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## APPENDIX E

BTM - UNCERTAINTY LOGS \& HEYFORD PARK INCLUSIONS


|  |  |  |  | Complete by Year (Units, |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Name | Description | Dev Type | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | Certainty |
| Inf101 | London Road level crossing | Closure time was a total of 16 minutes during the 2016 base surveys. Do Minimum to assume total closure every hour for 31 minutes from 2026. | Infrastructure | No | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf102 | NW Bicester Interim Scheme | Need to confirm this with OCC | Infrastructure | No | N/A | N/A | Hypothetical |
| Inf103 | NW Bicester Infrastructure | See MasterPlan | Infrastructure | Partial | Partial | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf104 | SE Bic Wretchwick Green | Associated Infrastructure | Infrastructure | Partial | Partial | Partial | More Than Likely |
| Inf105 | SE Bic Additional Area | Access Arrangements | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf106 | Proposed new Garden Town motorway junction | (location to be determined) | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf107 | A41 infrastructure improvements and bus priority | Potential bus priority improvements on A41 from Jn 9 to Boundary Way. | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf108 | Vendee Drive improvements | To be determined | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf109 | Western peripheral corridor: | realigning the A4095 Howes Lane, including a new tunnel under the railway | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf110 | Western peripheral corridor: | improvements to Lord's Lane / B4100 roundabout | Infrastructure | No | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf111 | Eastern peripheral corridor: | replace level crossing with road bridge as part of EWR Phase 2 (Charbridge Lane) | Infrastructure | No | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf112 | Eastern peripheral corridor: | upgrade the A4421 Charbridge Lane to dual facility plus junction improvements - to Charbridge Lane/ Bicester Rd roundabout | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf113 | Eastern peripheral corridor: | upgrade the A4421 Skimmingdish Lane to dual facility plus junction improvements (to A4421/Bicester Rd roundabout) | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf114 | Eastern peripheral corridor: | a link through the SE development site to aid connectivity and provide capacity | Infrastructure | No | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf115 | Pioneer Road roundabout improvements |  | Infrastructure | No | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf116 | Southern peripheral corridor: | a new south east link road - route options | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf117 | London Road level crossing solution |  | Infrastructure | No | No | No | Hypothetical |
| Inf118 | Oxford Rd/ Pingle Drive - upgraded signalised access | Bicester Village? | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Completed |
| Inf119 | A41/ Neunkirchen Way Roundabout (Rodney House) |  | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf120 | A41 Oxford Rd/ Boundary Way roundabout improvement scheme | Bicester Village? | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Completed |
| Inf121 | Upper Heyford improvements. Split into more detail below |  | Infrastructure |  |  |  |  |
| Inf122 | Bus Route S5/X5 | Inter Urban 8ph (2 pk via Kingsmere) need to change IP | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf123 | Bus Route 25A (Now renamed 250) | ThIS IS AS PER 2016 | Infrastructure | 1ph | 1ph | 1 ph |  |
| Inf124 | Bus Route E1 | NW Bicester NE | Infrastructure | 2ph | No | No | More Than Likely |
| Inf125 | Bus Route E2 | NW Bicester SE | Infrastructure | 2ph | 2ph | 6ph | More Than Likely |
| Inf126 | Bus Route E3 | NW Bicester NE | Infrastructure | No | 4ph | 6 ph | More Than Likely |
| Inf127 | Bus Route 21 | Highfield 2ph | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf128 | Bus Route SEB | SE Bicester 2ph | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf129 | Bus Route GH | Graven Hill 2ph | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf130 | Bus Route 26 | Kingsmere 2ph | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf131 | Reading - Bedford with a headway of 60 minutes all day; | East West Rail comprises four new services: | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf132 | Reading - Milton Keynes with a headway of 60 minutes all day; | East West Rail comprises four new services: | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf133 | Bletchley - Milton Keynes with a headway of 60 minutes all day; | East West Rail comprises four new services: | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf134 | Milton Keynes - Marylebone with a headway of 60 minutes all day. | East West Rail comprises four new services: | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | More Than Likely |
| Inf135 | Evergreen3 from Chiltern Railway | consists in the creation of a new service between Oxford and London Marylebone, with a headway of 30 minutes all day. | Infrastructure | N/A | N/A | N/A | Completed |
| Inf136 | Kingsmere Retail Mitigation Scheme | 16/02505/OUT | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf137 | Bicester 10 transport mitigation | 16/02586/OUT | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf138 | Bicester 11 Transport Mitigation | 15/01012/OUT | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf139 | Skimmingdish Lane housing site mitigation | 14/00697/F | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf140 | Shipton Junction A4095/A4260 | Quarry site access requirements | Infrastructure | No | No | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf141 | Heyford Park 2016 Infrastructure | This is what is on the ground at 2016 | Infrastructure |  |  |  |  |
| Inf142 | Heyford Park Existing Permission Infrastructure | This is the access roads required to allow connection to the highway network only e.g. access junctions on Camp Road. | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf143 | Heyford Park Existing Permission Mitigation | Includes S278 mititgation schemes that are not access (i.e. narrowing on Camp Road) and consented scheme at Middleton Stoney and Camp Road/Chilgrove Drive | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |
| Inf144 | Bicester 4 | Improvements at A41 / Lakeview Drive signal junction | Infrastructure | Yes | Yes | Yes | Near Certain |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Complete by Year (Units, |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Development Name | Description | Note | Dev Type | Total Dev Units/ Area | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |  | Certainty |
| Res101 | Bicester Community Hospital | Application (12/00809/F) for demolition of existing community hospital and redevelopment of site to provide a new community hospital and 14 residential units was approved on 27 September 2012. | OX26 6DU | C3Dwellings |  | 14 | 14 | 14 |  | Near Certain |
| Res102 | Highways Depot | Completed prior to June 2016 |  | C3Dwellings |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Completed |
| Res103 | Bicester 13 (Gavray Drive) | A strategic allocation in the adopted Local Plan 2011-2031 for 300 dwellings (Bicester 13). <br> HELAA273. Application (15/00837/OUT) for 180 dwellings was received on 11/5/2015 and is at appeal. | 300 dwellings should be applied in a 2031 high growth scenario | C3Dwellings |  | 180 | 180 | 180 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res104 | Bicester 2 (Graven Hill) | See 2017 AMR for planning information | 2100 in 2031 high growth scenario | C3Dwellings |  | 571 | 1571 | 1900 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res105 | Kingsmere | See 2017 AMR for planning information | 950 taken from 2016 AMR | C3Dwellings |  | 950 | 950 | 950 |  | Near Certain |
| Res106 | Land at Skimmingdish Lane | Application (14/00697/F) for 46 dwellings was approved on 9 December 2015. |  | C3Dwellings |  | 46 | 46 | 46 |  | Near Certain |
| Res107 | Land south of Church Lane (Old Place Yard and St Edburgs) | Non-Statutory allocation for 15 dwellings. Development principles approved in June 2007. Permission for 11 units (16/00043/F) on either side of the former Bicester Library and is currently under construction. The former Library site is site HELAA080. Total units expected on site is 16. | OX26 6AU. 16 should be applied to 2031 high growth scenario. | C3Dwellings |  | 11 | 11 | 11 |  | Near Certain |
| Res108 | Land south of Talisman Road | Outline application 09/01592/OUT for 140 dwellings granted on appeal (APP/C3105/A/11/2147212) on 18 August 2011. <br> Reserved Matters application for 125 dwellings (13/01226/REM) was approved on 13 February 2014. | The site was completed in March 2018 | C3Dwellings |  | 125 | 125 | 125 |  | Near Certain |
| Res109 | NWB Eco-town Exemplar | See 2017 AMR for planning information |  | C3Dwellings |  | 213 | 303 | 303 |  | Near Certain |
| Res110 | NWB Phase 2 | See 2017 AMR for planning information |  | C3Dwellings |  | 405 | 1505 | 2605 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res111 | SE Bicester (12) (Wretchwick Green) | A strategic allocation in the adopted Local Plan 2011-2031 for 1500 dwellings (Bicester 12). HELAA261. Please see 2017 AMR for planning information. A revised outline planning application is expected soon. | Could be seen as a high growth scenario as no houses have permission. | C3Dwellings |  | 175 | 1175 | 1500 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res112 | South West Bicester Phase 2 (Bicester 3) | A strategic allocation in the adopted Local Plan 2011-2031 for 726 dwellings (Bicester 3). <br> Resolution (7 August 2014) to approve 709 homes (13/00847/OUT) subject to legal agreement. |  | C3Dwellings |  | 190 | 709 | 709 |  | Near Certain |
| Res113 | St Edburg's School, Cemetery Road | Development principles approved in October 2008. A planning application for residential development was submitted in 2009 (09/00082/OUT) but withdrawn to enable land ownership issues to be resolved. HELAA262. | OX26 6BB | C3Dwellings |  | 10 | 10 | 10 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res114 | Winners Bargain Centres, Victoria Road | Application (15/00412/F) for redevelopment to form 42 sheltered apartments for the elderly, communal facilities, access, carparking and landscaping was approved on 15 June 2015. | OX26 6QD. Completed in September 2016 | C3Dwellings |  | 42 | 42 | 42 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res115 | Windfall allowance | Windfall allowance at Bicester is 10 units for the start of the trajectory and then reduced to 5 towards the end Please note this allowance cannot be included in the model due to lack of location details. |  | C3Dwellings |  | 134 | 174 | 199 |  |  |
| Res116 | Bessemere Close/Launton Rd | Non-statutory allocation for 70 dwellings. See 2017 AMR for details |  | C3Dwellings |  | 70 | 70 | 70 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res117 | Cattlemarket | Non-statutory allocation for 40 dwellings. HELAA264. See 2017 AMR for details |  | C3Dwellings |  | 0 | 40 | 40 |  | More Than Likely |
| Res118 | Upper Heyford Consented | 574 dwellings by 2016. Additional 665 by 2031 (1239 total) Based on PBA drawings See Figures 1 and 2 | Permitted development | C3Dwellings |  | 665 | 665 | 665 |  | Near Certain |


