

Summary Table of Reported Traffic Accidents (2001-2003)

| WSP Ref. | Police Ref. | Date | Time | Visibility | | Road Condition | | Severity | | | Vulnerable User | | | Contributing Factor | | | | | | Traveling | | Area | Location Map No. | Symbol | | | | |
|----------|-------------|------------|-------|------------|------|----------------|-----|----------|---------|-------|-----------------|------------|------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|----------------------|--------|--|-----------|------|------|------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|
| | | | | Light | Dark | Wet/Damp | Dry | Slight | Serious | Fatal | Cycle | Motorcycle | Pedestrian | Right Turn | Shunt | Lane Change | General Driver Error | | | Unknown | From | | | | To | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Lost Control | Overtaking | U-Turn | | | | | | | | | | |
| 116 | | 13/10/2004 | 14:10 | ☉ | | ☉ | | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N | SE | A41 BICESTER BYPASS APPROX 500M SE OF RBT J/W A41 TO M40 / B4030 OXFORD ROAD BICESTER | 39 | ☉ | |
| 117 | | 14/10/2004 | 7:45 | ☉ | | ☉ | | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SE | NE | B4030 MIDDLETON STONEY ROAD J/W A4095 HOWES LANE BICESTER | 1 | ☉ | |
| 118 | | 16/10/2004 | 10:15 | ☉ | | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | B4030 OXFORD ROAD BETWEEN RBT'S WITH A41 AND PINOLE DRIVE (TESCO'S BICESTER VILLAGE) | 11 | ☉ | |
| 119 | | 28/10/2004 | 18:30 | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | N | N | A41 SOUTH BOUND C/WAY AT ENTRANCE TO BLOOMS GARDEN CENTRE | 14 | ☉ |
| 120 | | 30/10/2004 | 19:28 | | ☉ | ☉ | | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | S | E | B4030 MIDDLETON STONEY RD J/W A4095 HOWES LANE CHESTERTON | 1 | ☉ |
| 121 | | 13/11/2004 | 16:23 | ☉ | | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SW | NE | QUEENS AVE OUTSIDE TELEPHONE EXCHANGE BICESTER | 17 | ☉ |
| 122 | | 20/11/2004 | 14:40 | ☉ | | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SE | NE | B4030 MIDDLETON STONEY RD J/W A4095 HOWES LANE BICESTER | 1 | ☉ |
| 123 | | 16/12/2004 | 17:20 | | ☉ | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SW | NE | A41 APPROX 800M SW OF J/W A421 NBOUND CHESTERTON | 15 | ☉ |
| 124 | | 20/12/2004 | 16:00 | ☉ | | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SW | NE | THE CAUSEWAY (EXACT LOCATION UNCERTAIN) BICESTER | 34 | ☉ |
| 125 | | 11/01/2005 | 21:30 | | ☉ | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SE | N | A41 BICESTER BYPASS APPROX 500M SE OF RBT J/W A41 TO WENDLEBURY BICESTER | 39 | ☉ |
| 126 | | 04/02/2005 | 18:40 | | ☉ | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | E | W | B4030 MIDDLETON STONEY RD APPROX 150M NW OF J/W VILLIERS RD BICESTER | 6 | ☉ |
| 127 | | 24/04/2005 | 16:20 | ☉ | | | ☉ | ☉ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | SE | N | B4100 MANORSFIELD ROAD J/W HANOVER GARDENS BICESTER | 31 | ☉ |

Totals
check

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|
| 88 | 39 | 47 | 80 | 106 | 18 | 3 | 13 | 16 | 24 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 40 |
| 127 | | 127 | | | 127 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |

Severity

- ☉ Slight
- ☐ Severe
- ☐ Fatal

Vulnerable user

- ☐ Pedestrian
- ☐ Cyclist
- ☐ Motorcycle
- ☐ Other



APPENDIX F

Correspondence with Highways Agency

11546

Phillips, Joseph

From: McMahon, Martin [martin.mcmahon@highways.gsi.gov.uk]
Sent: 28 September 2005 17:53
To: Phillips, Joseph
Cc: Hutchings, Richard; Jones, Peter
Subject: RE: Proposed Residential Development at SW Bicester

Dear Joseph

Please find attached a note explaining the assumptions for traffic growth used for the model for the M40 Junction 9 improvement scheme.

