 | 0.175 | 72 | 0.2 | 10.621 | B |
| C-A | 567 |  |  | 567 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1091 |  |  | 1091 |  |  |  |

## 08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 80 | 388 | 0.205 | 80 | 0.3 | 11.705 | B |
| C-AB | 60 | 467 | 0.129 | 60 | 0.1 | 8.855 | A |
| C-A | 475 |  |  | 475 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 914 |  | 914 |  |  |  |  |

THE FUTURE

# 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development, PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 0.83 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D4 | 2026 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

## Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 749 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 76 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1324 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 749 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 76 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1219 | 105 | 0 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C-A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 5 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.18 | 9.47 | 0.2 | A |
| C-AB | 0.24 | 9.80 | 0.3 | A |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 535 | 0.107 | 57 | 0.1 | 7.525 | A |
| C-AB | 79 | 557 | 0.142 | 78 | 0.2 | 7.516 | A |
| C-A | 918 |  |  | 918 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 564 |  | 564 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 505 | 0.135 | 68 | 0.2 | 8.242 |  |
| C-AB | 94 | 526 | 0.180 | 94 | 0.2 | 8.335 | A |
| C-A | 1096 |  |  | 1096 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 673 |  | 673 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 464 | 0.180 | 83 | 0.2 | 9.461 | A |
| C-AB | 116 | 483 | 0.239 | 115 | 0.3 | 9.779 | A |
| C-A | 1342 |  |  | 1342 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 825 |  |  | 825 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 84 | 464 | 0.180 | 84 | 0.2 | 9.472 | A |
| C-AB | 116 | 483 | 0.239 | 116 | 0.3 | 9.798 | A |
| C-A | 1342 |  |  | 1342 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 825 |  |  | 825 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 68 | 505 | 0.135 | 69 | 0.2 | 8.256 | A |
| C-AB | 94 | 526 | 0.180 | 95 | 0.2 | 8.357 | A |
| C-A | 1096 |  |  | 1096 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 673 |  | 673 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 57 | 535 | 0.107 | 57 | 0.1 | 7.548 | A |
| C-AB | 79 | 557 | 0.142 | 79 | 0.2 | 7.543 | A |
| C-A | 918 |  |  | 918 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 564 |  | 564 |  |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 4.06 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D5 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | AM | ONE HOUR | 07:15 | 08:45 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1184 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 191 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 814 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 1184 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 191 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.71 | 40.15 | 2.2 | E |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 14.34 | 0.4 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 144 | 409 | 0.351 | 142 | 0.5 | 13.360 | B |
| C-AB | 65 | 474 | 0.137 | 64 | 0.2 | 8.763 | A |
| C-A | 548 |  |  | 548 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 891 |  |  | 891 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 172 | 363 | 0.474 | 170 | 0.9 | 18.592 | C |
| C-AB | 77 | 420 | 0.184 | 77 | 0.2 | 10.470 | B |
| C-A | 654 |  |  | 654 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  | 1064 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 210 | 298 | 0.705 | 205 | 2.1 | 36.935 |  |
| C-AB | 95 | 346 | 0.274 | 94 | 0.4 | 14.271 |  |
| C-A | 802 |  |  | 802 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1304 |  | 1304 |  |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughhput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 210 | 298 | 0.705 | 210 | 2.2 | 40.145 |  |
| C-AB | 95 | 346 | 0.274 | 95 | 0.4 | 14.335 |  |
| C-A | 802 |  |  | 802 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1304 |  |  | 1304 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 172 | 363 | 0.474 | 177 | 0.9 | 19.883 | C |
| C-AB | 77 | 420 | 0.184 | 78 | 0.2 | 10.528 | B |
| C-A | 654 |  |  | 654 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1064 |  |  | 1064 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 144 | 409 | 0.351 | 145 | 0.6 | 13.722 | B |
| C-AB | 65 | 474 | 0.137 | 65 | 0.2 | 8.801 | A |
| C-A | 548 |  |  | 548 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 891 |  |  | 891 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development , PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 0.96 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period name | Traffic profile type | Start time (HH:mm) | Finish time (HH:mm) | Time segment length (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development | PM | ONE HOUR | 16:45 | 18:15 | 15 |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 878 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 86 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1391 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 878 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 86 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 4 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.22 | 10.81 | 0.3 | B |
| C-AB | 0.28 | 11.18 | 0.4 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 65 | 510 | 0.127 | 64 | 0.1 | 8.065 | A |
| C-AB | 87 | 536 | 0.163 | 87 | 0.2 | 7.991 | A |
| C-A | 960 |  |  | 960 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 661 |  | 661 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 475 | 0.163 | 77 | 0.2 | 9.033 | A |
| C-AB | 104 | 500 | 0.209 | 104 | 0.3 | 9.085 | A |
| C-A | 1146 |  |  | 1146 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 789 |  | 789 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 428 | 0.221 | 94 | 0.3 | 10.788 | B |
| C-AB | 128 | 450 | 0.284 | 127 | 0.4 | 11.143 | B |
| C-A | 1404 |  |  | 1404 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 967 |  |  | 967 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 95 | 428 | 0.221 | 95 | 0.3 | 10.811 | B |
| C-AB | 128 | 450 | 0.284 | 128 | 0.4 | 11.178 | B |
| C-A | 1404 |  |  | 1404 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 967 |  |  | 967 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 77 | 475 | 0.163 | 78 | 0.2 | 9.060 | A |
| C-AB | 104 | 500 | 0.209 | 105 | 0.3 | 9.122 | A |
| C-A | 1146 |  |  | 1146 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 789 |  | 789 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 65 | 510 | 0.127 | 65 | 0.1 | 8.094 | A |
| C-AB | 87 | 536 | 0.163 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.030 | A |
| C-A | 960 |  |  | 960 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 661 |  |  | 661 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), AM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 3.97 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> (ength (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D7 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | AM | ONE HOUR | $07: 15$ | $08: 45$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 1192 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 188 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 806 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 1192 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 188 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 7 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 6 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 3 | 0 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.70 | 39.76 | 2.2 | E |
| C-AB | 0.27 | 14.37 | 0.4 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