|  |  |  |  |  | Complete by Year (Units, sqm, |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Development Name | Description | Location | Dev Type | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 |  | Certainty |
| Emp101 | NW Bicester | 17/01090/OUT - Development of B1\| B2 and B8 (Use Classes) employment buildings| including landscaping; parking and service areas; balancing ponds and swales; and associated utilities and infrastructure. Construction of a new access off Middleton Stoney Road (B4030); 53,000 sq metres of flexible employment provisioncovering an area of 9.45 ha . Part superseded by 17/01090/OUT (eastern part). | Bic 1 - OS Parcel 4200 Adjoining And North East Of A4095 And Adjoining And South West Of Howes Lane Bicester | B8/B1/B2 | 26,500 | 53,000 | 53,000 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp102 | Graven Hill | 11/01494/OUT - facilities to include A1\| A2 | A3| A5 and D1 uses totalling up to 1358 sqm | up to 1000 sqm gross A1 uses | a pub/restaurant/hotel (class $\mathrm{A} 4 / \mathrm{A} 3 / \mathrm{C} 1$ ) up to 1000 sqm. employment floorspace comprising up to B1(a) 2160sqm \| B1(b) 2400sqm | B1(c) and B2 20520sqm and B8 uses up to 66960sqm. Erection of a 70400 sqm fulfilment centre on ' $C$ ' s. | Bic 2 - Site C Ploughley Roa | A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1/C1/B1a/B 1b/B1c/B2/B8 |  | 46,619 | 93,238 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp103 | Bicester Business Park | 17/02534/OUT (Not determined) - The construction of a business park of up to 60,000 sq.m (GEA) of flexible Class B1(a) office / Class B1(b) research \& development floorspace. High Growth scenario could be 103,250 in 2031 in line with the local plan employment trajectory. | Bic 4 | B1 | 30,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |  | More Than Likely |
| Emp104 | Bicester Gateway | 16/02586/OUT - 14972 sq m (Gross External Area) of B1 employment based buildings \| plus a hotel (up to 149 bedrooms). 63,000 would be a high growth scenario from 2026 | Bic 10 | B1 and hotel | 14,972 | 14,972 | 14,972 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp105 | NE Bicester Business Park | 15/01012/OUT - OUTLINE - Development of up to 48,308sqm of employment floorspace (Class B1c\| B2| B8 and ancillary B1a uses. | Bic 11 | B1ac/B2/B8 | 48,308 | 48,308 | 48,308 |  | Under Construction |
| Emp106 | Wretchwick Green | 16/01268/OUT - up to 18ha of employment land for B1 and/ or B8 uses, a local centre with retail and community use to include A1 and/ or A2 and/ or A3 and/ or A4 and/ or A5 and/ or D1 and/ or D2 and/ or B1 and/ or uses considered as sui generis. This could be viewed as a high growth scenario as is currently being adapted, but it is likely that something will come forward and so Local Plan employment trajectories have been used, less symetry park. | Bic 12 | B1(c)/B8 | - | 38,646 | 77,292 |  | More Than Likely |
| Emp107 | SE Bicester | 16/00861/HYBRID (not determined) -Full planning permission for 18,394 SQM (198,000 SQ FT) of logistics floor space\| within class B8 with ancillary class B1 (A) offices. Outline planning permission for up to 44,314 SQM (477,000 SQ FT) of logistics floor space within class B8 with ancillary class B1 (A) offices. | Bic 12: Symetry Park | B8 plus ancillary B1a | 62,708 | 62,708 | 62,708 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp108 | Canalside |  | Ban 1 | Town centre/commercial uses (not including B use classes) | - | - | - |  | Reasonably Foreseeable |
| Emp109 | Land West of M40 | 10/01816/HYBRID - 24,005sq meters B2 (Industrial) and/or B8 (warehouse/distribution) uses. Could assume a high growth scenario of 122500 in 2031 in line with Local Plan trajectory. 24k sqm completed prior to June 2016 65k LP allocation | Ban 6 | B1/B2/B8 |  | 32,736 | 65,472 |  | Reasonably Foreseeable |
| Emp110 | Land East of M40 |  | Ban 15 | B1/B2/B8 | 22750 | 45500 | 45500 |  | Reasonably Foreseeable |
| Emp111 | Former SAPA Site | Completed pre June 2016 |  | B1, B2 and B8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | Reasonably Foreseeable |
| Emp113 | Kingsmere | Superceded by Kingsmere retail | Bic 3 | B1 |  |  |  |  | Near Certain |
| Emp114 | Bicester Village Phase 4 | 15/00082/F - 5,181 sqm (GIA) retail floorspace and 118sqm ancillary toilet floorspace | Bicester Village | A1 | 5181 | 5181 | 5181 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp115 | Bicester Gateway (Kingsmere Retail) | 16/02505/OUT A1-7832sqm, A3-443sqm, D2-967sqm |  |  | 9242 | 9242 | 9242 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp116 | McDonalds Drive-thru | 17/00889/F Two storey drive-thru restaurant (class A3/A5) - 548sqm |  | A1/A5 | 548 | 548 | 548 |  | Near Certain |
| Emp117 | Heyford Park Consented | $\begin{aligned} & 2016=1,509 \\ & 2021 \text { onwards }=1,700 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 191 | 191 | 191 |  | Near Certain |