As you can see, we have consulted with both Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council during the construction of the model. Consequently we believe that the development of 1,585 dwellings at south-west Bicester has already been included.

If you require any further information please let me know.

Regards

Martin McMahon

-----Original Message-----

From: Phillips, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Phillips@WSPGroup.com]
Sent: 20 September 2005 11:14
To: McMahon, Martin
Cc: Hutchings, Richard; Jones, Peter
Subject: Proposed Residential Development at SW Bicester

Dear Mr McMahon,

Thank you for your recent letter, dated 15 September 2005, relating the proposed improvement scheme at M40 Junction 9.

Within your letter, it is stated that by the end of September, you would confirm whether the proposed development of 1,585 dwellings at south west Bicester is included in the predicted traffic growth used within the traffic modelling work undertaken by Mott MacDonald.

In this respect, we would be grateful if you could provide a response on this matter at the earliest opportunity to assist our current project programme.

Thank you again for your assistance and we look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Joseph Phillips
Principal Engineer
WSP Development Ltd
Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke

29/09/2005

Our ref: HA 9/42/56
Your ref: RGH/jap/11546

11546

Room 3A
Federated House
London Road
Dorking RH4 1SZ

Mr. R Hutchings
WSP Development
Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire RG21 4HJ

lett. m
PRS
JP
File

Direct Line: 01306 878445

Fax: 01306 878491

15 September 2005

Dear Mr. Hutchings

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT SOUTH WEST BICESTER

I refer to your letter of 22 August concerning the above and the proposed improvement scheme at M40 Junction 9.

As you are aware, Mott MacDonald, our Managing Agent, have designed the scheme for traffic growth within the area and that the traffic model shows that the proposed improvements will provide sufficient capacity at the junction until at least 2020.

I am currently investigating the predicted traffic growth used within the model to confirm whether or not the proposed development of 1,585 dwellings at south west Bicester are included. I expect to be able to confirm this by the end of September.

Yours sincerely



Martin McMahon
Route Manager
Traffic Operations Area 3
Email: martin.mcmahon@highways.gsi.gov.uk

m:\1388WSP

22 August 2005



Mr M McMahon
Highways Agency
Federated House
London Road
Dorking
RH4 1SZ

Dear Mr McMahon

Proposed Residential Development at South West Bicester

We are currently providing transport advice to our client, Countryside Properties, in relation to a proposed residential development of 1,585 dwellings on land to the south west of Bicester, in the vicinity of Whitelands Farm to the west of the A41.

We have already begun pre-application discussions with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) with regard to the scope of our Transport Assessment report for the development proposals. In addition to the potential traffic impact on the local highway network, we recognise that the impact at M40 Junction 9 will need to be discussed with the Highways Agency.

As a result of our preliminary discussions with OCC, we have already contacted Peter Gilbert at Mott Macdonald, who we understand is responsible for the technical assessments and preparation of the detailed design for M40 Junction 9 improvements. Mr Gilbert confirmed that a package of improvements for M40 Junction 9 has now been agreed and the main on-site works are currently programmed to commence in March / April 2006.

Mott Macdonald have also confirmed that during the preparation of the scheme design, both OCC and Cherwell District Council (CDC) requested that the proposed package of improvements for M40 Junction 9 allow for the predicted housing growth in the area up to 2020. Following their discussions with OCC and CDC, we understand that Mott Macdonald predicted the number of household completions that would occur in Cherwell between 1999 and 2020. We understand that this level of household completions in Cherwell was used to derive the 2020 future year traffic growth forecasts on which the package of improvements for M40 Junction 9 is based.

The proposed residential development to the south west of Bicester is currently predicted to be completed by 2014, within the period up to 2020. Furthermore, the proposed residential development site has been previously identified for residential development in the draft Cherwell District Local Plan 2011.

