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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Jubb have been commissioned, by Gallagher Estates, as Transport Consultant to advise on the transportation and highway issues associated with a proposed residential development situated on land at Wykham Park Farm to the south west of Banbury, east of the A361, Bloxham Road. Jubb are experienced practitioners in this field and have undertaken a wide variety of assessments on behalf of both public and private sector clients. The application site occupies a site of approx. 52 ha and is proposed for a development of up to 1,000 homes.


Figure 1 Site Location
1.2 Vehicular access to the site will be directly off Bloxham Road via a new 4 arm roundabout. Movements internal to the site will be managed to create a safe travel environment for all the road users, particularly facilitating easy access by foot and cycle. The proposed onsite parking provision is planned in compliance with the parking standards outlined in the Local Plan to avoid any potential over-spill on-street parking as a result of under provision.
1.3 In view of the proposed scale of development, a Transport Assessment has been developed to provide a robust transport study, to support the outline application, in compliance with relevant guidance. The structure of the report is set out below::

## Section 2

 Considers the proposal in light of national, regional and local policies;Section 3 Examines the site location in terms of its accessibility by sustainable means of transport;
Section 4 Reviews the baseline condition of the local highway network;
Section $5 \quad$ Predicts traffic growth for future year assessments;
Section 6 Details the development proposal and its associated parking and access arrangement;
Section $7 \quad$ Quantifies and distributes the development trips generated by all means of transport modes
Section 8 Examines the development impact on the operational efficiency of the local highway network
Section 9 Reviews sustainable transport opportunities
Section 10 Presents the conclusion of the Transport Assessment
1.4 The report concludes that the development will have some impact on the existing highway network without any mitigation, but with improvements that are proposed, will in some instances reduce existing traffic delays, provide new enhanced pedestrian facilities, and deliver much needed and identified housing demand in the town.

### 2.0 TRANSPORT PLANNING POLICY

2.1 The policy framework surrounding the proposed development forms an integral part of this Transport Assessment. Within the context of national, regional and local policy, the following planning and transport policies have been reviewed:

- National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- NPPF White Paper: Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon - Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen (DfT, 2011)
- Planning Practice Guidance - Travel Plans, Transport Assessment and Statement in decision-taking (2014)
- Guidance on Transport Assessment (DfT, 2007)
- Manual for Streets
- Local Transport Plan 32011 - 2026
- Cherwell Local Plan (2014)
2.2 Current transport policies at the national, regional and local level are built around the central themes of long-term sustainable development, sustained investment in transport and improved accessibility at all levels. The key objective of the transport strategy for the development proposal is to deliver a sustainable and safe transport regime that supports the provision of new homes providing benefits to the wider community and improving the residential choice in an identified growth area.


## National Planning Policy Framework

2.3 In March 2012, the Coalition Government published the National Planning Policy Framework in the bid to simplify the current planning system and allow the localism agenda to be delivered. The document replaces the Planning Policy Guidance and Planning Policy Statements with a "clear, tightly focused document setting out national priorities and rules".
2.4 The document states that "the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It is central to the economic, environmental and social success of the country and is the core principle underpinning planning".
2.5 NPPF outlines that Local Planning Authorities should plan positively for new development and approves all individual proposals where certain criteria are met, as is felt to be the case with this application.
2.6 In relation to transport developments should be located and designed where practical to:

- Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies;
- Give priority to pedestrian and cyclist movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities;
- Create safe and secure layouts;
- Incorporate facilities of charging plug in vehicles;
- Consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes; and
- Have a Travel Plan


## White Paper: Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon - Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen

2.7 The White Paper: Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon - Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen was published by the Department for Transport in January 2011. It forms part of the overall strategy to tackle carbon emission and sets out the Government's vision for a transport system that is not only an engine for economic growth but also a force to provide a greener, safer and improved quality of life in our communities. The paper informed the development of the latest Local Transport Plans (LTP3 2011-2026) and documented the change in emphasis from the Coalition Government to make decision making both localised and schemes cost effective.
2.8 The White Paper highlights the importance of a sustainable local transport system in the nation's economy and people's day to day life. It points out "effective sustainable local transport is delivered through solutions developed for the places they serve, tailored for the specific needs and behaviour patterns of individual community".

## Planning Practice Guidance - Travel Plans, Transport Assessment and Statement in decision-taking (2014)

2.9 The "Planning Practice Guidance - Travel Plans, Transport Assessment and Statement in decision-taking" was published in March 2014. It sets out the overarching principles on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements in the planning process and emphasises their importance in promoting and delivering sustainable development.
2.10 The document states that Travel Plans, Transport Assessments or Statements are required for all development that will have a material impact on the local and strategic highway network. The development of these documents is an iterative process as each may influence the other and should be:

- commensurate with the size and scope of the proposed development to which they relate and build on existing information wherever possible;
- established at the earliest practicable possible stage of a development proposal;
- tailored to particular local circumstances and developed in close consultation with the Local Planning Authority/ Highway Authority, transport operators, Rail Network Operators, Highways Agency where there may be implications for the strategic road network and other relevant bodies.


## Guidance on Transport Assessment

2.11 "Guidance on Transport Assessment", published by the DfT in May 2007, presents a detailed approach for stakeholders on:

- When a TA is necessary;
- What level of assessment is required; and
- Best practice for compiling such a report.
2.12 The guidance establishes the methods to certify that any proposals conform to up to date national policies and follows the vision of central Government on future transportation. The document emphasises that when preparing a TA the following considerations should be taken into account:
(i) Encouraging sustainable access
- Reducing the need to travel, especially by car;
- Improving sustainable transport choices - making it easier and safer for people to access jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services etc. by public transport, walking and cycling;
- The accessibility of the location;
- Other measures which may assist in influencing travel behaviour, i.e. achieving reductions in car usage by measures such as car sharing.
(ii) Managing the existing network
- Making the best possible use of existing transport infrastructure;
- Managing access to the highway network.
(iii) Mitigating residual impacts
- Through improvements to the local public transport network, and walking and cycling facilities;
- Through minor physical improvements to existing roads;
- Through provision of new or expanded roads.


## Manual for Streets

2.13 "Manual for Streets", launched in March 2007, supersedes "Design Bulletin 32", first published in 1977 and its company guide "Places, Streets and Movement" providing new advice for the design of residential streets in England and Wales. A second iteration "Manual for Streets 2 : Wider Application of Principles" was subsequently published in October 2010.
2.14 The overarching theme of the MfS is to increase the quality of life through good design which creates people-orientated streets. It highlights the importance of interactions between all road users and states that:

## "Streets should not be designed just to accommodate the movement of motor vehicles. It is important that designers place a high priority on meeting the

needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users, so that growth in these modes of travel is encouraged"
2.15 The scheme will be developed in accordance with these principles, but as an outline application much of this level of detail is to follow.

## Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2026

2.16 The Local Transport Plan 32011 to 2026 has been developed in response to the changes in priorities and policies of the Coalition Government with the aim to deliver a transport strategy that of greater efficiency and better use of resources to meet economic, environmental and social challenges.
2.17 The plan seeks to provide an affordable, low carbon, accessible, integrated, efficient and reliable transport network to achieve a more competitive economy and better connected, more active and healthy communities. The nine overarching objectives for the plan are:

- Improve the condition of local roads, footways and cycleways, including resilience to climate change
- Reduce congestion
- Reduce casualties and the dangers associated with travel
- Improve accessibility to work, education and services
- Secure infrastructure and services to support development
- Reduce carbon emissions from transport
- Improve air quality, reduce other environmental impacts and enhance the street environment
- Develop and increase the use of high quality, welcoming public transport; and
- Develop and increase cycling and walking for local journeys, recreation and health


## The Non-Statutory Cherwell District Local Plan (2004)

2.18 The NSCLP was approved in 2011 as interim planning policy for development control purposes until its replacement by the LDF. Relevant transport policies in the NSCLP include:

- TR3 - A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan must accompany development proposals likely to generate significant levels of traffic;
- TR4 - Before proposals for development are permitted the Council will need to be satisfied that all appropriate mitigation measures required to support that development are identified within an implementation programme. Such measures will include highway improvements, traffic management measures, improved public transport and / or facilities, and measures to improve pedestrian and cycle accessibility;
- TR9 - All new development shall provide cycle parking to Oxfordshire County Council standards;
- TR11 - Development likely to attract vehicular traffic will be required to:
(i) Accommodate within the site the necessary highway safety requirements relating to access, turning and servicing;
(ii) Include appropriate measures to minimise the visual impact of vehicles and parking areas;
(iii) Comply with maximum standards for car parking;
(iv) Provide parking for people with disabilities in accordance with the Council's standards;
(v) Provide cycle parking in accordance with the Council's standards.
2.19 The Proposed Development meets the requirements of the saved policies of the NSCLP.

Draft Cherwell Local Plan (2014)
2.20 The Cherwell Local Plan is currently at examination stage. The Examination in Public commenced in June 2014, and was formally suspended to allow Cherwell District Council to make modifications to the Plan to identify further land for housing.
2.21 The relevant policies draft Local Plan policies are set out below:

## Policy SLE 4 - Improved Transport and Connections

The Council will support the implementation of the proposals in 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 and Bicester in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Plan and Movement Studies....

Policy ESD 1 - Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change

Measures will be taken to mitigate the impact of development within the district on climate change. At a strategic level, this will include:

- Distributing growth to the most sustainable locations
- Delivering development that seeks to reduce the need to travel and which encourages sustainable travel options including walking, cycling and public transport to reduce dependence on private cars
2.22 The proposed development, through the provision of footways / cycleways linked to the existing network and the diversion of a local bus service along with a Travel Plan increases the opportunities for future residents to undertake journeys by alternative modes to the private car.
2.23 The recent publication of proposed modifications includes for the allocation of this site under Policy Banbury 17 - South of Salt Way - East for the development of 68 hectares for a new neighbourhood of up to 1,345 dwellings with associated facilities and infrastructure provision is sought for:


## Infrastructure Needs

- Education - land for a primary school.
- Open Space - to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and sports provision
- Community - on-site provision including community and/or local retail facilities;
- Access and movement - Principal access to be created off the Bloxham Road (A361). The layout should also allow for a route for any future east-west link to join White Post Road for local traffic should that may be identified in the movement strategy of the Banbury Master Plan.
- A transport assessment and travel plan will be required to assess the transportation implications of the proposed development and to identify appropriate mitigation measures.
2.24 Furthermore the scheme has to consider the following highway/access related items.
- A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and allows for integration with land that comprises the South West Banbury area and existing communities in Banbury
- A linked network of cycle and footways to provide access into Banbury;
- Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity with existing development
- A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities,
- New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with existing networks, the wider urban area and community facilities with a legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel
- A new footpath bridleway to be provided running from east to west along the southern boundary of the development area, incorporating links with existing footpaths to form a new circular route around the development linking back to Salt Way
- Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops including the provision of a bus route through the site and new bus stops on the site.
- Provision of a transport assessment and Travel Plan including to maximise connectivity with existing development, including linkages with and improvements to existing public transport
- Retention of Public Rights of Way and a layout that affords good access to the countryside


## Summary

2.25 The design philosophy of the proposed development will echo Central and Local Government's vision to promote a sustainable transport regime with particular emphasis on priority measures for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. Movements internal to the site will be designed to create a safe travel environment for all the road users, particularly facilitating easy access by foot and cycle.
2.26 Measures and initiatives in the form of highway enhancements, traffic management and travel planning are also proposed to support the delivery of a sustainable development, promote the usage of Active Travel where appropriate.