This tab is for shopping trips. Jobs are covered under employment

| ID | Development Name | Description | Location | Dev Type | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | Certainty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ret1 | Bicester Village Phase 4 | 15/00082/F - 5,181 sqm (GIA) retail floorspace and 118sqm ancillary toilet floorspace |  | A1 | 5181 | 5181 | 5181 | Near Certain |
| Ret2 | Bicester Gateway (Kingsmere Retail) | 16/02505/OUT A1-7832sqm, A3-443sqm, D2967sqm | Bic 3 |  | 9242 | 9242 | 9242 | Near Certain |
| Ret3 | McDonalds Drive-thru | 17/00889/F Two storey drive-thru restaurant (class A3/A5) - 548sqm |  | A1/A5 | 548 | 548 | 548 | Near Certain |


|  |  |  |  | Complete by Year (Units, |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Development Name | Notes | Dev Type | 2021 | 2026 | 2031 | Certainty |
| Sch101 | Bicester - SW (Kingsmere) | Due to open 2019 | 600-place secondary | 600 | 600 | 600 | Near Certain |
| Sch102 | Bicester - SW (Kingsmere) | Possibly +420 places, most likely after 2021 but by 2026 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Primary - prob } \\ \text { 2fe } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0 | 420 | 420 | More Than Likely |
| Sch103 | Bicester - S (Graven Hill) | Possibly +210 places by 2021 and another +420 places by 2026 | Primary - 2-3fe | 210 | 630 | 630 | Near Certain |
| Sch104 | Bicester - NW (Ecotown) | +210 places in 2017; probably another +210 places by 2021; by 2026 say another +420 places; another +420 places possible by 2031 or might be later. | 3-4 primaries | 420 | 840 | 1260 | More Than Likely |
| Sch105 | Bicester - NW (Ecotown) | Assume +600 by 2026; possibly another +600 by 2031 | Secondary - size tbc | 0 | 600 | 1200 | More Than Likely |
| Sch106 | Bicester - SE | Possibly +420 places, most likely after 2021 but by 2026 | Primary - 2fe? | 0 | 420 | 420 | More Than Likely |
| Sch107 | Longfield | Longfield increase this year from 1.5fe to 2fe | Primary | 58 | 79 | 101 | Completed |
| Sch108 | Launton | Launton is looking at going up from 175 to 210 places from 2017, subject to consultation | Primary | 35 | 35 | 35 | Hypothetical |
| Sch109 | St Edburgs | St Edburg's is now 2fe in its new location, with actual pupil numbers still to rise. | Primary | 169 | 348 | 528 | Completed |
| Sch110 | Upper Heyford committed | These are additional places as part of the existing permission | Primary |  |  | 280 | Near Certain |
| Sch111 | Upper Heyford committed | These are additional places as part of the existing permission | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Secondary - size } \\ \text { tbc } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | 180 | Near Certain |


| Originator | Reason for Modelling | Model Name | HPA TrafficIncluded | Heyford Park Allocation Mitigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Public Transport Improvements (1) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { HPA M40 10 } \\ \text { mprovenents (2) } \end{gathered}\right.$ | B430 / Unammed Road Junction (3) | Hopcrofts Holt Junction (4) | $\begin{gathered} \text { B4027 / A4260 } \\ \text { Junction (5) } \end{gathered}$ | Middleton Stoney Bus Gate (6) | Middleton Stoney <br> Junction (7) | Middleton Stoney Bypass | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HGV Weight } \\ & \text { Restriction on } \\ & \text { B4030 (8) } \end{aligned}$ | HGV Weight Restriction on B4030 (9) | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline \text { Ardley Village } \\ \text { B430 } \\ \text { Signalisation (10) } \end{array}$ | Chilgrove Drive $/$ <br> Camp Road <br> Junction Upgrade <br> (11) (11) |  |
| Oxfordshire County Council | Testing Impact andMitagation ofHevorid ParkAllocation (HPA) | 2016 Base Year | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
|  |  | 2026 Reference Case | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
|  |  | 2031 Reference Case | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
|  |  | 2031 Do Nothing | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |  |
|  |  | 2031 Do Minimum | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes <br> see comments) | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | B430 / Unnamed junction improvements are the basic signalisation of the existing priority junction. |
|  |  | 2031 Do Something 1 | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (see comments) } \end{gathered}$ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | B430 / Unnamed junction improvements are the signalisation of the junction with increased capacity from the Do Minimum scenario. |
|  |  | 2031 Do Something 1a | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (as DS1) } \end{gathered}$ | Yes | Yes | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Yes } \\ \text { (see comments) }\end{array}$ | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Bus gate in alternative location, on Camp Road. |
|  |  | 2031 Do Something 1b | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (as DS1) } \end{gathered}$ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |  |
|  |  | 2031 Do Something 2 | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (as DS1) } \end{gathered}$ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (see comments) } \end{gathered}$ | No | No | No | Yes | Eastern section of bypass only. |
|  |  | 2031 Do Something 3 | Yes | Yes | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \\ \text { (as DS1) } \end{gathered}$ | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes (see comments) | No | No | No | Yes | Full bypass scheme included. |
| Kingsmere | Kingsmere Update | 2026 Reference Case Kingsmere Update | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Amendment of the 2026 Reference Case to limit access to Kingsmere development from the Pioneer Way junction |
|  |  | 2031 Reference Case Kingsmere Update | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |

NOTES:
.Increased bus services to to HPA site.
2. Signals on Baynards Green roundabout. Signals on Padbury roundabout. Additional southbound lane on Cherwell signal junction. Signals on Ardley road roundabout.
3. Existing three arm priority junction changed to signal controlled junction. (Node 40995)
. Increased capacity at existing signal controlled junction. (Node 90880)
5. Existing staggered priority crossroads changed to a four arm roundabout. (Nodes 42058 and 40392)
. Bus gate on B4030 to the north-west of Middleton Stoney. (Between nodes 40235 and 90298 or for DS1a only between nodes 4235 and 40990)
7. Improvements to existing four arm signal controlled junction in the centre of Middleton Stoney. (Nodes 40230 and 41480 )
8. HGV weight restricion is on the B4030 directly to the east of Middleton Stoney. (Between nodes 41480 and 96030 )
9. HGV weight restriction is on the B4030 directly to the west of Lower Heyford. (Between nodes 40245 and 40387)
0. Existing staggered priority crossroads changed to a signal junction. (Nodes 901880 and 410220

1. Existing staggered priority crossroads changed to a signal junction. (Nodes 40990 and 96550 )


North West Bicester (Bicester 1) Zones with Dwellings in 2031
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OCC RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDE EXTRACTS


## TECHNICAL

## 5. Road Types

5.1. The following table outlines some different road types within residential developments, their characteristics and where they should be used. This list is not exhaustive and innovation is encouraged.
5.2. If necessary further information is available on request regarding these suggested road types. See next Chapter for some further information on road alignments etc.

| Road Description | Max. recommended Number of Dwellings* | Design Speed | Carriageway \& Footway Details** | Description and Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Distributor | n/a | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 50 \mathrm{kph} \\ & (30 \mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 2 \mathrm{X} 2 \mathrm{~m} \text { footways } \end{aligned}$ | Multipurpose local road, generally forming part of local County network. Collected frontage access in forward gear only. |
| Link Road | n/a | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 50 \mathrm{kph} \\ & \text { (30mph) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6. } 75 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { 2 X } 2 \mathrm{~m} \text { footways } \end{aligned}$ | Links residential elements and accommodates regular nonresidential uses. Frontage access in forward gear only. Min 3m verges required. |
| Major Access Road | 700 <br> 400 link or loop <br> 200 cul-de-sac | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \mathrm{kph} \\ & \text { (20mph) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6.75 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 5.5 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 2 \mathrm{X} 1.8 \text { footways. } \end{aligned}$ | Direct access in or out of a residential area may serve nonresidential uses regularly accessed by vehicles $<7.5 \mathrm{~T}$ (a plated HGV). If a bus route 6.75 m carriageway required. |
| Minor Access Road | 200 link or loop <br> 100 cul-de-sac | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \mathrm{kph} \\ & \text { (20mph) } \end{aligned}$ | 5m <br> ( 5.5 m for first 12 m ) <br> $2 \times 1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ footways. | No access restrictions. Special surface finish. |
| Access Way | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \text { link or loop } \\ & 25 \text { cul-de-sac } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \mathrm{kph} \\ & (20 \mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \mathrm{~m} \\ & 2 \times 1.5 \mathrm{~m} . \end{aligned}$ | No access restrictions. Special surface finish. |
| Access Lane | 50 link or loop <br> 25 cul-de-sac | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \mathrm{kph} \\ & (20 \mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | 6.0 m overall 4.2 m vehicle <br> 1.8 m pedestrian overrunnable or 2 x 1 m where kerb height is $<25 \mathrm{~mm}$. | Specifically designed for rural access. Pedestrian margin overrunnable. |
| Mews | 25 cul-de-sac | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30kph } \\ & \text { (20mph) } \end{aligned}$ | 6.0m overall 4.8 vehicle tracked route. <br> Pedestrian safe area to be considered by design | Urban form. Special surface finish. Special junction criterion. |
| Residential Square | Defined by space enclosed | As host road | 4.8m tracked vehicle way. | Urban form. Ramped approaches to tabled area. Special surface finish. Central feature for driver orientation. |

* Number of residential units is guidance only as to hierarchy road hierarchy. Other factors may produce a demand for a higher category street.
** The widths given are minimums for the road description and additional width may be required for adoptable roads.


## 6. Technical Support Data

## Junction Design and Sight Lines

6.1. Street junctions, within a residential development should be considered as integral part of the overall layout, requiring careful consideration.
6.2. One of the main requirements of a street junction, within a residential development, is to provide for pedestrian crossing on a direct desire line. This requires either:
i. The junction radii should be kept to a minimum ( 1.0 m max radius). Large vehicles will have to use the offside running lane to complete the left turn without the rear wheels mounting the kerb. Vehicle tracking drawings should be provided to ensure this is possible. The small kerb radius at the junction has several advantages. In addition to providing for direct pedestrian crossing, vehicle speeds are reduced to $10 \mathrm{mph}-15 \mathrm{mph}$ which reduces the likelihood of vehicle- cycle conflicts.
Or
ii. Larger radii may be used for the junction but the footways are built out at the corners. These junctions should be combined with a speed table at the junction.
The actual treatment of junctions will be on a case by case assessment that best suits the overall design of the development. However, in all cases tactile paving should be provided to assist the blind and partially sighted.
6.3. Generally, overrun areas should be avoided, although there may be occasions when these are acceptable. Bringing the carriageway up flush with the footway level at the junction at busy crossings should be considered at all junctions as it implies priority to pedestrians.

## Visibility at Junctions

6.4. Visibility at junctions is defined by means of the ' X '-distance and ' Y '-distance shown on the following diagram.
6.5. The sightlines should take account of what the driver can see and what pedestrians (particularly children) can see - hence they should be determined from a drivers eye height of $1.05-2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ and an object height of $0.6-2 \mathrm{~m}$.

6.6. An ' $X$ '-distance of 2.4 m is normally required but in certain circumstances (e.g. lightly trafficked, slow speed street) 2.0 m may be acceptable. Agreement should be sought with the Highway Authority at an early stage for this dispensation.
6.7. Speed surveys should be carried out to determine actual road speeds rather than posted Speed Limit Orders. The following table provides the default required sightlines unless the standards of other guidance can be shown to be appropriate to context.

Table of Required Sightline ('Y')-Distance for Speed on Through Road

| Kph | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 85 | 100 | 120 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mph | 19 | 25 | 31 | 37 | 43 | 53 | 62 | 75 |
| SSD (m) | 33 | 45 | 70 | 90 | 120 | 160 | 215 | 295 |

## Speed Restraint and Forward Visibility

6.8. One of the key design aims should be to reduce speeds within the development to 20 mph . Generally speed can be restrained by limiting straight or uninterrupted lengths of street to less than 70m. Other features which can be introduced to control speeds are listed below:
i. Physical features, involving vertical or horizontal deflection. However, speed humps should be considered only as a last resort and other measures should be given preference.
ii. Changes in priority at junctions can help to produce a reduction in speed and roundabouts are particularly effective in this respect.
iii. Street dimensions. In addition, to the width between buildings influencing driver speed, keeping lengths of street between junctions short should also be a key design element.
iv. Limiting forward visibility has a major influence on speed - refer to table below.
v. Providing appropriate street features such as on street parking, obstructions in the street, edge marking that visually narrow the carriageway and changes in texture or colour can be part of the tool box of measures. All these features give a psychological message, which encourages drivers to reduce their speed.
6.9. Limiting forward visibility should be used to control speeds within the development and this should be given priority in formulating layouts. The following table gives the forward stopping sight distance required for given speeds.