07:15-07:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 142 | 408 | 0.347 | 139 | 0.5 | 13.330 | B |
| C-AB | 63 | 472 | 0.134 | 63 | 0.2 | 8.771 | A |
| C-A | 544 |  |  | 544 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 897 |  |  | 897 |  |  |  |

07:30-07:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 169 | 361 | 0.469 | 168 | 0.9 | 18.526 | C |
| C-AB | 76 | 418 | 0.181 | 75 | 0.2 | 10.492 | B |
| C-A | 649 |  |  | 649 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1072 |  | 1072 |  |  |  |  |

07:45-08:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 207 | 296 | 0.700 | 202 | 2.1 | 36.672 |  |
| C-AB | 92 | 343 | 0.270 | 92 | 0.4 | 14.305 |  |
| C-A | 795 |  |  | 795 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1312 |  |  | 1312 |  |  |  |

08:00-08:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughhput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 207 | 296 | 0.700 | 207 | 2.2 | 39.763 |  |
| C-AB | 92 | 343 | 0.270 | 92 | 0.4 | 14.366 |  |
| C-A | 795 |  |  | 795 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 1312 |  |  | 1312 |  |  |  |

08:15-08:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 169 | 361 | 0.469 | 174 | 0.9 | 19.774 | C |
| C-AB | 76 | 418 | 0.181 | 76 | 0.2 | 10.542 | B |
| C-A | 649 |  |  | 649 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 1072 |  |  | 1072 |  |  |  |

08:30-08:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 142 | 408 | 0.347 | 143 | 0.5 | 13.687 | B |
| C-AB | 63 | 472 | 0.134 | 64 | 0.2 | 8.810 | A |
| C-A | 544 |  |  | 544 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 897 |  |  | 897 |  |  |  |

# 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR), PM 

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction type | Major road direction | Use circulating lanes | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | A4421 Buckingham Rd/Bicester Rd | T-Junction | Two-way |  | 0.95 | A |

## Junction Network Options

| Driving side | Lighting |
| :---: | :---: |
| Left | Normal/unknown |

## Traffic Demand

## Demand Set Details

| ID | Scenario name | Time Period <br> name | Traffic profile <br> type | Start time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Finish time <br> (HH:mm) | Time segment <br> (ength (min) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D8 | 2031 SATURN Base + Committed (inc. FAST) + Development (SEPR) | PM | ONE HOUR | $16: 45$ | $18: 15$ |  |


| Vehicle mix source | PCU Factor for a HV (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HV Percentages | 2.00 |