### 3.0 SITE ACCESSBILITY AUDIT

3.1 Current National and Local planning policies highlight the importance of integrating land-use, transport and planning decisions to address the needs of the future and present communities to create developments with good access to local infrastructure and supported by quality public transport services. This section examines the level of accessibility by all means of transport to the application site.

## Site Location

3.2 Banbury is an important urban centre and employment area in North Oxfordshire with a population of approx. 40,000. The lies to the west of the M40 (Birmingham-London) motorway and lies some 20 miles from Oxford.
3.3 The application site is situated on the A361 on the south west of the town, under 2 km from the town centre and lies within close proximity to a wide range of compatible and supportive 'day to day' services offering a range of opportunities for people to travel to and from the site other than by car.
3.4 The proximity of the site to local facilities is summarised in Table 3.1 along with the estimated journey time by different means of travel and depicted in Local Movements Plan (Figure 2). It should be noted that:

- All the above distances are approximately measured from the centre of the development site along a suitable walking route to the nearby facilities; and
- The estimated walking and cycling times are approximated using a walking speed of $80 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$ (abstracted from IHT Guidelines for: Providing for Journeys of Foot) and a cycle speed of $240 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{min}$.

| Facility | Location | Distance | Journey Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary School | Queensway Primary School, Brantwood Rise, OX16 9NH <br> John's Roman Catholic Primary School, Avocet Way, Chatsworth Drive, OX16 9YA | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 1.4 \mathrm{mi} \end{aligned}$ | 24 mins <br> 8 mins कо |
| Secondary School | Banbury Academy, Ruskin Road, OX16 9HY Blessed George Napier Catholic School Addison Road, OX16 9DG | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 1.0 \mathrm{mi} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { minutes } \\ & 20 \text { minutes } \end{aligned}$ |
| Independent School | Tudor Hall School, Wykham Park, OX16 9UR | 0.6 mi | 10 mins |
| Doctors/Health | Hightown Surgery, Hightown Gardens, OX16 9DB Horton General Hospital, Oxford Rd, OX16 9AL | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 1.7 \mathrm{mi} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Dentist | Church Street, Bloxham, Banbury, OX15 4ES | 1.5 mi | 22 minutes |
| Leisure/ Recreational | Banbury Library, Marlborough Rd, OX16 5DB <br> Easington Sports \& Social Club, Addison Road, OX16 9DH <br> Woodgreen Leisure Centre, Woodgreen Avenue, OX16 OHS | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 1.4 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 2.0 \mathrm{mi} \end{aligned}$ | 24 mins <br> 10 mins do <br> 14 mins of |
| Supermarket | Sainsbury's, Oxford Road, OX16 9XA <br> Tesco, Lockheed Close OX16 1LX <br> Morrisons, Swan Close Road, OX16 5AQ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 3.0 \mathrm{mi} \\ & 2.1 \mathrm{mi} \end{aligned}$ | 11 mins do 20 mins do 14 mins कо |
| Local Store | Wykham Park Farm, Wykham Lane, OX16 9UP | 0.5 mi | 8 mins |
| Post Office | Easington, 25 Horton View, OX16 9HW | 1.2 mi | 12 mins |
| Nearby Bus Stop | Bloxham Road Sycamore Drive (future internal to site) | 0.6 mi | 7 minutes |
| Railway Station | Banbury | 2.5 mi | $17 \text { minutes }$ |
| Future |  |  |  |
| Convenience Store | On site | Within 0.5 mi | 8 minutes or less |
| Primary School |  |  |  |

Table 1: Local Services and Facilities


| 以疁 | Application Site | H | Hospital |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Primary School | $\square$ | Place or Worship |
| 5 | Secondary School | － | Medical Practice |
| 令 | College | $\bigcirc$ | Library |
| － | Superstore | 7 | Station |
| － | Bus Stops | $\square$ | Recreational Facilities |
| F | Post Office |  |  |

Figure 2 Local Facilities and Services

## Walking

3.5 It has been acknowledged that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace car trips, particularly under 2 kilometres. With a large number of local amenities and services accessible within 1.5 km travel distance, the residents of the development will have a wide range of facilities available within walking distance.
3.6 Dropped kerbs and a pedestrian refuges are provided on Bloxham Road in the vicinity of the Salt Way Cycle route and the Browning Road junction. A Zebra crossing facility with refuge is provided between Springfield Avenue and Queensway and a Pelican crossing is provided in the vicinity of the Harriers View junction. The Salt way provides a high quality strategic walking route right next to the site which can be used by residents walking to key facilities in the area.
3.7 Pedestrian phases are provided within the signalised junctions on Oxford Road at the Hightown Road, Horton View and South Bar Street junctions. Dropped kerbs and a pedestrian refuge are provided within the signalised junction of Oxford Road / Upper Windsor Street. Elsewhere the town has a typical network of urban footpaths as would be expected from a town of its size and age.


Figure 3 Pedestrian Facilities

## Cycling

3.8 The Salt Way Cycle Route, which is traffic free and lies adjacent to the northern boundary of the site forms part of National Cycle Route 5. This route connects with villages such as Chipping Campden to the west, Bodicote to the east and Bloxham to the south. To the east, a local onroad route is promoted along Bankside providing access to the town centre and the railway station.


Figure 4 National Cycle Network

## Travel by Bus

3.9 The nearest bus stops are located on Bloxham Road served by the route 488/489 operated by Stagecoach offering hourly services to Banbury, Monday to Saturday between 06:30-19:05. In addition the B1 service can be found on Timms Road/Sycamore Drive in the residential estate to the north east of the development site.
3.10 The bus services which utilise these stops are summarised below in Table 3.2 along with a brief route description and the associated operating frequency (Appendix B). The table indicates the general level of provision however, some additional service buses are added or routes varied slightly to accommodate peak period, school journey destination demands and enhanced summer services.

| No./ Operator | Service Route | Mon -Fri |  | Sat |  | Sun |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | First /Last | Per <br> day | First /Last | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ | First /Last | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Per } \\ & \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |
| 488 / 489 | Banbury Chipping Norton | $\begin{aligned} & 0630 \\ & 1912 \end{aligned}$ | Hourly | $\begin{aligned} & 0642 \\ & 1912 \end{aligned}$ | Hourly | N/A |  |
| Stagecoach | Return | $\begin{aligned} & 0643 \\ & 1948 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0753 \\ & 1948 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| B1 <br> Stagecoach | Banbury Easington (circular) | $\begin{aligned} & 0701 \\ & 1823 \end{aligned}$ | Half Hourly | $\begin{aligned} & 0711 \\ & 1812 \end{aligned}$ | Half Hourly | $\begin{aligned} & 1046 \\ & 1646 \end{aligned}$ | Two hourly |

Table 3.2 Bus Timetable


Figure 5 Local Bus Routes
3.11 The approximate travel time of bus journey from the development site to the key destinations are summarised below (as timetabled) :

- Town Centre
- Chipping Norton

7-10 minutes
50 minutes
3.12 It is known that significant improvements are planned in conjunction with developer funding from residential development south of Banbury, and such enhancements are discussed later in this report. In addition to these services, there are a number of services which run from Banbury Centre to the following destinations - Stratford-upon-Avon, Shipston-on-Stour, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Brackley and Eydon enabling commuting and leisure journeys to be undertaken by bus. Bus timetables are attached in Appendix B. National Express run coaches from Banbury to Gatwick, Heathrow, Birmingham, Wolverhampton and Oxford.

## Travel by Rail

3.13 Banbury railway station lies on the Chiltern Mainline with frequent services to / from Birmingham Snowhill, Stratford-upon-Avon, Kidderminster, London Marylebone, London Paddington, Oxford, Manchester and Reading.
3.14 The railway station is located within cycling distance at 3.4 km from the site and cycle parking is provided at the station enabling future residents of the site to undertake a multi-modal journey to work and leisure locations.

| Service Route | Station | Mon -Fri |  | Sat |  | Sun |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Freq/No | First <br> /Last | Freq | First <br> /Last | Freq |  |
| Hereford/Worcester <br> - Oxford/London | Charlbury | 0606 <br> 2345 | $\approx$ Hourly <br> 22 | 0705 <br> 2214 | $\approx$ Hourly <br> 14 | 1028 <br> 2225 | $\approx$ Hourly <br> 11 |
|  | Shipton | 0740 <br> 1820 | Irregular <br> 2 | 0759 <br> 2206 | Irregular <br> 3 | - | - |
|  | Charlbury | 0710 <br> 2311 | $\approx$ Hourly <br> 20 | 0641 <br> 2307 | $\approx$ Hourly <br> 14 | 0934 <br> 2312 | Hourly <br> 12 |
|  | Shipton | 1805 <br> 2318 | Irregular <br> 3 | 1446 <br> 2314 | Irregular <br> 4 | - | - |

Table 3.3 Rail Timetable

### 4.0 STUDY HIGHWAY NETWORK

## Travel by Car

4.1 The proposed site is located to the east of Bloxham Road, classified as the A361 which runs between the centre of Banbury 10 miles south to Chipping Norton. Past the site the speed limit is 60 mph , becoming 30 mph as it enters the built up urban area of Banbury. Vehicular access to the proposed development will be directly from Bloxham Road. As a rural inter-urban route this road is typically 7.0 m in width and as it passes the application site.
4.2 The current application to the west of Bloxham Road (Barwood) proposes to move the existing 30 mph limit south, which is incorporated within the planned access junction.