Table of Required Forward Visibility Distance for Speed on Through Road

| Kph | 16 | 20 | 24 | 25 | 30 | 32 | 40 | 45 | 48 | 50 | 60 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mph | 10 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 25 | 28 | 30 | 31 | 37 |
| SSD (m) | 9 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 20 | 22 | 31 | 36 | 40 | 43 | 56 |


6.10. All new residential developments containing an adoptable highway network will be expected to form part of a $20 \mathrm{mph}(30 \mathrm{kph})$ zone. Residential developments, which have streets not offered for adoption, will not be excepted from the imposition of the principles outlined in this document.
6.11. Speed restraint measures should be used throughout the 20 mph zone and no warning signs are required within the zone. Signs (in accordance with Traffic Advisory Leaflet 2/93) and an entrance gateway are, however, required to indicate to drivers that they are entering the zone.
6.12. It is essential that the designer appreciates that speed restraint is not just a matter of using the engineering features, described in this section. A driver's perception of a safe speed is also materially affected by the spacing, form and proximity of the buildings served by the road, in addition to the surface materials used and the effective use of hard and soft landscaping. A composite design will be called for, which must be agreed at an early stage by both Planning and Highway Authorities.

## Number of Access points

6.13. A minimum of two access points from the surrounding highway network should be provided where the number of dwellings exceeds 500 units.

## Emergency Access

6.14. If more than 150 dwellings and less than 500 dwellings are served by a single access an emergency access should be provided. This may take the form of an uprated cycle track or a reinforced grass area. The details must be agreed with the Highway Authority.

## Access for Servicing

6.15. Refuse vehicles must be able to reach refuse collection within 25 m for single domestic refuse bin or 5 m for larger communal (shared) bins. Developers proposals should show the location of the refuse storage and ensure by means of vehicle tracking plots that refuse vehicles can access the location without reversing.
6.16. It is common in recently built developments to see refuse bins left on street mainly because there is no suitable place within the cartilage of the property to store them. Developers should therefore give consideration where residents will store bins and avoid the need to keep bins on street for convenience.

## Access for Fire Tenders

6.17. Building Regulations require access for fire tenders to a point no further than 45 m from all parts of the ground floor of any residential building. Any road or private drive being part of that access must be no less than 3.7 m wide between kerbs ( 3.1 m minimum for a gateway or similar short narrowing), and should have a minimum centre line radius of 6.6 m (or 7.8 between walls) and headroom of 3.7 m .
6.18. The access (including manholes etc.) should have a carrying capacity of a 12.5 tonne vehicle (bridges etc. should have a minimum carrying capacity of 17 tonnes).
6.19. A cul-de-sac longer than 20 m must have a turning area suitable to enable a fire tender to carry-out a three point turn.
6.20. Where there are flats of more than four storeys there are additional access requirements, about which, the local Building Control Authority / Building Regulations should be consulted.
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## DESIGNER'S STATEMENT

## INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Velocity Transport Planning (VTP) prepared the junction designs for the proposals associated with Land at North West Bicester, Oxfordshire. The development of this design has involved consultation with the local highway authority, Oxfordshire County Council, and is to provide vehicular access to a development of up to 550 dwellings.
1.1.2 The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out be an independent audit company, Road Safety Consulting Ltd, and a number of problems were raised which this Designer's Response addresses.
1.1.3 I have considered the issues and problems raised in the Stage 1 RSA and my comments are set out within this Designer's Response.

Signed


Date: $\quad 14^{\text {th }}$ April 2021

## 2

## 2.1 <br> INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Road Safety Consultants Ltd (RSC) were commissioned by VTP to carry out a Stage 1 RSA of the proposed site access arrangements and the proposed traffic signalisation of the existing Charlotte Avenue junction with the B4100 Banbury Road.

## INTRODUCTION

The proposed development is expected to accommodate up to 550 dwellings and is the subject of a current outline planning application to be submitted to Cherwell District Council.

The Stage 1 RSA considered the following schemes:

- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev A - Site Accesses A, B, C
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-010 Rev A - Site Access D
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 Rev A - Site Access E
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 Rev A - Charlotte Avenue Signal Junction

This Designer's Response addresses the problems raised in the Stage 1 RSA and draws together the following documents and information:
a) The Designer's Response to the Stage 1 RSA is set out as follows:

- Column 1 - identifies the item number in the Stage 1 RSA;
- Column 2 - summarises the problem identified within the Stage 1 RSA;
- Column 3 - sets out the Auditor's recommendation;
- Column 4 - sets out the Designer's Response; and
- Column 5 - allows for comments from the Local Highway Authority.
b) A summary of the Stage 1 RSA Brief (excluding all of the attachments) is included at Appendix A. The signed Stage 1 RSA prepared by RSC is included at Appendix B.

The updated drawings to reflect the comments raised through the Stage 1 RSA, are included at Appendix C, as follows:

- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev C - Site Accesses A, B, C
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-010 Rev A - Site Access D
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 Rev B - Site Access E
- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 Rev B - Charlotte Avenue Signal Junction

| Stage 1 RSA Report (RSC/KS/EB/200069 - Residential Development Access Proposals) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Problem | Auditor's Recommendation | Designer's Response | Highway Authority Response |
| 3.1 - Site Accesses A, B, C (Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev A) |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1.1 | Location: Site accesses B \& C <br> Summary: Tactile paving layout may be confusing and lead to pedestrian to vehicle collisions involving sightimpaired people <br> At the side road crossing points, the tactile paving layout at the junction radii may be confusing for some sightimpaired pedestrians. Some sight-impaired users may find it difficult to align themselves to cross the junction and this may lead to them to walking into the carriageway, or towards upstand kerbs, which may result in pedestrian to vehicle collisions, or trips / falls at kerb upstands. | It is recommended that the crossing points are inset into the side road, to simplify the tactile paving layouts, minimise crossing distances and provide clear crossing alignment. | VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev C has been prepared to reflect the Auditor's recommendation. <br> This updated arrangement shows the informal crossing points being relocated, which will include dropped kerbs and tactile paving. The full detailed design of these crossing facilities will be finalised at the detailed design stage. |  |
| 3.1.2 | Location: General to the location <br> Summary: Lack of pedestrian crossing facilities on pedestrian desire routes may lead to mobility impaired user trips or falls at upstand kerbs <br> It is unclear what routes pedestrians will take east-west across the existing spine road. Should there be a desire to cross the road east-west, the lack of dropped kerb facilities may lead to mobility impaired users, such as older pedestrians or wheelchair users, trips or falls at upstand kerbs. | It is recommended that pedestrian desire routes are assessed and suitable dropped kerb crossing facilities provided, where appropriate. | As per the Auditor's recommendation, the pedestrian desire lines have been assessed and additional informal crossing points identified either side of the existing bus gate. <br> VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev <br> C presents the informal crossing facilities. <br> The full detailed design of these crossing facilities will be finalised at the detailed design stage. |  |


