**Table to show the performance of each development option modelled by Jacob’s in 2012 as part of the Visum traffic modelling for the Local Plan**

**Option 1 -** includes residential development primarily in and around Canterbury and the Herne Bay area. Option 1 has the higher allocation of commercial development which is also focussed in the same areas. Comprises of 11 major housing sites (including 5500 homes in South Canterbury) plus 4 commercial sites.

**Option 2 -** has the lowest allocation of residential units more of which are located in the coastal areas and on the A28 corridor around Sturry and Hersden. Commercial development is located near Herne bay, Sturry and Hersden. Comprises of 35 housing sites (but no South Canterbury sites) plus 4 commercial sites.

**Option 3 -** includes a significant amount of residential development in the Canterbury area together with a more dispersed distribution across the district. Option 3 has the lowest commercial development which has a similar distribution to Option2. Comprises of 26 housing sites (but no South Canterbury sites) plus 4 commercial sites.

| **Model measurement being made** | **Options** |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Increase in travel demand (am) (Table 4-a)1 | 50100 | W | 1 | 49900 | M | 2 | 49900 | M | 2 |
| Increase in travel demand (pm) (Table 4-a)1 | 49700 | W | 1 | 49400 | B | 3 | 49500 | M | 2 |
| Mode of transport (car) (Table 5-a)2 | 84.2% | W | 1 | 83.0% | B | 3 | 83.8% | M | 2 |
| Mode of transport (bus)(Table 5-a)2 | 11.0% | W | 1 | 12.7% | B | 3 | 11.7% | M | 2 |
| Mode of transport (rail)(Table 5-a)2 |  4.8% | B | 3 |  4.3% | W | 1 |  4.5% | M | 2 |
| Park & Ride use (am)(Table 5-b)3 |  4.1% | B | 3 |  4.0% | M | 2 |  4.0% | M | 2 |
| Park & Ride use (pm)(Table 5-b)3 |  2.4% | M | 2 |  2.4% | M | 2 |  2.6% | B | 3 |
| Peak road traffic speed reached (mph)(Table 6-a)4 | 19.7 | B | 3 | 19.5 | M | 2 | 19.5 | M | 2 |
| Additional vehicle kilometres driven (Table 6-a)4 | 200551 | W | 1 | 184704 | B | 3 | 186600 | M | 2 |
| Total congestion time created (mins) (Table 6-a)4 | 313951 | W | 1 | 306444 | M | 2 | 302374 | B | 3 |
| Inner cordon crossed (am)(Table 6-b)5 | 16900 | B | 3 | 17000 | M | 2 | 17200 | W | 1 |
| Inner cordon crossed (pm)(Table 6-b)5 | 16300 | M | 2 | 16400 | W | 1 | 16200 | B | 3 |
| Mean time delay at junctions (Figures 6-e, f and g)6 |  1.87 | B | 3 |  2.07 | W | 1 |  1.96 | M | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Total score |  |  | 25 |  |  | 27 |  |  | 28 |

1 Person trips. Not all the travel demand tabular data were used because other Tables produced relied on these same data.

2 Person trips. Assumes that increased use of car is undesirable, but increases in bus or train are preferred.

3 Person trips. Assumes that the largest proportion of traffic diverted to Park & Ride is good.

4  Assumes that faster speeds, shorter extra driving distance and less congestion time are preferred.

5  Assumes that least amount of traffic moving through inner traffic cordon is preferable. Data on outer cordon crossed has not been included because this could have both negative and positive effects.

6  Minutes. Data based on a calculation of the mean delays at all road junctions shown on each map.