Figure 6: Highway Schematic

## Highway Safety

4.3 In order to fully understand the operation of the existing network and thus assess the potential impact of the proposed development, the safety level and operational efficiency of the adjoining highway has been reviewed.
4.4 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) records were sourced along the surrounding road network to cover a five year period from 01/07/09-31/05/14 (Appendix C). There have been a total of 59 Personal Injury Accidents recorded in the identified study area that included the principal routes of the A361 (Bloxham Road) and A4020 (Oxford Road) and the junctions along these route. Within this study area there was 1 fatal, 12 serious and 46 slight collisions recorded resulting in casualties. A summary of the recorded incidents is tabulated below:


Figure 7 Collision Study Area

| Year | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 (6 months) |  |  | 5 | 5 |
| 2010 |  |  | 8 | 8 |
| 2011 |  | 3 | 11 | 14 |
| 2012 |  | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| 2013 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 19 |
| 2014 (6 months) |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ |

Table 4.1: Accident Summary
4.5 Of the above:

- The sole fatal accident occurred on Bloxham Road at the crossroads with Wykham Lane as an elderly passenger died in a collision with another vehicle when pulling out of the junction.
- Seven collisions involved pedestrians four of which were serious, at various locations throughout the study area, but clustered in the AM peak (3 between 8am-9am) or PM (3 between 17:30-18:30).
- Ten collisions involved cyclists five of which were serious again at various points around within the study area.
- Ten involved motorcyclists, all bar one involving a collision with another vehicle. One of these was recorded as serious. These were mainly concentrated along Oxford Road.
4.6 In looking at the location of the recorded incidents the following are the primary locations as noted in the Collision records. As would be expected the most common location for accidents is at Junctions.

| Primary <br> Road | Secondary Road <br> (Junction with...) | Number |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Bloxham Rd | Wykham Lane | 6 |
| Oxford Rd | Horton View | 6 |
| Oxford Rd | Farmfield Rd <br> (Sainsbury's) | 5 |
| Wykham Lane |  | 4 |
| Bloxham Rd | Springfield Ave | 4 |
| Bloxham Rd | Queensway | 4 |
| Bloxham Rd | Browning Rd | 3 |
| Bloxham Rd | Old Parr Rd |  |
| Oxford Rd | Old Parr | 3 |
| South Bar | Bloxham Rd | 3 |


| Location | Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Priority Junction | 23 |
| Signalised junction | 18 |
| Pedestrian <br> Crossing | 4 |
| Link | 13 |
| Roundabout | 1 |




4.7 Based upon the recorded causations and the categorisations used in Road Casualty Great Britain, the following shows the main causations involved with failing to give way upon entering a junction including shunts when queuing. These appear reflective of the locations and junction types and do not appear to be as a consequence of undue congestion, or sub-standard road geometry and are attributed to driver behaviour/error e.g. failing to judge other person's path or speed. A further 21 other Contributory Factors were also identified.

| Contributory Factor <br> Class | Incidents |
| :---: | :---: |
| Driver/Rider Error or <br> Reaction | 32 |
| Behaviour or <br> Inexperience | 8 |
| Pedestrian Only Fault | 6 |
| Injudicious Action | 5 |
| Road Environment | 3 |
| Vision Affected | 2 |
| Impairment or <br> Distraction | 2 |


| Most Common <br> Contributory Factor | Incidents |
| :---: | :---: |
| Failed to Look Properly | 33 |
| Failed to judge another <br> person's path of speed | 14 |
| Careless/reckless <br> or in a hurry | 11 |
| Poor turn or manoeuvre | 9 |
| Failed to look properly <br> (pedestrian) | 6 |
| Disobeyed Give Way <br> or Stop Sign | 4 |
| Careless/reckless or in a <br> hurry (pedestrian) | 4 |

4.8 Development traffic would have a minor impact upon the amount of accidents due to the fact that most accidents are not directly caused by the volume of traffic but the driver's error or irresponsible driving behaviour. The existing accident pattern will not be negatively affected by the proposed development. Planned improvements could provide positive mitigation in particular improvements at signalised junctions, these are discussed later.

### 5.0 BASELINE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

5.1 In order to examine the current operational efficiency of the adjoining highway, traffic surveys as used in the submitted planning application at OS Parcel 5700 South of Salt Way at Crouch Farm Bloxham Road Banbury Oxfordshire (planning application reference 12/00080/OUT), were used to establish a baseline, position. These surveys were carried out by PCC Traffic Information Consultancy on Thursday 6th October 2011 at the following junctions:

- Bloxham Road / Springfield Avenue
- Bloxham Road / Queensway
- Bloxham Road / Oxford Road
- Oxford Road / Upper Windsor Street
- Oxford Road / Horton View / Hightown Road
- Oxford Road / Farmfield Road
- Oxford Road / Grange Road
5.2 An additional traffic survey of the Bloxham Road / Wykham Lane junction was carried out by Axiom Traffic Limited on Thursday 20th September 2012.
5.3 Based on these surveys traditional peak periods of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 were chosen as appropriate for assessment. TEMPRO database ver6.2 has been employed as an initial tool to estimate the primary growth factors and thus establish a baseline condition for year 2014.
5.4 In accordance with the methodology outlined within section 5.5 of WebTAG guidance note 3.15.2, the results are then fed into the National Transport Model (NTM 2009) to derive an adjusted local growth factor for Banbury Area. The resultant local growth rates are:

| Period | Growth Factor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak | PM Peak |
| Year 2011 to 2014 | 1.0211 | 1.0217 |
| Year 2012 to 2014 | 1.0139 | 1.0143 |

Table 5.1 Base Year Prediction
5.5 Further data has also been collated from DfT atc, and at other locations throughout the town to inform Noise and Air Quality Assessments and these are detailed in the respective Wardell Armstrong reports.

## Future Baseline Traffic Conditions

5.6 A design year of 2027, has been identified as an appropriate timeline for the build out of the site and accords with the principles of DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment.
5.7 In view of this, growth adjustments are applied to base year traffic flow to reflect the rising traffic demand resulting from greater wealth, increased working population, increased employment potential, and increased car ownership amongst other factors.
5.8 The relevant Origin/Destination growth rates for Car Drivers have been derived using TEMPRO Dataset 6.2 for Banbury Urban Area. The factors have subsequently been adjusted in line with DfT Tempro User Guidance to account for National Transport Model (NTM 2009) using Rural Principal Roads to derive a local traffic growth from the 2014 base flow to a Design Year of 2027. These growth factors have been adjusted to take into account the College Fields Scheme which permitted in 2007, and this included within the Tempro baseline, has not yet been constructed, and thus its growth has been allowed for by direct distribution of traffic as per the scheme's associated Transport Assessment (see committed developments below).

| Period | Growth Rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM | PM |
| Year 2014 to 2027 | 1.1608 | 1.1680 |

Table 5.2 Growth Factors
Committed Developments
5.9 In compliance with the DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment, committed developments that will impose a significant impact upon the local highway network are to be considered. Land East of Bloxham Road (12/00080/OUT), a residential development for up to 145 dwellings, to the immediate north of the site, has been included within future baseline scenarios. Furthermore the approved development known as College Fields has been included within the Base 2027 scenario.
5.10 As a further sensitivity test, additional potential developments have been modelled including:

- Land West of Bloxham Road, (as known as Crouch Farm Phase 2 or Barwood), lies to the immediate west of the proposed development site Planning permission is sought for up to 400 dwellings, however the proposed main modifications to the Cherwell Local Plan identify the site for only 150 dwellings.
- Land East of Bloxham Road, south of Salt Way (Ely Diocese). This is land within the proposed allocation to the east of the land which this TA is written in support of. Access for 200 units is taken from White Post Road.
- College Fields Phase 2 - a further 600 homes to the east of Oxford Road using the approved point of access.


### 6.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

6.1 The site is located on the southern boundary of Banbury's existing urban area and lies within the Banbury Easington Ward approximately 2km south of Banbury's main centre. The western site boundary is defined by the alignment of Bloxham Road (A361); the historical Salt Way Cycle Route runs along the northern boundary and open fields abutting the eastern and southern sides of the development.


Figure 8 Proposed Development Framework Plan
6.2 The Development Framework Plan for the site in respect to the form, mix, and quantum remain fluid to respond to market forces and other outside constraints but is envisaged as providing a maximum of 1,000 dwellings for the purposes of this assessment, in a mixture of sizes. In addition the development will provide a local centre providing for the everyday local shopping needs of the residents and a primary school catering for the primary school aged children of families living within the development.
6.3 Land to the east of the site and west of Bodicote, has been identified in the proposed Main Modifications to the Plan, allocated through draft Policy Banbury 17, for some 200 units. As no application has been submitted for the development of this site, this site has not been considered in this assessment.
6.4 Land immediately north of the site, known as Land East of Bloxham Road has been granted planning permission for 145 dwellings (planning application reference 12/00080/OUT and has been included within the future baseline assessment.

## Site Access

6.5 The primary access to the development site will be directly off the A361 Bloxham Road. The proposed access junction has been designed in compliance with DMRB standards and has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to ensure its suitability and adequacy on highway safety and capacity terms. The existing change of speed limit is proposed to be moved south of this junction to reflect the change in character arising from the additional residential development that will front this road.
6.6 A footway/cycleway will be constructed alongside the re-aligned Bloxham Road to the north of the proposed roundabout. This footway will extend to the north providing a safe and convenient route to reach the existing footway provision on the eastern side of Bloxham Road and the existing Salt Way cycleway. A further link into this new route will be provided in the northwestern corner of the site.
6.7 Three shared use cycleway links will be provided allowing access for pedestrian and cyclists onto the Saltway Cycleway and enabling journeys to Easington, Sainsbury Supermarket and further afield on foot and by bicycle. Pedestrian facilities will be provided at the proposed access roundabout enabling crossing of all arms by pedestrians via dropped kerbs.
6.8 Following discussions with Stagecoach, it is known that developer funding has been secured to improve the frequency of the existing service which passes along Bloxham Road. Discussions have identified that this improved service 488/489 will be able to enter the site. The layout of the site will enable the bus to undertake a circulatory route returning to Bloxham Road. This bus service will enable access to the railway station. Additionally, the footpath and cycle links detailed above will serve to provide access to the railway station by walking and cycling.

## Internal Road Layout

6.9 To deliver a sustainable development, the proposed scheme has been sensitively designed to provide a high quality layout and urban environment maximising transport sustainability and integration. The internal road network is to be engineered to accomplish the standards specified in the MfS Guidance with particular emphasis on the creation of safe routes around the site facilitating easy access by foot and cycle.
6.10 The internal road hierarchy will be designed to reflect the volume and type of trips likely on each link and the number of properties accessed and would be subject to a speed limit of 20 mph .

- Within the site, the principal access road would comprise a 5.5 m carriageway with a 2.0 m footway to either side of the carriageway.
- Connected cycle routes throughout.
- Mews courts and shared surfacing could be utilised if desired with varying criteria.
- Internal road layout to accommodate necessary refuse collection and emergency services.


## Parking Provision

6.11 The scale of parking provision is viewed in some quarters as a tool in managing demand generated by vehicles, and subsequently is keenly managed by planning authorities. The proposed framework for on-site parking provision for cars, bicycles and deliveries will be determined in the context of OCC's Parking Standards For New Residential Developments to:

- Prevent any overspill of parking onto the neighbouring highway network; and
- Improve local highway safety by providing adequate visibility, parking and on-site turning facilities.

|  | Maximum Parking Provision if.. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size | Allocated | Additional <br> allowance of <br> unallocated spaces <br> if 2 allocated <br> spaces provided | Additional <br> allowance of <br> unallocated <br> spaces if 1 <br> allocated space <br> provided | Unallocated <br> Spaces |
| 1 bed | 1 | 0 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| 2 bed | 2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.4 |
| 3 bed | 2 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| $4+$ | 2 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 2.4 |

Table 6.1-Parking Standards
6.12 Parking is likely to be provided for each dwelling in a combination of private garages and driveways in a location that is easily accessible from the property.. The use of rear parking courts will be limited in line with OCC Guidance although there maybe cases where a small contained courtyard serving a limited number of dwellings will be appropriate in terms of placemaking. In such instance, they would be well-lit, overlooked and restricted to a maximum of 10 spaces per court.