| 3.3-Construction Site Access (Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 Rev A) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.3.1 | Location: At the access <br> Summary: Large vehicle swept paths may lead to late braking on the B4100 and shunt type collisions <br> This section of the B4100 is subject to a 40 mph speed limit, although there is no street lighting and speed limit repeater signing appears to be widely spaced. By observation, vehicle speeds appeared to be in excess of the posted speed limit. It is unclear whether large construction vehicles will be able to pass each other at the junction mouth and this may lead to construction vehicles stopping suddenly within the main carriageway, with consequent risk of shunt type collisions. | It is recommended that the construction access is sufficiently wide to allow large vehicles to enter and exit the junction simultaneously. <br> It may also be appropriate to provide temporary signing in advance of the construction access, to encourage appropriate vehicle speeds and highlight the likelihood of large slow moving vehicles. | As per the Auditor's recommendation, VTP have reviewed the construction access arrangement and amended this to ensure that simultaneous access can be achieved by 2 large HGVs. VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 Rev B presents the revised layout, which now includes the swept path assessment of a large HGV and an indication of appropriate warning signage. <br> The full detailed design of the construction access arrangement will be finalised at the detailed design stage. |  |
| 3.3.2 | Location: At the access <br> Summary: Muck and detritus on the carriageway may lead to loss of control type collisions <br> Construction activities may lead to deposits of muck and detritus on the B4100, with consequent risk of loss of control type collisions, particularly in wet weather conditions. | It is recommended that adequate measures are introduced to ensure muck and detritus is not deposited on the B4100, which may include effective wheel washing facilities | Prior to the implementation of the construction access junction, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) will be submitted to and approved by the LPA. This will include details of the appropriate measures to be introduced that will ensure that the carriageway of the B4100 will be kept clear of muck and detritus. |  |


| 3.4-Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signal Controlled Junction (Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 Rev A) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3.4.1 | Location: At the junction <br> Summary: Pedestrian to vehicle collisions involving <br> main road right turning vehicles <br> The staging layout on the drawing indicates that right <br> turners turn within gaps in the opposing traffic or <br> within the inter-green period. <br> The stacking space for waiting right turners may lead <br> to up to four / five vehicles passing the signal stop line <br> and attempting to clear the junction in the intergreen <br> period. The intergreen period at the end of stage 1 <br> may not be sufficient to clear the right turn queue <br> leading to an increased risk of pedestrian to vehicle <br> collisions at the crossing | It is recommended that the right turn <br> manoeuvre is positively signalled, to <br> minimise the possible pedestrian to <br> vehicle conflict. Measures may include an <br> early cut off with an indicative arrow and <br> that an adequate inter-green period is <br> provided to ensure queuing right turn <br> vehicles can clear the crossing area before <br> the pedestrian crossing signal is given a <br> green person aspect. | The design of the traffic signal <br> junction has been revisited to <br> ensure that adequate time is <br> afforded to the right turners to <br> perform the manoeuvre. The <br> results of this revised signal <br> arrangement are set out within the <br> supporting Transport Assessment. |  |
| 3.4.2 | Location: At the junction <br> Summary: Collisions involving main road right turning <br> vehicles <br> The staging layout on the drawing indicates that right <br> turners turn within gaps in the opposing traffic or <br> within the inter-green. <br> The junction layout on the drawing indicates a far <br> sided secondary signal head for the southbound traffic <br> stream. Drivers making the main road right turn <br> manoeuvre may take their cue to commence a right <br> turn based on this signal aspect. With the 40mph <br> speed limit and observed high northbound speeds, <br> northbound vehicles passing the stop line at the end <br> of the stage may come into conflict with right turning <br> vehicles | It is recommended that the right turn <br> manoeuvre is positively signalled, to <br> minimise the possible right turn across <br> path conflict. Measures may include an <br> early cut off with an indicative arrow or if <br> the staging arrangement is to remain as a <br> two stage, the far sided signal aspect <br> should be relocated to be closely <br> associated. | See comment above. |  |


| 3.4.3 | Location: At the junction <br> Summary: Pedestrian to vehicle collisions leading to pedestrian injury <br> The Linsig analysis shows no inter-green period between the termination of the traffic phase $D$ to the start of pedestrian phase $E$ and vice a versa. If insufficient time is provided between the termination of these phases, it may lead to a slow walking pedestrian being hit by a vehicle, leading to pedestrian injury | It is recommended that appropriate intergreen periods are provided between the phases | See comment above. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.0 - Other Observations |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | Location: Site Access A <br> At the existing pedestrian crossing point, there are sections of dropped kerbs, that are unprotected by tactile paving. Sight-impaired pedestrians may not perceive the change from footway to carriageway and inadvertently walking into the path of vehicles. <br> It is acknowledged that this is an existing issue and should be discussed with the highway authority and be resolved, with appropriate remedial measures such as extending tactile paving to cover the dropped kerb areas |  | It is acknowledged that this is an existing issue, but the layout of the existing crossing facility, including the dropped kerbs and tactile paving, can be revisited as part of the detailed design stage. |


| 4.2 | Location: At the bus / cycle gate <br> The existing signing at this location may confuse users, <br> as the 'No Entry' signs appear to prohibit all traffic at <br> this facility. The issue should be discussed with the <br> highway authority for resolution. It would be <br> appropriate to simplify and clarify signing at both ends <br> of the bus only gate facility; an 'exception' plate would <br> be appropriate underneath the 'No Entry' signing. <br> The position of the no-entry signage may need to be <br> relocated to suit the new accesses B and C, so that <br> drivers wishing to enter Access B and C do not need <br> drive through the no entry signage. | It is acknowledged that the signage <br> and location of the signage at the <br> existing bus gate might be <br> reconfigured to not only reflect the <br> prohibition of vehicles through the <br> bus gate, with the exception of <br> buses and cycles, but also to simply <br> the arrangement and therefore be <br> less confusing for road users. <br> As part of the detailed design of <br> the site access junctions, <br> amendments to the bus gate, and <br> introduction of the new footway <br> along the western side of the bus <br> gate, the appropriate signage can <br> be agreed with OCC at the detailed <br> design stage. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.3 | Location: Along the B4100 <br> Along the western verge, there appears to be a <br> pedestrian route. It is unclear what pedestrian desire <br> there is in the vicinity, however, any unexpected <br> pedestrian movements in the vicinity of construction <br> traffic may lead to an increased risk of pedestrian to <br> vehicle collisions at the site construction access. <br> It is recommended that an assessment of pedestrian <br> movements is carried out to establish the need for <br> measures to mitigate the risk to pedestrians in the <br> vicinity of the access | As the Auditor has identified, it is <br> unclear what pedestrian desire <br> there is along this highway verge. <br> As set out within the TA, it is <br> considered that there would be a <br> very limited desire for pedestrians <br> along this verge. <br> However, it is acknowledged that <br> as part of the detailed design of the <br> construction access, the potential <br> presence of pedestrians in <br> proximity to the new junction will <br> be factored in to the configuration <br> of the junction at the detailed <br> design stage. |

Location: Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signal Junction
The proposed signal junction
It is unclear from the information provided (as indicated by the tactile paving layout), whether the arrangement as presented within the TA includes signalised pedestrian crossing phases. The colour and layout of the tactile paving will be finalised at the detailed design stage. controlled crossing with traffic signal push button units and indicators, or as an uncontrolled crossing, although the phasing diagram appears to show the pedestrian movements as signal phases.