WSP Development
Mountbatten House
Basing View
Basingstoke
Hampshire
RG21 4HJ
Tel: +44 (0)1256 318800
Fax: +44 (0)1256 318700
www.wspgroup.com
WSP Development Ltd
2382309 England

Consequently, we would consider that the proposed development of 1,585 residential dwellings has been included within the overall predicted residential dwelling completions in Cherwell up to 2020.

Based on the above, we would therefore be grateful if you could confirm that the current package of improvements for M40 Junction 9 would satisfactorily accommodate the proposed residential development at south west Bicester.

We understand that funding has already been agreed for the proposed package of improvements, given that construction is due begin toward the end of the current financial year. However, we would be grateful if you could confirm that full funding is already provided.

We look forward to hearing from you shortly. In the meantime, we are willing to discuss this matter further, should this be of assistance, and would be happy to arrange a meeting, if you feel this would be beneficial.

Yours sincerely

Richard Hutchings
Director

cc J Coates, Countryside Properties
J Oldham, Countryside Properties
R Gorman, Terence O'Rourke



APPENDIX G

Parking Standards

APPENDIX B PARKING STANDARDS – Maxima Levels

| Accessibility Characteristic | Residential | Food Retail ** | Non Food Retail ** | B1 and A2 | B2 - General Industry | B8 Warehousing | D2 Assembly and Leisure ** | Cinema & Conference | Hotel and Guest Hse | Hospital | Higher Education | A3 - Restaurant/ pubs | Stadia |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Type 1 | 1 space per dwelling up to 2 beds; 2+beds on merit | Operational Parking Only | | | | | | | on merits | on merits | operational need | operational need | N/A |
| Type 2 | 1 bed - 1 space; 2/3 bed - 2 spaces; 4 bed+ 2+spaces on merit | 1 space per 14sq m | 1 space per 20sqm | 1 space per 30 sqm | 1 space per 50 sqm | 1 space per 200 sqm | 1 space per 22 sqm | 1 space per 5 seats | 1 space per 1 beds | on merits | 1 space per 2 staff 1 space per 15 students | 1 space per 15 sqm of public space | on merits (guide 1 per 15 seats) * |
| Application Threshold GFA | N/A | 1000 | 1000 | 500 | 500 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 30 | N/A | 2500 | | 1500 seats |

* Coach parking treated separately

** A PPG6 sequential test location policy will apply to these land uses

Type 1 – Central Policy Areas –

Banbury – Combined Town Centre Commercial and Shopping Area

Bicester – Town Centre Boundary

Kidlington – Shopping Centre Boundary

Type 2 – Other Areas

(Continues Overleaf)

Parking Standards for Developments Below the Threshold Size

There will be a presumption that the above maximum standards apply to developments below the threshold size but each case will be on merit and the parking provision for each site will be considered in the light of its location and the need to reduce private vehicle mileage in line with PPG13.

Notes

Where developers are proposing levels of parking significantly below the maximum levels they will be required to submit supporting information to show the likely impacts on street parking and the availability of public transport. This could include parking surveys to show the level of existing parking stress and an assessment of any road safety implications. It may also require a contribution to improving public transport.

Operational parking is the level of parking to accommodate those vehicles required for the essential operation of the land use under consideration. The specific operational need of an applicant will not necessarily be the determinant of the parking provision.

Travel plans will be required to show how the use of private vehicle trips will be controlled or reduced. (See Policy TR3)

Cycle Parking will be required in line with the County Councils Cycling Strategy.

Parking provision for the disabled will be required in line with County Council standards and the advice contained in Traffic Advice Leaflet 5/95 – Draft Parking for Disabled People.