In conjunction with parking controls and physical design measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of travel, a travel plan will also be introduced onsite to:

- Raise people's awareness of sustainable travel;
- Reduce people's dependency on car usage;
- Discourage the unnecessary car journeys; and
- Encourage modal shift towards walking, cycling and public transport.


### 7.0 DEVELOPMENT TRIP GENERATION \& TESTING

7.1 Standard best practice methods in accordance with DfT Guidance have been adopted to quantify the associated development impact in terms of person trips generated, modal split, trip distribution, and its assignment.
7.2 Vehicle trip rates for all modes of travel have been derived from TRICS 7.1.1 with the database being filtered to include only surveys that are:

- Private housing sites
- $\quad$ Sites within England, Wales or Scotland
- Edge of town and suburban locations;
- $\quad$ Surveys from the most recent 5 years; and
7.3 The resultant weekday daily and peak period trip rates by all means of transport for privately owned houses are summarised below (Appendix D). These have been calculated using the vehicle trip rates, and matching these against the 2011 recorded census data for Travel to Work (Parish - Banbury).

| Modes | Modal Share | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (2011 Census) | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| Car Driver | $62.80 \%$ | 0.124 | 0.406 | 0.332 | 0.151 |
| Car Passenger | $6.58 \%$ | 0.013 | 0.043 | 0.035 | 0.016 |
| Pedestrian | $20.24 \%$ | 0.040 | 0.131 | 0.107 | 0.049 |
| Cycling | $3.67 \%$ | 0.007 | 0.024 | 0.019 | 0.009 |
| Public Transport | $6.71 \%$ | 0.013 | 0.043 | 0.035 | 0.016 |

Table 7.1 Trip Rates by All Means of Transport
7.4 Thus for the proposed scheme of up to 1,000 housing units, the maximum anticipated trip generation by various means of transport is tabulated below:

| Modes | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| Car Driver | 124 | 406 | 332 | 151 |
| Car Passenger | 13 | 43 | 35 | 16 |
| Pedestrian | 40 | 131 | 107 | 49 |
| Cycling | 7 | 24 | 19 | 9 |
| Public Transport | 13 | 43 | 35 | 16 |

Table 7.2 Trips Generation by All Modes of Transport

## Transport Assessment

## Traffic Distribution

7.5 To provide a representation of likely trip distribution, a combination of a zonal method, existing junction turning movements and route choice/availability has been used based on the 2014 baseline traffic flows.
7.6 The primary reason for this hybrid method was to reflect initial concerns by OCC that the flows based solely on turning movements would result in greater trips south out of the town than would occur in reality. Based on a zonal approach 19\% of trips were identified to travel south, with the remaining $81 \%$ travelling north to be subsequently distributed at each junction. This predicted behaviour of vehicle movements reflects the likely points of origin and destination for flows into/out of the development.
7.7 Where more than one route choice is available for example via Springfield Road to points east of the site, a logical route choice model has been employed to distribute trips turning onto Oxford Road, based on the zonal distribution between Hightown Road, Oxford Road (South) and Sainsbury's. This exercise has been undertaken for the AM and PM peak and the resultant distribution is included in Appendix $\mathbf{E}$.

|  | Destination | Proportion | IN | OUT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bloxham Rd South | 19.7\% | 24 | 80 |
|  | Wykham Lane | 4.2\% | 5 | 17 |
|  | Queens Way | 25.7\% | 32 | 135 |
|  | South Bar | 22.3\% | 28 | 86 |
|  | Upper Windsor | 12.8\% | 16 | 49 |
|  | Hightown Road | 1.2\% | 2 | 4 |
|  | Sainsbury | 2.5\% | 3 | 10 |
|  | Hospital | 0.8\% | 1 | 0 |
|  | Oxford Road South | 5.1\% | 6 | 22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 「 } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | Bloxham Rd South | 16.1\% | 53 | 24 |
|  | Wykham Lane | 2.6\% | 9 | 4 |
|  | Queens Way | 24.8\% | 82 | 41 |
|  | South Bar | 29.1\% | 97 | 27 |
|  | Upper Windsor | 14.0\% | 47 | 13 |
|  | Hightown Road | 1.0\% | 3 | 1 |
|  | Sainsbury | 3.1\% | 10 | 5 |
|  | Hospital | 0.1\% | 0 | 1 |
|  | Oxford Road South | 4.8\% | 16 | 7 |

Table 7.3: Vehicle Trip Distribution

### 8.0 TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 In accordance with OCC requirements, junction capacity tests have been carried out at the following key junctions using the industry standard modelling software:

- Bloxham Road / Wykham Lane (PICADY)
- Bloxham Road / Springfield Avenue (PICADY)
- Bloxham Road / Queensway (PICADY)
- Bloxham Road / Oxford Road (network LINSIG Model)
- Oxford Road / Upper Windsor Street (network LINSIG Model)
- Oxford Road / Horton View / Hightown Road (network LINSIG Model)
- Oxford Road / Farmfield Road / Sainsbury’s (network LINSIG Model)
- Oxford Road / Grange Road (network LINSIG Model)


Figure 9 Junctions Assessed
8.2 The identified study network were assessed in the AM and PM peak hours scenarios:

- 2014 Base
- 2027 Base + Committed namely College Fields Phase 1 and Crouch Farm Phase 1 (Horgan) of 145 units
- 2027 Base + Committed+ Development of Wykham Park Farm (1,000 units).
- 2027 Base + Committed + Development + Others (College Fields Phase $2-600$ units, Ely Diocese - 200 units and Barwood - 400 units)


## Existing Highway Network - Junction Assessment

8.3 Bloxham Rd / Springfield Avenue: At this 3 arm priority junction in 2027 with committed development the junction will operate over capacity in the PM peak with an RFC of 1.07 and a queue of 23 vehicles. This situation is compounded with the addition of development traffic. Improvements are proposed at this junction as tested later in this report.

|  |  | Springfield Avenue (B-C) |  | Springfield Avenue(B-A) |  | Bloxham Road South (C-B) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.24 | < 1 | 0.50 | 1 | 0.31 | < 1 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.27 | < 1 | 0.78 | 3 | 0.40 | 1 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed + Dev | 0.34 | <1 | 1.45 | 44 | 0.54 | 1 |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.35 | 1 | 0.72 | 2 | 0.19 | <1 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.49 | 1 | 1.07 | 23 | 0.25 | 1 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed + Dev | 0.69 | 2 | 1.75 | 96 | 0.34 | <1 |

Table 8.1 Bloxham Road / Springfield Avenue -PICADY Junction Assessment
8.4 Bloxham Rd/ Queensway: This junction is shown to operate over its theoretical capacity at the current time, particularly with regard to the right turn movement out of Queensway. This is exacerbated with background growth by 2027 and hence an alternative junction form is proposed as mitigation.

|  |  | Queens Way(B-C) |  | Queensway(B-A) |  | Bloxham Road(C-B) |  | Bloxham Road(A-BC) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.706 | 2 | 0.860 | 5 | 0.253 | 0 | 0.325 | 0 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.883 | 6 | 1.19 | 48 | 0.318 | 0 | 0.392 | 1 |
|  | Base 2027 with Development | 0.953 | 12 | 1.477 | 118 | 0.359 | 1 | 0.488 | 1 |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.576 | 1 | 0.878 | 6 | 0.435 | 1 | 0.277 | 0 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.708 | 2 | 1.232 | 65 | 0.537 | 1 | 0.329 | 0 |
|  | Base 2027 with Development | 0.726 | 3 | 1.749 | 177 | 0.562 | 1 | 0.368 | 0 |

Table 8.2 Bloxham Road / Queensway -PICADY Junction Assessment
8.5 The existing Wykham Lane Crossroads to the south of the development is shown to operate within capacity under all scenarios and hence no changes are proposed at this junction.

|  |  | Wykham Lane E (B-ACD) |  | Bloxham Rd N(A-BCD) |  | Wykham Lane W(D-ABC) |  | Bloxham Rd S (C-ABD) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.38 | 1 | 0.010 | < 1 | 0.12 | <1 | 0.28 | < 1 |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.5 | 1 | 0.01 | $<1$ | 0.17 | $<1$ | 0.340 | 1 |
|  | Base 2027 with Development | 0.55 | 1 | 0.01 | $<1$ | 0.18 | < 1 | 0.36 | 1 |
|  | Base Year 2014 | 0.26 | <1 | 0.01 | < 1 | 0.09 | <1 | 0.18 | $<1$ |
|  | Base 2027 + Committed | 0.36 | 1 | 0.02 | <1 | 0.12 | <1 | 0.22 | <1 |
|  | Base 2027 with Development | 0.41 | 1 | 0.02 | < 1 | 0.13 | <1 | 0.22 | < 1 |

Table 8.3 Bloxham Road / Wykham Lane -PICADY Junction Assessment

- Oxford Road Highway Network
8.6 To accurately reflect the interplay between the linked junctions on Oxford Road, a LINSIG network model has been used to portray existing and proposed traffic conditions. This shows that at present, different junctions and links are operating over capacity at differing times of the day, overall the network is seen to be at capacity based on present arrangements. This situation is exacerbated with the addition of committed development traffic in 2027. The junctions concerned are:
- Junction 1: Bloxham Road / Oxford Road
- Junction 2: Oxford Road / Upper Windsor Street
- Junction 3: Oxford Road / Horton View / Hightown Road
- Junction 4: Oxford Road / Farmfield Road / Sainsbury's
- Junction 5: Oxford Road / Grange Road