It is recommended the type of crossing should be clarified and at the detail design stage the colour and layout of the tactile paving should comply with latest guidance for the chosen crossing type
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Table 3: Scheme Details


## Table 4: Locality

| Description of Locality |
| :--- |
| The site is located to the immediate north-west of Bicester Town Centre and forms part of the North West <br> Bicester Eco Town development. |
| General Description: |
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#### Abstract

The proposed development is for up to 550 residential units, the access to the development is to be taken from the as-built estate road that runs from a priority junction with the B4100 to the south-east of the proposed development with Charlotte Avenue to a priority junction to the north-east of the proposed development with Braeburn Avenue. A Bus Only link is located between the Eastern and Western Parcels of the proposed development. Two site access junctions will be formed to the south of the bus gate and one new access junction to be formed to the north of the bus gate. A new extended access road is to be provided on the northern boundary of the proposed development. A temporary access is proposed to access the Eastern Parcel of land from the B4100 during construction only.

The proposed signalised junction forms an existing priority junction with the estate road (Charlotte Avenue) and the B4100 to the south-east of the proposed development.

Relevant Factors which may Affect Road Safety N/A


Table 5: Analysis

| Collision Data Analysis |
| :--- |
| Latest three-year PIA data is included. |
| Departures from Standards: |
| N/A |
| Previous Road Safety Audit Stage Reports, Road Safety Audit Responses and Evidence of Agreed Actions |
| N/A |
| Strategic Decisions: |
| N/A |
| List of Included Documents \& Drawings: |
| Documents: |
| - $\quad$ Extracts from VTP Transport Assessment (Accident Data, Traffic Flow Diagrams) |
| Drawings: |
| - Site Location Plan |
| - Illustrative Masterplan |
| - VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 Rev A - Site Accesses A to C |
| - VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-010 Rev A - Site Access D |
| - VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 Rev A - Site Access E |
| • VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 Rev A - Charlotte Avenue Signal Junction |

- VTP Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 Rev A - Charlotte Avenue Signal Junction
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## 1. Introduction

1.1. This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on the proposed Residential Development Access Proposals on Land North-west of Bicester, Oxfordshire. The Audit was carried out during April 2021.
1.2. This Road Safety Audit was produced for (client organisation): Firethorn Trust, requested by (design organisation): Velocity Transport Planning Ltd, on behalf of (overseeing organisation): Oxfordshire County Council.
1.3. The Road Safety Audit Brief was provided by Mark Kirby of Velocity Transport Planning Ltd. The audit team has reviewed the brief and consider it adequate to enable the audit to be carried out.
1.4. The Audit Team membership was as follows:

Audit Team Leader
Kevin Seymour
B Sc, PG Dip TS, MCIHT, MSoRSA
Highways England Certificate of Competence (Road Safety Audit)
Road Safety Consulting Ltd
Audit Team Member
Elaine Bingham
B Eng (Hons), MCIHT, MSoRSA
Highways England Certificate of Competence (Road Safety Audit)
Road Safety Consulting Ltd
1.5. The audit took place at the offices of Road Safety Consulting Ltd between $6^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ April 2021. The audit was undertaken in accordance with the audit brief and the report has been prepared with reference to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) GG 119.
1.6. The Audit Team visited the site together on the on the $7^{\text {th }}$ April 2021 between $1: 30 \mathrm{pm}$ and 3:00pm. At the time of the audit the weather was dry and overcast. The road surface was dry. Traffic flows were low. Pedestrian volumes were low and no cyclists were observed.
1.7. The audit comprised an examination of the information provided by the Design Organisation and listed in Appendix 1.
1.8. 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 designs to any other criteria.
1.9. All comments and recommendations are referenced to the design drawing and the locations have been indicated on plans in Appendix 2.
1.10. The audit team is unaware of any previous road safety audits on the current access proposals.

## 2. Items Considered

### 2.1. $\quad$ Scheme Proposals

2.1.1. The proposed development is for up to 550 residential units, the access to the development is to be taken from the as-built estate road that runs from a priority junction with the B4100 to the south-east of the proposed development with Charlotte Avenue to a priority junction to the north-east of the proposed development with Braeburn Avenue.
2.1.2. The access proposal consists of:
> Two new site access junctions to be created from the existing estate road that bisects the site located to the north and south of the existing bus gate.
> Two existing access points extended into the proposed development.
> A signalised junction to be created at the existing priority junction of Charlotte Avenue and B4100.
> A temporary priority junction to be created for construction use only on the B4100 Banbury Road. There is currently an existing farm gate at this location.

### 2.2. Information Provided to the Audit Team

2.2.1. Information that has been provided to the Audit Team, for the purpose of this audit, is as outlined within Appendix 1 of this report.

### 2.3. Departures from Standards (Design)

2.3.1. The Audit Team has not been advised of any design departures from standards.

### 2.4. Departures from Standards (Road Safety Audit)

2.4.1. This Road Safety Audit has been produced, with reference to DMRB - GG 119 - Road Safety Audit with the following exceptions.
> The Audit Team has not received a formally approved Road Safety Audit Brief by the overseeing organisation; however, the Audit Team has a brief prepared by the design organisation and therefore did not consider that the lack of a formal brief would compromise the production of a Road Safety Audit for these proposals.
> Section 4 of this report provides additional Observations, that are outside of the scope of GG119 (which specifically excludes the provision of additional comments within Road Safety Audit report). These comments, whilst considered outside the scope of the audit, have been produced to assist the designer in providing a safe design where any safety comment may be conditional on receiving more detailed information.

## 3. Items Raised by this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

### 3.1. Site Accesses A, B, C (Drawing 4600-1100-T-009)

### 3.1.1. Problem

Location: Site accesses B \& C
Summary: Tactile paving layout may be confusing and lead to pedestrian to vehicle collisions involving sight-impaired people


At the side road crossing points, the tactile paving layout at the junction radii may be confusing for some sight-impaired pedestrians. Some sight-impaired users may find it difficult to align themselves to cross the junction and this may lead to them to walking into the carriageway, or towards upstand kerbs, which may result in pedestrian to vehicle collisions, or trips / falls at kerb upstands.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that the crossing points are inset into the side road, to simplify the tactile paving layouts, minimise crossing distances and provide clear crossing alignment.

### 3.1.2. Problem

Location: General to the location
Summary: Lack of pedestrian crossing facilities on pedestrian desire routes may lead to mobility impaired user trips or falls at upstand kerbs

It is unclear what routes pedestrians will take east-west across the existing spine road. Should there be a desire to cross the road east-west, the lack of dropped kerb facilities may lead to mobility impaired users, such as older pedestrians or wheelchair users, trips or falls at upstand kerbs.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that pedestrian desire routes are assessed and suitable dropped kerb crossing facilities provided, where appropriate.

