

Table 7-4: Highway Impact Assessment for Detailed Junction Capacity Modelling

ID	AM Peak Hour (08:00-09:00)				PM Peak Hour (17:00-18:00)				Overall Assessment	Comments
	Criteria				Criteria					
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
J1	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J2	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J3	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J4	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J5	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 1
J6	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J7	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J8	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J9	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 1
J10	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J11	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J12	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J13	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 2
J14	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 1
J15	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 3
J16	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	PM peak indicates increase in VoC from 87% to 90% however there is only an increase of 50 vehicles equating to 1% increase in traffic at this junction therefore it is considered that modelling of this junction is not required.
J17	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	AM Peak indicates VoC increase of 2% from 98% to 100% however there is an increase of only 30 additional vehicles (~1%) at the junction which equates to an indiscernible 1 vehicle every two minutes. It is considered further detailed modelling is not required.
J18	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J19	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J20	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J21	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Refer to Note 1
J22	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J23	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J24	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J25	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J26	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J27	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	Modelling Required
J28	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J29	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J30	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	Refer to Note 1
J31	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J32	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria
J33	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Does not meet modelling criteria

6.2.8.1 Hinckley NRFI ES Appendix 8.1 Transport Assessment Table 7-4

ID	AM Peak Hour (08:00-09:00)				PM Peak Hour (17:00-18:00)				Overall Assessment	Comments
	Criteria				Criteria					
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
J34	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓	x	✓	AM peak indicated increase of approximately 3% in VoC however flow change indicates reduction of total traffic at junction in WD scenario therefore this does not require modelling
J35	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	✓	PM peak indicated increase of approximately 2% in VoC however flow change indicates reduction of total traffic at junction in WD scenario therefore this does not require modelling
J36	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	PM peak indicates reduction in VoC from 87% to 86% therefore this does not require modelling
J37	x	x	x	x	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	Modelling Required
J38	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x	Refer to Note 1
J39	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	Modelling Required
J40	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x	Refer to Note 1
J41	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	Modelling Required
J42	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J43	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J44	x	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J45	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	Refer to Note 1
J46	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J47	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J48	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	Refer to Note 1
J49	x	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	x	x	✓	AM Peak: VoC increase of 6% from 83% to 89% however there is an increase of only 5 vehicles at the junction. PM Peak: Increase of only 0.2% in VoC which is negligible.
J50	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J51	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J52	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J53	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J54	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria
J55	x	✓	x	x	x	✓	x	x	x	Does not meet modelling criteria

Note 1: At the request of LCC/NH a number of junctions were assessed as part of PRTM 2.1 modelling run. These junctions have been retained through the PRTM 2.2 modelling for consistency despite no longer meeting assessment criteria.

Note 2: Whilst this junction does not meet assessment criteria it was deemed pertinent that the junction was modelled due to the change in base traffic behaviour as a result of the proposed infrastructure provided by the scheme.

Note 3: Whilst this junction does not meet assessment criteria and the proposed infrastructure does not change base traffic behaviour. LCC/NH requested a review of this junction. Therefore the junction is reviewed in the Highway Impact chapter (8.0) of the Transport Assessment.

Note 4: Criteria 1 is scored from the results of Table 7-3