| Arm/Link/Scenario |  |  | 2014 Base |  |  |  | 2027 with Committed Dev |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  |  | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue |
|  | 1/1 | South Bar Street Ahead | 43.8\% | 7.9 | 43.0\% | 6.4 | 44.3\% | 6.6 | 52.6\% | 9.1 |
|  | 1/2 | South Bar Street Right | 66.4\% | 9.6 | 84.6\% | 15.5 | 61.6\% | 10.2 | 94.6\% | 22 |
|  | 3/2+3/1 | Bloxham Rd Left \& Right | 84.1\% | 19.9 | 82.4\% | 12.9 | 109.1\% | 69.4 | 91.5\% | 15.6 |
|  | 5/2+5/1 | Oxford Rd Northbound | 73.9\% | 18.4 | 65.3\% | 10.7 | 76.4\% | 19.3 | 86.2\% | 28.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 亏ٍ } \end{aligned}$ | 1/2+1/1 | Oxford Rd Southbound | 64.8\% | 12.3 | 77.4\% | 21.2 | 80.1\% | 21.6 | 85.9\% | 28.5 |
|  | 2/1 | Upper Wndsr St Left | 38.3\% | 6.6 | 28.0\% | 4.8 | 42.8\% | 8.0 | 39.5\% | 6.7 |
|  | 2/2 | Upper Wndsr St Right | 73.5\% | 6.4 | 61.6\% | 7.6 | 73.8\% | 7.2 | 78.9\% | 10.1 |
|  | 4/1+4/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 79.3\% | 26.5 | 77.7\% | 24 | 83.7\% | 29.5 | 84.7\% | 29.5 |
|  | 1/2+1/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 94.0\% | 25.8 | 103.3\% | 55.2 | 117.0\% | 104.6 | 131.2\% | 163.1 |
|  | 3/1 | Horton View | 92.1\% | 14.5 | 81.8\% | 11.6 | 117.4\% | 43.6 | 93.7\% | 16.8 |
|  | 5/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 36.6\% | 2.5 | 42.1\% | 5.2 | 39.2\% | 2.8 | 42.9\% | 5.50 |
|  | 5/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 39.3\% | 1.7 | 39.8\% | 4.1 | 42.8\% | 2.0 | 40.3\% | 4.30 |
|  | 6/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 25.5\% | 2.7 | 32.2\% | 3.9 | 23.0\% | 2.9 | 29.0\% | 3.80 |
|  | 6/2 | Oxford Rd SB | 56.6\% | 10 | 55.5\% | 10 | 57.1\% | 12.1 | 60.7\% | 11.2 |
|  | 7/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 29.4\% | 8.9 | 32.5\% | 8.3 | 31.5\% | 9.9 | 32.5\% | 7.9 |
|  | 7/2+7/3 | Oxford Rd NB | 42.2\% | 10 | 39.3\% | 9.5 | 46.0\% | 10.9 | 40.9\% | 9 |
|  | 8/1 | Hightown Rd | 81.4\% | 10.1 | 95.5\% | 16.5 | 108.9\% | 28.3 | 111.0\% | 37.6 |
|  | 1/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 19.6\% | 3.7 | 48.9\% | 7.0 | 17.6\% | 3.2 | 41.9\% | 7.4 |
|  | 1/2 | Oxford Rd SB | 94.6\% | 32.6 | 121.6\% | 101.1 | 104.6\% | 54.6 | 132.9\% | 141.5 |
|  | 2/2+2/1 | Sainsbury | 84.7\% | 6.1 | 68.1\% | 3.8 | 86.3\% | 6.4 | 68.9\% | 3.9 |
|  | 4/1 | Farmfield Rd | 91.8\% | 10.4 | 122.3\% | 65.4 | 97.8\% | 14.4 | 144.1\% | 117.2 |
|  | 6/1+6/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 84.4\% | 23.7 | 115.9\% | 91.2 | 110.5\% | 84.9 | 142.1\% | 198.2 |
|  | 1/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 53.0\% | 17.1 | 50.6\% | 16.2 | 58.4\% | 20.8 | 58.1\% | 18.8 |
|  | 2/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 36.4\% | 0.3 | 43.7\% | 0.4 | 45.7\% | 0.4 | 53.9\% | 0.6 |
|  | 4/1 | Grange Rd | 41.9\% | 2.6 | 29.0\% | 1.2 | 81.2\% | 6.0 | 69.3\% | 3.2 |
| PRC Over All Lanes |  |  | -5.10\% |  | -35.90\% |  | -30.50\% |  | -60.10\% |  |
| Total Delay Over All Lanes |  |  | 111.37 PCU/Hr |  | 320.37 PCU/Hr |  | 367.77 PCU/Hr |  | 673.65 PCU/Hr |  |
|  |  | Cycle Time | 120 sec |  | 120 sec |  | 120sec |  | 120sec |  |

Table 8.4 Oxford Road Existing Signalised Network
8.7 Following the junction capacity tests, referred to above, enhancements at Queensway and modifications along Oxford Road have been identified to help mitigate the impact of the proposed development. These junctions have been tested for the design year of 2027 (with development).

- Bloxham Rd/ Queensway
8.8 Based on the modelled future traffic conditions a signal controlled scheme has been designed which will mitigate the impact of the development. The proposed junction design is shown in Appendix G. As with all signal controlled junctions assessed in this report, the proposed junction design for the Queensway junction has been modelled using the LINSIG V3 software. The junction has been modelled with a 120 second cycle time with pedestrian facilities called every cycle.

| Arm/Link/Scenario |  | 2027 with Wykham Park Farm Dev |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue |
| $1 / 1+1 / 2$ | Bloxham Road South | 86.8\% | 26.0 | 84.4\% | 22.9 |
| 3/1 | Queensway Left | 72.3\% | 11.5 | 46.6\% | 7.8 |
| 3/2 | Queensway Right | 84.6\% | 14.0 | 84.5\% | 15.5 |
| $5 / 1+5 / 2$ | Bloxham Road North | 71.4\% | 13.7 | 85.4\% | 25.4 |
| PRC Over All Lanes |  | 3.7\% |  | 5.4\% |  |
| Total Delay Over All Lanes |  | 27.07 PCU/Hr |  | 28.97 PCU/Hr |  |
| Cycle Time |  | 120sec |  | 120sec |  |

Table 8.5 Bloxham Road / Queensway Proposed Signalised Junction
8.9 Based on these tests the improved junction is shown to be operating within capacity with the signalised junction offering benefits for wider traffic movements within the town and improvements to pedestrian facilities.

- Bloxham Rd / Springfield Avenue:
8.10 The Crouch Farm planning application proposes a junction improvement at this junction which consists of widening of the Springfield Rd arm of the junction. This improvement would be implemented by the Wykham Park Farm development if it proceeded prior to the Crouch Farm development. The design of this enhanced junction is included within Appendix $\mathbf{G}$. The results of the capacity analysis for this improved junction is set out in table 8.6. The improved junction will have an RFC below 1.07 and a reduced queue length compared with the Base $2027+$ committed situation set out in table 8.1. The proposed junction solution therefore represents betterment at this junction.

|  | Springfield Ave (B-C) |  | Springfield Ave(B-A |  | Bloxham Rd South (C-B) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue |
| AM | 0.28 | $<1$ | 0.7 | 2 | 0.48 | 1 |
| PM | 0.59 | 2 | 0.99 | 14 | 0.29 | $<1$ |

Table 8.6 Bloxham Rd / Springfield Ave 2027 with Development

- Oxford Road Highway Network
8.11 The previous tests presented an assessment based on the current signal arrangements and available road width/geometry. These below assess the network with a number of proposed improvements or mitigation measures as per existing permitted works (Sainsbury and College Fields) or new works suggested in conjunction with the planned development at Wykham Park Farm
8.12 The proposed highway improvements, approved as part of the Sainsbury's and College Field's development, have been agreed with OCC, and are attached in Appendix G. The proposed improvements are identified below:
- Oxford Road/Bloxham Road: Pedestrian splitter island provided to improve crossing and signal stage arrangement within junction controller to improve capacity,
- Oxford Road / Farmfield Road / Horton View / Hightown Road / Upper Windsor Street: Carriageway widening on the Oxford Road Northbound south of Sainsbury's, Hightown Road, and north of Horton View. Carriageway widening on Oxford Road Southbound north and south of Sainsbury's. This provides two northbound and southbound lanes for the majority of Oxford Road within the modelled network area.
8.13 In addition it is proposed as part of the development of Land at Wykham Park Farm, to improve the Bloxham Road / South Bar / Oxford Road junction by providing a longer left turn lane on Bloxham Road and a left turn flare on Oxford Road north into Bloxham Road. This is paired with improved pedestrian facilities and signal staging improvements are detailed in Appendix G.
8.14 The results of these works are documented in the table below based on assessment as a linked network using the LINSIG V3 software. No allowance has been made for enhanced performance that can arise from the use of SCOOT or MOVA which has been shown to provide up to a $10 \%$ improvement in operation. The results therefore are a robust estimation of future performance.
8.15 It can be seen that with proposed enhancements compared to the base situation there is a decrease in overall delay from 674 PCU hours in the PM peak to 314PCU hours. In all scenarios even with the additional development flows, the junctions are shown to be at operating a
comparable standard to present day (2014) but with an improved PRC particularly in the PM Peak improving from a current day PRC of $-35.9 \%$ to $-15.8 \%$, and in the AM peak from $-5.1 \%$ to $-0.9 \%$.
8.16 Following the implementation of the mitigation as identified above, the proposed development can be accommodated on the highway network, with no resultant adverse impact on the network.

| Arm/Link/Scenario |  |  | 2027 With Committed Development |  |  |  | 2027 with Committed Development + Wykham Park Farm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  |  | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ᄃ } \\ & . \overline{0} \\ & \text { O } \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | 1/1 | South Bar Street Ahead | 47.3\% | 8.1 | 53.8\% | 9.9 | 49.1\% | 9.90 | 52.4\% | 9.1 |
|  | 1/2 | South Bar Street Right | 55.9\% | 4.3 | 76.8\% | 15.7 | 63.9\% | 10.80 | 94.3\% | 17.8 |
|  | 3/1+3/2 | Bloxham Rd Left \& Right | $\begin{aligned} & 85.0 \% \\ & 84.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | 20.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 83.7 \% \\ & 65.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 12.6 | 90.8\% | 27.10 | $\begin{aligned} & 99.2 \% \\ & 88.60 \% \end{aligned}$ | 18.2 |
|  | 5/1+5/2 | Oxford Rd Northbound | 83.9\% | 16.3 | 76.5\% | 12.1 | 90.7\% | 25.00 | 93.0\% | 30.2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 亏̄ } \end{aligned}$ | 1/1+1/2 | Oxford Rd Southbound | 87.5\% | 25.1 | 105.7\% | 62.9 | 87.9\% | 24.90 | 102.3\% | 55 |
|  | 2/1 | Upper Wndsr St Left | 40.4\% | 7.6 | 31.1\% | 5.6 | 41.7\% | 8.10 | 32.1\% | 5.9 |
|  | 2/2 | Upper Wndsr St Right | 79.1\% | 7.7 | 75.2\% | 9.7 | 80.6\% | 8.70 | 90.9\% | 14.2 |
|  | 4/1+4/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 86.5\% | 30.8 | 82.1\% | 20.9 | 90.0\% | 39.30 | $\begin{gathered} 95.1 \\ 95.0 \% \end{gathered}$ | 39.9 |
|  | 1/1+1/2 | Oxford Rd SB | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 77.6 \% \\ & 77.6 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 15.9 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 83.2 \% \\ & 78.5 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 35.1 | 73.1\% | 23.10 | $\begin{gathered} 91.8 \\ 85.0 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 33.1 |
|  | 3/1 | Horton View | 82.8\% | 13.6 | 95.4\% | 17.8 | 89.2\% | 16.40 | 83.6\% | 14.7 |
|  | 5/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 53.4\% | 3.0 | 49.5\% | 3.2 | 49.9\% | 3.80 | 67.4\% | 5.7 |
|  | 5/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 47.4\% | 3.3 | 46.6\% | 2.9 | 48.0\% | 3.20 | 50.0\% | 3.6 |
|  | 6/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 53.6\% | 4.1 | 73.4\% | 16.7 | 63.7\% | 16.20 | 80.2\% | 24.1 |
|  | 6/2 | Oxford Rd SB | 56.2\% | 7.0 | 35.1\% | 4.8 | 43.7\% | 3.9* | 36.7\% | 6.7 |
|  | 7/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 46.0\% | 8.3 | 40.6\% | 5.3 | 41.3\% | 10.20 | 56.7\% | 16.8 |
|  | 7/2+7/3 | Oxford Rd NB | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 56.4 \% \\ & 86.9 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.9 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 44.9 \% \\ 102.9 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6.6 | 79.0\% | 12.30 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 87.3 \\ 87.1 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 13.9 |
|  | 8/1 | Hightown Rd | 74.1\% | 10.9 | 107.9\% | 33.2 | 80.1\% | 12.70 | 95.4\% | 20.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { J } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{亏} \end{aligned}$ | 1/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 45.6\% | 7.2 | 92.3\% | 28.7 | 49.8\% | 7.50 | 88.0\% | 38.2 |
|  | 1/2 | Oxford Rd SB | 56.1\% | 5.9 | 55.1\% | 8.2 | 39.2\% | 3.00 | 38.9\% | 7.9 |
|  | 2/1+2/2 | Sainsbury's | 49.8\% | 4.0 | 21.6\% | 2.3 | 42.1\% | 3.90 | 21.4\% | 2.9 |
|  | 4/1 | Farmfield Rd | 88.2\% | 10.9 | 116.4\% | 64.3 | 71.9\% | 9.10 | 104.3\% | 41.7 |
|  | 6/1+6/2 | Oxford Rd NB | 87.5\% | 29.7 | 118.4\% | 123.1 | 76.5\% | 25.80 | $\begin{gathered} 99.3 \\ 100.2 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 51 |
|  | 1/1 | Oxford Rd SB | 58.8\% | 5.8 | 69.3\% | 17.1 | 63.3\% | 14.70 | 75.1\% | 27.9 |
|  | 2/1 | Oxford Rd NB | 78.2\% | 14.3 | 89.4\% | 19.1 | 75.1\% | 12.20 | 101.4\% | 39.2 |
|  | 4/1 | Grange Rd | 45.7\% | 0.4 | 53.9\% | 0.6 | 46.3\% | 0.40 | 54.8\% | 0.6 |
| PRC Over All Lanes |  |  | 2.0\% |  | -31.6\% |  | -0.9\% |  | -15.8\% |  |
| Total Delay Over All Lanes |  |  | 102.77 PCU/Hr |  | $314.94 \mathrm{PCU} / \mathrm{Hr}$ |  | 108.94 PCU/Hr |  | 241.94 PCU/Hr |  |
|  |  | Cycle Time | 120 sec |  | 120sec |  | 240 sec |  | 240 sec |  |