### 3.2. Site Access D (Drawing 4600-1100-T-010)

## No Comments

### 3.3. Construction Site Access E (Drawing 4600-1100-T-011)

### 3.3.1. Problem

Location: At the access
Summary: Large vehicle swept paths may lead to late braking on the B4100 and shunt type collisions

This section of the B4110 is subject to a 40 mph speed limit, although there is no street lighting and speed limit repeater signing appears to be widely spaced. By observation, vehicle speeds appeared to be in excess of the posted speed limit. It is unclear whether large construction vehicles will be able to pass each other at the junction mouth and this may lead to construction vehicles stopping suddenly within the main carriageway, with consequent risk of shunt type collisions.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that the construction access is sufficiently wide to allow large vehicles to enter and exit the junction simultaneously.

It may also be appropriate to provide temporary signing in advance of the construction access, to encourage appropriate vehicle speeds and highlight the likelihood of large slow moving vehicles.
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### 3.3.2. Problem

Location: At the access
Summary: Muck and detritus on the carriageway may lead to loss of control type collisions

Construction activities may lead to deposits of muck and detritus on the B4100, with consequent risk of loss of control type collisions, particularly in wet weather conditions.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that adequate measures are introduced to ensure muck and detritus is not deposited on the B4100, which may include effective wheel washing facilities.

### 3.4. Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signal Controlled Junction (Drawing 4600-1100-T-016)

### 3.4.1. Problem

Location: At the junction
Summary: Pedestrian to vehicle collisions involving main road right turning vehicles


The staging layout on the drawing indicates that right turners turn within gaps in the opposing traffic or within the inter-green period.
The stacking space for waiting right turners may lead to up to four / five vehicles passing the signal stop line and attempting to clear the junction in the intergreen period. The intergreen period at the end of stage 1 may not be sufficient to clear the right turn queue leading to an increased risk of pedestrian to vehicle collisions at the crossing.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that the right turn manoeuvre is positively signalled, to minimise the possible pedestrian to vehicle conflict. Measures may include an early cut off with an indicative arrow and that an adequate inter-green period is provided to ensure queuing right turn vehicles can clear the crossing area before the pedestrian crossing signal is given a green person aspect.

### 3.4.2. Problem

Location: At the junction
Summary: Collisions involving main road right turning vehicles


The staging layout on the drawing indicates that right turners turn within gaps in the opposing traffic or within the inter-green.
The junction layout on the drawing indicates a far sided secondary signal head for the southbound traffic stream. Drivers making the main road right turn manoeuvre may take their cue to commence a right turn based on this signal aspect. With the 40 mph speed limit and observed high northbound speeds, northbound vehicles passing the stop line at the end of the stage may come into conflict with right turning vehicles.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that the right turn manoeuvre is positively signalled, to minimise the possible right turn across path conflict. Measures may include an early cut off with an indicative arrow or if the staging arrangement is to remain as a two stage, the far sided signal aspect should be relocated to be closely associated.

### 3.4.3. Problem

Location: At the junction
Summary: Pedestrian to vehicle collisions leading to pedestrian injury


The Linsig analysis shows no inter-green period between the termination of the traffic phase D to the start of pedestrian phase E and vice a versa. If insufficient time is provided between the termination of these phases, it may lead to a slow walking pedestrian being hit by a vehicle, leading to pedestrian injury.

## Recommendation:

It is recommended that appropriate inter-green periods are provided between the phases.

## 4. Other Observations

### 4.1. Observation

Location: Site Access A


At the existing pedestrian crossing point, there are sections of dropped kerbs, that are unprotected by tactile paving. Sight-impaired pedestrians may not perceive the change from footway to carriageway and inadvertently walking into the path of vehicles.

It is acknowledged that this is an existing issue and should be discussed with the highway authority and be resolved, with appropriate remedial measures such as extending tactile paving to cover the dropped kerb areas.

### 4.2. Observation

Location: At the bus / cycle only gate


The existing signing at this location may confuse users, as the 'No Entry' signs appear to prohibit all traffic at this facility. The issue should be discussed with the highway authority for resolution. It would be appropriate to simplify and clarify signing at both ends of the bus only gate facility; an 'exception' plate would be appropriate underneath the 'No Entry' signing.
The position of the no-entry signage may need to be relocated to suit the new accesses $B$ and $C$, so that drivers wishing to enter Access $B$ and $C$ do not need drive through the no entry signage.

### 4.3. Observation

Location: Along the B4100


Along the western verge, there appears to be a pedestrian route. It is unclear what pedestrian desire there is in the vicinity, however, any unexpected pedestrian movements in the vicinity of construction traffic may lead to an increased risk of pedestrian to vehicle collisions at the site construction access.

It is recommended that an assessment of pedestrian movements is carried out to establish the need for measures to mitigate the risk to pedestrians in the vicinity of the access.

### 4.4. Observation

Location: Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signal Junction

It is unclear from the information provided (as indicated by the tactile paving layout), whether the crossing on Charlotte Avenue will be installed as controlled crossing with traffic signal push button units and indicators) or as an uncontrolled crossing, although the phasing diagram appears to show the pedestrian movements as signal phases.

It is recommended the type of crossing should be clarified and at the detail design stage the colour and layout of the tactile paving should comply with latest guidance for the chosen crossing type.

## 5. Audit Team Statement

We certify that this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been carried with reference to GG 119.

## Audit Team Leader

Kevin Seymour
B Sc, PG Dip TS, MCIHT, MSoRSA
Highways England Certificate of Competence (Road Safety Audit)

Signed:


Director of Road Safely Consulting Ltd

## Audit Team Member

Elaine Bingham,
B Eng (Hons), MCIHT, MSoRSA
Highways England Certificate of Competence (Road Safety Audit)
Director of Road Safety Consulting Ltd

Signed: ..........Bingham........................... Dated g $^{\text {th }}$ April 2021
Director of Road Safety Consulting Ltd

Road Safety Consulting Ltd
4 Paramore Close
Whetstone
Leicestershire
LE 6EY

## APPENDIX 1: Information Provided

## List of Information Provided

| Document Reference Number | Revision | Title |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Drawing 4600-1100-T-009 | A | Site Access A, B, C |
| Drawing 4600-1100-T-010 | A | Site Access D - Direct Access to North of <br> the Western Parcel |
| Drawing 4600-1100-T-011 | A | Site Access E - Proposed Construction <br> Access |
| Drawing 4600-1100-T-016 | A | Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signals |
| Drawing 1192-SK004A | - | Illustrative Masterplan |
| Drawing 1192-SK001 | G | Site Location Plan |
| Document 4600-1100-T-016 | A | Charlotte Avenue Traffic Signals V1 - Full <br> Input Data and Results |
| Document 2021.04.01 | - | Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Brief |
| Document Extract from TA | - | Traffic Collision Data |
| Document Traffic Flow Diagrams - | - | Plans 1-9 |

## APPENDIX 2: Drawing Showing Problem Locations

Problem numbers shown on the attached drawing refer to Problem numbers within the report.
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Updated Junction Drawings
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