Demand overview (Traffic)

| Arm | Linked arm | Use O-D data | Average Demand (Veh/hr) | Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) |  | $\checkmark$ | 876 | 100.000 |
| B - Bicester Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 82 | 100.000 |
| C - A4421 Buckingham Road |  | $\checkmark$ | 1379 | 100.000 |

## Origin-Destination Data

Demand (Veh/hr)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  |  |  |  |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | A A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 876 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 0 | 0 | 82 |

## Vehicle Mix

Heavy Vehicle Percentages

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | B - Bicester Road | C - A4421 Buckingham Road |
|  | A - A4421 Buckingham Road (N) | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | B - Bicester Road | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | C - A4421 Buckingham Road | 1 | 4 | 0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (Veh) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 0.21 | 10.65 | 0.3 | B |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 11.23 | 0.4 | B |
| C-A |  |  |  |  |
| AB |  |  |  |  |
| AC |  |  |  |  |

## Main Results for each time segment

16:45-17:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 62 | 510 | 0.121 | 61 | 0.1 | 8.005 | A |
| C-AB | 89 | 537 | 0.166 | 88 | 0.2 | 8.011 | A |
| C-A | 949 |  |  | 949 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 659 |  | 659 |  |  |  |  |

17:00-17:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 74 | 476 | 0.155 | 74 | 0.2 | 8.944 | A |
| C-AB | 106 | 500 | 0.212 | 106 | 0.3 | 9.115 | A |
| C-A | 1134 |  |  | 1134 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 788 |  | 788 |  |  |  |  |

17:15-17:30

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 428 | 0.211 | 90 | 0.3 | 10.630 | B |
| C-AB | 130 | 450 | 0.288 | 129 | 0.4 | 11.196 | B |
| C-A | 1388 |  |  | 1388 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 964 |  |  | 964 |  |  |  |

17:30-17:45

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(V e h / h r)$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 90 | 428 | 0.211 | 90 | 0.3 | 10.651 | B |
| C-AB | 130 | 450 | 0.288 | 130 | 0.4 | 11.233 | B |
| C-A | 1388 |  |  | 1388 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 964 |  |  | 964 |  |  |  |

17:45-18:00

| Stream | Total Demand <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathbf{h r})$ | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> $(\mathbf{V e h} / \mathrm{hr})$ | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 74 | 476 | 0.155 | 74 | 0.2 | 8.965 | A |
| C-AB | 106 | 500 | 0.212 | 107 | 0.3 | 9.153 | A |
| C-A | 1134 |  |  | 1134 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| AC | 788 |  | 788 |  |  |  |  |

18:00-18:15

| Stream | Total Demand <br> (Veh/hr) | Capacity (Veh/hr) | RFC | Throughput <br> (Veh/hr) | End queue (Veh) | Delay (s) | Unsignalised <br> level of service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-AC | 62 | 510 | 0.121 | 62 | 0.1 | 8.031 | A |
| C-AB | 89 | 537 | 0.166 | 89 | 0.2 | 8.048 | A |
| C-A | 949 |  |  | 949 |  |  |  |
| AB | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| AC | 659 |  |  | 659 |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX O - Preliminary Mitigation Drawings






[^0]:    © Copyright mode transport planning. All rights reserved

[^1]:    *\% Mode Split for 'Car Driver' and 'Walk' modes have been adjusted based on the recommendation from OCC to reduce 'Walk' \% and the first principles approach, suggesting a higher level of car drivers, for a better representation than the results shown in the 2018 NTS.

[^2]:    

[^3]:    

[^4]:    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.

[^5]:    Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.

[^6]:    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.

[^7]:    Vehicle Mix

[^8]:    Vehicle Mix

[^9]:    Vehicle Mix

[^10]:    Vehicle Mix

[^11]:    Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.

[^12]:    Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.

[^13]:    Values shown are the highest values encountered over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.

[^14]:    The slope and intercept shown above include any corrections and adjustments.