Table 8.7 Oxford Road With Improved Signalised Network

- Do Something Scenario - Access Junction
8.17 To adequately accommodate the anticipated development traffic, it is proposed to create a new roundabout on the A361. The junction has been designed in line with DMRB standards with sufficient capacity to accommodate not only the anticipated development traffic but also the background traffic growth and committed developments in the area. This junction design is included in Appendix A.
8.18 The new 50 m ICD roundabout provides for entry flares on all approaches. The design allows for the retention of access to the existing properties along Bloxham Road, and can satisfactorily accommodate the potential priority access junction to land opposite which is the subject of a planning application for 400 residential units (Barwood) (see Appendix A).

|  | 2027 with Wykham Park Farm Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bloxham Road <br> (North) |  | Site Access (East) |  | Site Access (South) |  | Bloxham Road (South) |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \frac{1}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \frac{1}{x} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 0 0 | $\stackrel{\text { U }}{\substack{4 \\ \sim}}$ | 0 0 0 0 |
| AM Peak | 0.45 | 0.8 | 0.36 | 0.57 | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.67 | 2 |
| PM Peak | 0.59 | 1.43 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.46 | 0.86 |

Table 8.8 Site Access Junction
8.19 Based on the modelling results there is shown to be minimal impact or delay on the main through traffic, the roundabout will provide a natural point to start the urban 30 mph limit reflecting the changing character for this length of Bloxham Road.

## Sensitivity Testing - Other Potential Developments

8.20 A planning application has been submitted for up to 400 homes on land known to the west of Bloxham Road commonly referred to as Crouch Farm or Barwood, and designated within the Local Plan Modifications as land south of Salt Way, West. Although the allocation proposes 150 units against the submission seeking 400, it is the latter that has first been tested in line with associated Transport Assessment's study network. There are also further potential development sites within Banbury which will generate further traffic including:

- Land East of Bloxham Road, south of Salt Way (Ely Diocese). This is land within the proposed allocation to the east of the land which this TA is written in support of. Access for 200 units is taken from White Post Road.
- College Fields Phase 2 - a further 600 homes to the east of Oxford Road using the approved point of access
8.21 In order to assess the cumulative impacts of the proposed development of Wykham Park Farm and the three other identified sites, sensitivity tests using the combined traffic flows have been undertaken. The Crouch Farm proposed access junction is shown to have significant reserve capacity within the Crouch Farm Transport Assessment and has therefore not been evaluated.
- Bloxham Rd / Springfield Avenue:
8.22 As mentioned in paragraph 8.10 The Crouch Farm planning application proposes a junction improvement at this junction which consists of widening of the Springfield Rd arm of the junction. This improvement would be implemented by the Crouch Farm or Wykham Park Farm development, whichever comes first. The results of the capacity analysis for this improved junction is set out in Table 8.9 below. This shows that the junction will operate at the same level of capacity as the base 2027 + committed situation as set out in table 8.1if the level of development at Wykham Park Farm and Crouch Farm was as per the proposed local plan allocation i.e. 150 dwellings at Crouch Farm as opposed to 400 dwellings.
8.23 However if all Crouch Farm were to be developed at 400 dwellings these benefits will be eroded. If development is capped as the Local Plan proposes the capacity situation at this junction will will be akin to that currently predicted for 2027.

|  |  | 2027 with Local <br> Plan Allocations <br> (1000 at WPF and <br> 150 dwellings at <br> Crouch Farm) |  | 2027 with all <br> development (1000 <br> at WPF and 400 at <br> Crouch Farm). |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM | AM | PM |  |
| Springfield <br> Ave (B-C) | RFC | 0.30 | 0.62 | 0.32 | 0.68 |
|  | Queue | $<1$ | 1.6 | 1 | 2 |
|  | RFC | 0.85 | 1.09 | 0.95 | 1.2 |
|  | Queue | 5 | 26 | 9 | 43 |
| Bloxham Rd <br> South (C-B) | RFC | 0.50 | 0.3 | 0.53 | 0.32 |
|  | Queue | $<1$ | $<1$ | 1 | 1 |

Table 8.9 Bloxham Rd / Springfield Ave -PICADY Junction Assessment (Sensitivity Test)

- Wykham Lane Crossroads:
8.24 This junction to the south of the development is shown to operate within capacity including for the wider development scenarios and hence no changes are proposed at this junction.

|  | Wykham Lane E <br> (B-ACD) |  | Bloxham Rd N <br> (A-BCD) |  | Wykham Lane <br> W(D-ABC) |  | Bloxham Rd S <br> (C-ABD) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue | RFC | Queue |
|  | 0.58 | 1 | 0.01 | $<1$ | 0.18 | $<1$ | 0.37 | 1 |
|  | 0.45 | 1 | 0.02 | $<1$ | 0.13 | $<1$ | 0.22 | $<1$ |

Table 8.10 Bloxham Road / Wykham Lane -PICADY Junction Assessment

## - Bloxham Rd/ Queensway

8.25 Based on the modelled results as set out in table 8.11 this junction once signalised is shown to have capacity for the proposed Wykham Park Farm development and the Crouch Farm development if that scheme is developed as per the draft allocation of 150 dwellings. Once the Crouch Farm scheme is increased to 400 dwellings the junction operates marginally outside of standard accepted operating parameters. However as with the signalised tests undertaken for other junctions in the town, these results are a worst case assessment as they do not include the benefits and greater capacity is afforded by the use of MOVA.

| Arm/Link/Scenario |  | 2027 with Local Plan Allocations (1000 at WPF and 150 dwellings at Crouch Farm) |  |  |  | 2027 with all development (1000 at WPF and 400 at Crouch Farm). |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deg of } \\ \text { Sat } \end{gathered}$ | Queue |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 / 1+ \\ & 1 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | Bloxham Road South | 89.9\% | 30.3 | 88.0\% | 25.9 | 92.8\% | 35.6 | 92.4\% | 30.5 |
| 3/1 | Queensway Left | 72.3\% | 11.3 | 45.6\% | 7.7 | 74.6\% | 11.7 | 44.6\% | 7.6 |
| 3/2 | Queensway Right | 87.4\% | 15.0 | 89.4\% | 17.6 | 92.9\% | 17.3 | 90.5\% | 18.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 / 1+ \\ & 5 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | Bloxham Road North | 83.1\% | 17.9 | 87.3\% | 27.1 | 82.5\% | 17.9 | 91.8\% | 32.0 |
| PRC Over All Lanes |  | 0.1\% |  | 0.6\% |  | -3.2\% |  | -2.60\% |  |
| Total Delay Over All Lanes |  | 32.01 PCU/Hr |  | 32.57 PCU/Hr |  | 37.57 PCU/Hr |  | $38.11 \mathrm{PCU} / \mathrm{Hr}$ |  |
|  | Cycle Time | 120sec |  | 120sec |  | 120sec |  | 120 sec |  |

Table 8.11 Bloxham Rd / Queensway Proposed Signalised Junction (Sensitivity Tests)

- Oxford Road Highway Network
8.26 The junctions shown to be under greatest stress are those along Oxford Road. With a significant quantum of development proposed close to this corridor, the assessment of these junctions indicate that based upon improvements the future conditions would be marginally worse in the than the present day (2014) but with an improved PRC in the PM Peak improving from a current day PRC of $-35.9 \%$ to $-24.1 \%$, but worse in the AM peak decreasing from $-5.1 \%$ to $-18.8 \%$.