APPENDIX H

Stage 1 Road Safety Audits

DEVELOPMENT AT WHITELANDS FARM

SOUTH-WEST BICESTER

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT STAGE 1

TMS 5741



Vanguard Centre
University of Warwick Science Park
Sir William Lyons Road
Coventry CV4 7EZ

Tel: 024 7669 0900
Fax: 024 7669 0274
Email: info@tmsconsultancy.co.uk
Website: www.tmsconsultancy.co.uk

DEVELOPMENT AT WHITELANDS FARM

SOUTH-WEST BICESTER

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT STAGE 1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report describes a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on a series of proposed new access junctions to a development of land at Whitelands Farm, south-west of Bicester, on behalf of WSP Development. The audit was carried out between 21st and 26th April 2006 in the offices of TMS Consultancy.

1.2 The audit team members were as follows:-

Kevin Seymour, BSc, Dip TS, MIHT;
Senior Engineer, TMS Consultancy

Andy Paul, B. Eng (Hons);
Principal Engineer, TMS Consultancy

1.3 The audit comprised an examination of the drawings and other information relating to the scheme supplied by the design office (as listed in **Appendix A**). The audit team visited the site on 21st April 2006. The weather was dry but cloudy. The traffic conditions were light.

1.4 The terms of reference of the audit are as described in HD 19/03. The team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the design to any other criteria.

1.5 All of the problems described in this report are considered by the audit team to require action in order to improve the safety of the scheme and minimise accident occurrence.

2. ITEMS RESULTING FROM THIS STAGE 1 AUDIT

2.1 PROBLEM

Location: General

Summary: Pedestrian and cyclist to vehicle conflict at main roads.

The likely pedestrian and cycle desire lines cannot be assessed from the drawings provided. Poor provision for vulnerable users at major road crossings and junctions may lead to increased accident risk to users.

RECOMMENDATION

Where such desire lines cross major roads suitable provision should be made for vulnerable users.

2.2 PROBLEM

Location: Existing roundabout on Oxford Road, near Sports Ground

Summary: Potential pedestrian / vehicle conflicts

The drawings show a new staggered pedestrian crossing point across the northern arm of the existing A41 roundabout adjacent to the Rugby Sports Field. Pedestrians crossing the roundabout exit at this point may be vulnerable to vehicles accelerating away from the roundabout.

RECOMMENDATION

The staggered crossing at this location should be signal-controlled.

2.3 PROBLEM

Location: Proposed north-western access roundabout

Summary: Potential loss of control or side-swipe type collisions

The proposed roundabout layout includes excessive entry path curvature on both Middleton Stoney Road approaches. This could lead to loss of control accidents on the circulatory carriageway, or to side-swipe collisions as vehicles negotiate the roundabout.

RECOMMENDATION

The geometry of the roundabout should be altered to provide entry path curvature of between 70m and 100m on all approaches to the roundabout.

2.4 PROBLEM

Location: Traffic signal junction on the A41

Summary: Potential collisions at junction

Traffic signal controlled junctions on high speed roads have poor accident records.

RECOMMENDATION

A 40mph speed limit should be introduced on the A41, and this should be reinforced by the provision of appropriate vehicle-activated signs informing drivers if they are exceeding the speed limit.

2.5 Other Issues


It is unclear from the drawings provided what level of activity will occur on the perimeter road. If limited access is permitted along the road vehicle speeds may be high on this road. It may be appropriate to reduce the design speed of this road in order to encourage lower speeds on the road.

3. AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

I certify that this audit has generally been carried out in accordance with HD 19/03.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER:

Andy Paul, B.Eng (Hons);
Principal Engineer, TMS Consultancy

Signed..........

Date.....3rd May 2006.....

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER:

Kevin Seymour, BSc, Dip TS, MIHT;
Senior Engineer, TMS Consultancy

TMS Consultancy
Vanguard Centre
University of Warwick Science Park
Sir William Lyons Road
Coventry
CV4 7EZ

Tel. 024 76 690900
Fax. 024 76 690274
Email: info@tmsconsultancy.co.uk
Website: www.tmsconsultancy.co.uk

APPENDIX A

List of Drawings Examined:

- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 901-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 902-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 903-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 904-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 905-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 906-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 907-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 908-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 909-A
- Drawing No. 1546 / GA / 910-A

Other Information Provided:

- Injury Accident Information
- Traffic Flow Information