| Arm／Link／Scenario |  |  | 2027 Base With Committed Dev （Table 8．3） |  |  |  | 2027 With All New Developments |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  |  | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | Queue | Deg of Sat | $\begin{gathered} \text { Queu } \\ e \end{gathered}$ | Deg of Sat | Queue |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{亏} \end{aligned}$ | 1／1 | South Bar Street Ahead | 44．3\％ | 6.6 | 52．6\％ | 9.1 | 49．5\％ | 9.5 | 53．2\％ | 9.4 |
|  | 1／2 | South Bar Street Right | 61．6\％ | 10.2 | 94．6\％ | 22 | 69．0\％ | 13.2 | 97．3\％ | 30.4 |
|  | $3 / 2+3 / 1$ | Bloxham Rd Left \＆Right | 109．1\％ | 69.4 | 91．5\％ | 15.6 | 94．6\％ | 33.2 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 111.7 \% \\ 99.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | 38.4 |
|  | 5／2＋5／1 | Oxford Rd Northbound | 76．4\％ | 19.3 | 86．2\％ | 28.6 | 93．5\％ | 34.1 | 86．5\％ | 16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { 을 } \\ & \text { 亏ٍ } \end{aligned}$ | 1／2＋1／1 | Oxford Rd Southbound | 80．1\％ | 21.6 | 85．9\％ | 28.5 | 103．3\％ | 56.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 110.2 \% \\ & 110.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | 97 |
|  | 2／1 | Upper Wndsr St Left | 42．8\％ | 8.0 | 39．5\％ | 6.7 | 36．5\％ | 7.4 | 32．0\％ | 6.8 |
|  | 2／2 | Upper Wndsr St Right | 73．8\％ | 7.2 | 78．9\％ | 10.1 | 78．8\％ | 9.8 | 90．4\％ | 14.5 |
|  | 4／1＋4／2 | Oxford Rd NB | 83．7\％ | 29.5 | 84．7\％ | 29.5 | 82．6\％ | 26.3 | 89．7\％ | 41.4 |
|  | 1／2＋1／1 | Oxford Rd SB | 117．0\％ | 104.6 | 131．2\％ | 163.1 | 86．5\％ | 34.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 81.7 \% \\ & 84.2 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 29.9 |
|  | 3／1 | Horton View | 117．4\％ | 43.6 | 93．7\％ | 16.8 | 107．0\％ | 36.2 | 95．0\％ | 18.4 |
|  | 5／1 | Oxford Rd NB | 39．2\％ | 2.8 | 42．9\％ | 5.50 | 82．7\％ | 9.4 | 57．5\％ | 5.8 |
|  | 5／2 | Oxford Rd NB | 42．8\％ | 2.0 | 40．3\％ | 4.30 | 14．7\％ | 5.7 | 53．7\％ | 4.4 |
|  | 6／1 | Oxford Rd SB | 23．0\％ | 2.9 | 29．0\％ | 3.80 | 83．8\％ | 32.7 | 82．0\％ | 29.8 |
|  | 6／2 | Oxford Rd SB | 57．1\％ | 12.1 | 60．7\％ | 11.2 | 18．1\％ | 7.8 | 27．8\％ | 2 |
|  | 7／1 | Oxford Rd NB | 31．5\％ | 9.9 | 32．5\％ | 7.9 | 80．5\％ | 35.9 | 47．0\％ | 6.9 |
|  | 7／2＋7／3 | Oxford Rd NB | 46．0\％ | 10.9 | 40．9\％ | 9 | 105．6\％ | 18.1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 98.0 \% \\ & 98.4 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 18.5 |
|  | 8／1 | Hightown Rd | 108．9\％ | 28.3 | 111．0\％ | 37.6 | 94．6\％ | 20.1 | 107．4\％ | 36.2 |
|  | 1／1 | Oxford Rd SB | 17．6\％ | 3.2 | 41．9\％ | 7.4 | 59．5\％ | 10.4 | 85．8\％ | 26.7 |
|  | 1／2 | Oxford Rd SB | 104．6\％ | 54.6 | 132．9\％ | 141.5 | 27．9\％ | 3.5 | 35．2\％ | 4.2 |
|  | 2／2＋2／1 | Sainsbury | 86．3\％ | 6.4 | 68．9\％ | 3.9 | 46．1\％ | 4.2 | 22．8\％ | 2.6 |
|  | 4／1 | Farmfield Rd | 97．8\％ | 14.4 | 144．1\％ | 117.2 | 82．4\％ | 10.9 | 111．7\％ | 67.5 |
|  | 6／1＋6／2 | Oxford Rd NB | 110．5\％ | 84.9 | 142．1\％ | 198.2 | 79．1\％ | 27.3 | 100．8\％ | 60.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { م } \\ & \text { Cㅡㅡㅁ } \\ & \text { 亿 } \end{aligned}$ | 1／1 | Oxford Rd SB | 58．4\％ | 20.8 | 58．1\％ | 18.8 | 67．7\％ | 22.6 | 75．5\％ | 23.8 |
|  | 2／1 | Oxford Rd NB | 45．7\％ | 0.4 | 53．9\％ | 0.6 | 71．3\％ | 8.8 | 100．3\％ | 35.3 |
|  | 4／1 | Grange Rd | 81．2\％ | 6.0 | 69．3\％ | 3.2 | 49．1\％ | 0.5 | 56．7\％ | 0.7 |
| PRC Over All Lanes |  |  | －30．50\％ |  | －60．10\％ |  | －18．8\％ |  | －24．1\％ |  |
| Total Delay Over All Lanes |  |  | 367．77 PCU／Hr |  | 673．65 PCU／Hr |  | 192．98 PCU／Hr |  | $330.08 \mathrm{PCU} / \mathrm{Hr}$ |  |
|  |  | Cycle Time | 120sec |  | 120sec |  | 240 sec |  | 240sec |  |

## Table 8．12 Oxford Road Existing vs Future Improved Signalised Network

### 9.0 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

9.1 The proposed development will promote measures that maximise the accessibility of the site to sustainable modes. The primary aim is to remove barriers and facilitate access for alternative means of travel.
9.2 To deliver a sustainable development, the proposed scheme will be sensitively designed to provide a high quality layout and environment maximising transport sustainability and integration. Particular emphasis will be focused on the creation of safe routes within the site facilitating ease of access by foot and cycle to both internal and external destinations.
9.3 The application site is situated in close proximity to the surrounding community, employment, healthcare and educational facilities. It can take advantage of the existing footpaths, cycleways and public transport services that provide access to Banbury town and its Railway Station.
9.4 In addition to the main vehicular access, two pedestrian and cyclist only routes are also identified to optimise the usage of walking and cycling and improve the permeability of the development site enhancing the linkages to the neighbouring services and facilities.
9.5 The design of the internal road system will be in line with "Manual for Streets" standards to address the priority of non-car movements by:

- Creating a "home zone" environment that is safe for all road users;
- Incorporating dropped kerbs and tactile paving to assist the passage of push chairs and people with mobility problems; and
- Consideration of slopes and gradients to ensure routes comply with standards.
9.6 It is the Government's aim to promote smarter travel choices as a strategic management tool in achieving traffic reduction and accelerating the development of more sustainable travel trends within both the strategic and local highway networks.
9.7 To echo Central Government and Local Authority aspirations and thus deliver a sustainable development that promotes a balanced and vigorous local community, and contributes to the Government's shared priorities of reducing congestion, the developer has committed to the implementation of a Residents Travel Plan. The document has been developed in accordance with Good Practice Guidance and submitted as a separate document from the TA in support of the planning application to:
- encourage the participation in sustainable modes of travel prioritising walking, cycling and public transport for any development associated journeys; and thus
- reduce the reliance on the private motor vehicle and contribute to national targets for $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ reduction; and
- Promote a healthier lifestyle for staff, visitors and the wider community.
10.1 This Transport Assessment has assessed the accessibility of this site and carried out a detailed study to establish the likely impact of the development and to identify appropriate mitigation measures where required.
10.2 The report concludes that:
- The proposed development is consistent with the national, regional and local planning and transport policies;
- $\quad$ The application site is well located to provide the identified growth within Banbury;
- Its connectivity to the walking/cycling routes and proximity to the public transport network, offers realistic alternative travel mode choices to the private car for day to day destinations.
- The existing highway network is shown to require investment to accommodate existing growth, and that the development can help bring forward further improvements to the network to achieve this.
- $\quad$ The Design of the proposed development will facilitate:
- An adequate and safe parking environment;
- Access junction suitable for all road users; and
- Highly permeable and appealing walking and cycling environment.
- The introduction of the Development Travel Plan will assist in
- Mitigating the development Impact;
- Releasing capacity on the highway network by reducing car trips;
- Strengthening the coherence of the whole community; and
- Delivering a sustainable development in the area.
10.3 It is therefore considered that there are no transport or highways grounds for the refusal of this development.


## Appendix A <br> Development Layout \＆ <br> Proposed Access Junction



Appendix B
Public Transport Information

| MONDAYS TO FRIDAYS Except |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banbury Bridge Street, stand 2 | 0650 | 0720 | 0750 | 0825 | 0900 | 0930 | 1000 | 1035 | 1105 | 1135 | 1210 | 1245 |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 0657 | 0727 | 0757 | 0833 | 0908 | 0938 | 1008 | 1043 | 1113 | 1144 | 1219 | 1254 |
| Sycamore Drive arr | 0701 | 0731 | 0802 | 0838 | 0912 | 0942 | 1012 | 1047 | 1117 | 1148 | 1223 | 1258 |
| Sycamore Drive dep | 0701 | 0731 | 0805 | 0839 | 0913 | 0943 | 1013 | 1048 | 1118 | 1149 | 1224 | 1259 |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 0706 | 0736 | 0810 | 0845 | 0918 | 0948 | 1018 | 1053 | 1123 | 1155 | 1230 | 1305 |
| Banbury, Bridge Street, Stop 5 | 0715 | 0745 | 0820 | 0855 | 0927 | 0957 | 1027 | 1102 | 1132 | 1204 | 1239 | 1314 |
| Banbury Bridge Street, stand 2 | 1315 | 1350 | 1425 | 1455 | 1530 | 1605 | 1640 | 1710 | 1740 | 1810 |  |  |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 1324 | 1358 | 1433 | 1504 | 1539 | 1614 | 1648 | 1718 | 1747 | 1817 |  |  |
| Sycamore Drive arr | 1328 | 1402 | 1437 | 1508 | 1543 | 1618 | 1653 | 1723 | 1751 | 1821 |  |  |
| Sycamore Drive dep | 1329 | 1403 | 1438 | 1509 | 1544 | 1619 | 1653 | 1723 | 1753 | 1823 |  |  |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 1335 | 1408 | 1443 | 1515 | 1550 | 1625 | 1659 | 1729 | 1758 | 1828 |  |  |
| Banbury, Bridge Street, Stop 5 | 1344 | 1417 | 1452 | 1524 | 1559 | 1634 | 1708 | 1738 | 1806 | 1836 |  |  |


| SATURDAYS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banbury Bridge Street, stand 2 | 0700 | 0730 | then | 00 | 30 |  | 1700 | 1730 | 1800 |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 0707 | 0737 | every | 07 | 37 |  | 1707 | 1737 | 1807 |
| Sycamore Drive arr | 0711 | 0741 | 30 | 11 | 41 | until | 1711 | 1741 | 1811 |
| Sycamore Drive dep | 0712 | 0742 | minutes | 12 | 42 |  | 1712 | 1742 | 1812 |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 0717 | 0747 | at | 17 | 47 |  | 1717 | 1747 | 1817 |
| Banbury, Bridge Street, Stop 5 | 0725 | 0755 |  | 25 | 55 |  | 1725 | 1755 | 1825 |

SUNDAY AND BANK HOLIDAYS (Except Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Day)

| Banbury Bridge Street, stand 2 | 1035 | 1235 | 1435 | 1635 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 1042 | 1242 | 1442 | 1642 |
| Sycamore Drive arr | 1046 | 1246 | 1446 | 1646 |
| Sycamore Drive dep | 1047 | 1247 | 1447 | 1647 |
| Calthorpe, Horton Hospital | 1052 | 1252 | 1452 | 1652 |
| Banbury, Bridge Street, Stop 5 | 1058 | 1258 | 1458 | 1658 |

This timetable is valid at the time of download from our website.
However this may be affected by alteration at short notice. To read service updates or to re-check your journey go to www.stagecoachbus.com.

```Banbury - Chipping Norton

Operated by: MRS
Stagecoach in Oxfordshire
Timetable valid from 2 Jun 2013 until further notice
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Service: Operator: & \begin{tabular}{l}
489 \\
MRS
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
489 \\
\text { MRS }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
489 \\
\text { MRS }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
488 \\
MRS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
488 \\
MRS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
488 \\
MRS
\end{tabular} & \[
488
\]
MRS & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
488
\] \\
MRS
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
488
\] \\
MRS
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station (Bay 7) & Depart: & 06:25 & 06:50 & 07:55 & 08:30 & 09:05 & 10:05 & 11:05 & 12:05 & 13:05 \\
\hline Poets Corner, Queensway & & 06:30 & 06:57 & 08:02 & 08:37 & 09:12 & 10:12 & 11:12 & 12:12 & 13:12 \\
\hline Bloxham, Church & & 06:35 & 07:02 & 08:09 & & 09:19 & 10:19 & 11:19 & 12:19 & \\
\hline Bloxham, Courtington Lane & & & & & & & & & & 13:19 \\
\hline Milcombe, New Road Stores & & & & & & & & & & 13:25 \\
\hline South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH & & 06:38 & 07:06 & 08:13 & & & & & & 13:28 \\
\hline Milcombe, New Road Stores & & & & & & 09:25 & 10:25 & 11:25 & 12:25 & \\
\hline Milcombe, Village Hall & & & & & & 09:26 & 10:26 & 11:26 & 12:26 & \\
\hline Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH & & & & & & & & & & 13:35 \\
\hline Hook Norton, Church & & & & & & 09:33 & 10:33 & 11:33 & 12:33 & 13:42 \\
\hline Great Rollright, The Green & & & & & & 09:42 & 10:42 & 11:42 & 12:42 & 13:51 \\
\hline Over Norton, Old Post Office & & & & & & 09:46 & 10:46 & 11:46 & 12:46 & 13:55 \\
\hline Chipping Norton, West Street (Stop B) & & 06:50 & 07:18 & 08:30 & & 09:51 & 10:51 & 11:51 & 12:51 & 14:00 \\
\hline Chipping Norton, Cornish Road & Arrive: & 06:55 & 07:23 & & & 09:56 & 10:56 & 11:56 & 12:56 & 14:05 \\
\hline Chipping Norton, Chipping Norton School & Arrive: & & & 08:35 & & & & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Courtington Lane & & & & & 08:44 & & & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Church & Arrive: & & & & 08:47 & & & & & \\
\hline & Service: & 488 & 488 & 488 & 488 & 488 & 488 & & & \\
\hline & Operator: & MRS & MRS & MRS & MRS & MRS & MRS & & & \\
\hline Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station (Bay 7) & Depart: & 14:05 & 15:10 & 16:10 & 17:10 & 18:05 & 19:05 & & & \\
\hline Poets Corner, Queensway & & 14:12 & 15:17 & 16:17 & 17:17 & 18:12 & 19:12 & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Church & & 14:19 & 15:24 & 16:24 & 17:24 & & 19:19 & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Courtington Lane & & & & & & 18:19 & & & & \\
\hline Milcombe, New Road Stores & & & & & & 18:25 & 19:25 & & & \\
\hline South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH & & & & & & 18:28 & & & & \\
\hline Milcombe, New Road Stores & & 14:25 & 15:30 & 16:30 & 17:30 & & & & & \\
\hline Milcombe, Village Hall & & 14:26 & 15:31 & 16:31 & 17:31 & & & & & \\
\hline Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH & & & & & & 18:35 & & & & \\
\hline Hook Norton, Church & & 14:33 & 15:38 & 16:38 & 17:38 & 18:42 & & & & \\
\hline Great Rollright, The Green & & 14:42 & 15:47 & 16:47 & 17:47 & 18:51 & & & & \\
\hline Over Norton, Old Post Office & & 14:46 & 15:51 & 16:51 & 17:51 & 18:55 & & & & \\
\hline Chipping Norton, West Street (Stop B) & & 14:51 & 15:56 & 16:56 & 17:56 & 19:00 & & & & \\
\hline Chipping Norton, Cornish Road & Arrive: & 14:56 & 16:01 & 17:01 & 18:01 & 19:05 & & & & \\
\hline Chipping Norton, Chipping Norton School & Arrive: & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Courtington Lane & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Bloxham, Church & Arrive: & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Created by Stagecoach Group Plc on 30/07/2014 01:27. This timetable is valid at the time of download from our website. However, this may be affected by alteration at short notice. To read service updates or to re-check your journey go to www.stagecoachbus.com.
```

Chipping Norton - Banbury
Chipping Norton - Banbury

Operated by: MRS
Stagecoach in Oxfordshire
Timetable valid from 2 Jun 2013 until further notice

|  | Service: Operator: | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS | $488$ <br> MRS | 488 <br> MRS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chipping Norton, Cornish Road | Depart: |  | 07:00 | 07:25 |  | 09:00 | 10:00 | 11:00 | 12:00 | 13:00 |
| Chipping Norton, Chipping Norton School | Depart: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, Town Hall |  |  | 07:05 | 07:30 |  | 09:05 | 10:05 | 11:05 | 12:05 | 13:05 |
| Over Norton, Old Post Office |  |  | 07:10 | 07:35 |  | 09:10 | 10:10 | 11:10 | 12:10 | 13:10 |
| Great Rollright, The Green |  |  | 07:14 | 07:39 |  | 09:14 | 10:14 | 11:14 | 12:14 | 13:14 |
| Hook Norton, Church |  |  | 07:23 | 07:48 |  | 09:23 | 10:23 | 11:23 | 12:23 | 13:23 |
| Milcombe, Village Hall |  |  | 07:30 |  |  | 09:30 |  | 11:30 | 12:30 | 13:30 |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  | 06:31 | 07:31 |  |  | 09:31 |  | 11:31 | 12:31 | 13:31 |
| Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH |  |  |  | 07:55 |  |  | 10:30 |  |  |  |
| South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH |  |  |  | 08:03 |  |  | 10:38 |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  |  |  | 08:06 |  |  | 10:41 |  |  |  |
| Bloxham, Church |  | 06:37 | 07:37 | 08:12 | 08:47 | 09:37 |  | 11:37 | 12:37 | 13:37 |
| Bloxham, Courtington Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10:47 |  |  |  |
| Poets Corner, Queensway |  | 06:43 | 07:43 | 08:18 | 08:53 | 09:43 | 10:53 | 11:43 | 12:43 | 13:43 |
| Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station | Arrive: | 06:50 | 07:50 | 08:25 | 09:00 | 09:50 | 11:00 | 11:50 | 12:50 | 13:50 |
|  | Service: | 488 | 489 | 488 | 488 | 488 | 488 |  |  |  |
|  | Operator: | MRS | MRS | MRS | MRS | MRS | MRS |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, Cornish Road | Depart: | 14:05 |  | 16:05 | 17:05 | 18:05 | 19:05 |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, Chipping Norton School | Depart: |  | 15:15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, Town Hall |  | 14:10 | 15:20 | 16:10 | 17:10 | 18:10 | 19:10 |  |  |  |
| Over Norton, Old Post Office |  | 14:15 |  | 16:15 | 17:15 | 18:15 | 19:15 |  |  |  |
| Great Rollright, The Green |  | 14:19 |  | 16:19 | 17:19 | 18:19 | 19:19 |  |  |  |
| Hook Norton, Church |  | 14:28 |  | 16:28 | 17:28 | 18:28 | 19:28 |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, Village Hall |  | 14:35 |  | 16:35 | 17:35 | 18:35 | 19:35 |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  | 14:36 |  | 16:36 | 17:36 | 18:36 | 19:36 |  |  |  |
| Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH |  |  | 15:37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bloxham, Church |  | 14:42 | 15:42 | 16:42 | 17:42 | 18:42 | 19:42 |  |  |  |
| Bloxham, Courtington Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poets Corner, Queensway |  | 14:48 | 15:48 | 16:48 | 17:48 | 18:48 | 19:48 |  |  |  |
| Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station | Arrive: | 14:55 | 15:55 | 16:55 | 17:55 | 18:55 | 19:55 |  |  |  |

Created by Stagecoach Group Plc on 30/07/2014 01:27. This timetable is valid at the time of download from our website. However, this may be affected by alteration at short notice. To read service updates or to re-check your journey go to www.stagecoachbus.com.

Services
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Banbury - Chipping Norton } & 489 \\ \text { Banbury - Chipping Norton } & 488\end{array}$
Banbury - Chipping Norton
Saturdays (not Bank Holidays)

Operated by: MRS
Stagecoach in Oxfordshire
Timetable valid from 2 Jun 2013 until further notice

|  | Service: Operator: | $\begin{gathered} 489 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 488 \\ \text { MRS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station (Bay 7) | Depart: | 06:35 | 08:05 | 09:05 | 10:05 | 11:05 | 12:05 | 13:05 | 14:05 | 15:10 |
| Poets Corner, Queensway |  | 06:42 | 08:12 | 09:12 | 10:12 | 11:12 | 12:12 | 13:12 | 14:12 | 15:17 |
| Bloxham, Church |  | 06:47 | 08:19 | 09:19 | 10:19 | 11:19 | 12:19 |  | 14:19 | 15:24 |
| Bloxham, Courtington Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13:19 |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13:25 |  |  |
| South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH |  | 06:51 |  |  |  |  |  | 13:28 |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  |  | 08:25 | 09:25 | 10:25 | 11:25 | 12:25 |  | 14:25 | 15:30 |
| Milcombe, Village Hall |  |  | 08:26 | 09:26 | 10:26 | 11:26 | 12:26 |  | 14:26 | 15:31 |
| Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13:35 |  |  |
| Hook Norton, Church |  |  | 08:33 | 09:33 | 10:33 | 11:33 | 12:33 | 13:42 | 14:33 | 15:38 |
| Great Rollright, The Green |  |  | 08:42 | 09:42 | 10:42 | 11:42 | 12:42 | 13:51 | 14:42 | 15:47 |
| Over Norton, Old Post Office |  |  | 08:46 | 09:46 | 10:46 | 11:46 | 12:46 | 13:55 | 14:46 | 15:51 |
| Chipping Norton, West Street (Stop B) |  | 07:03 | 08:51 | 09:51 | 10:51 | 11:51 | 12:51 | 14:00 | 14:51 | 15:56 |
| Chipping Norton, Cornish Road | Arrive: | 07:08 | 08:56 | 09:56 | 10:56 | 11:56 | 12:56 | 14:05 | 14:56 | 16:01 |
|  | Service: | 488 | 488 | 488 | 488 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Operator: | MRS | MRS | MRS | MRS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Banbury Town Centre, Bus Station (Bay 7) | Depart: | 16:10 | 17:10 | 18:05 | 19:05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poets Corner, Queensway |  | 16:17 | 17:17 | 18:12 | 19:12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bloxham, Church |  | 16:24 | 17:24 |  | 19:19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bloxham, Courtington Lane |  |  |  | 18:19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  |  |  | 18:25 | 19:25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Newington, The Duck on the Pond PH |  |  |  | 18:28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, New Road Stores |  | 16:30 | 17:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Milcombe, Village Hall |  | 16:31 | 17:31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wigginton, The White Swan Inn PH |  |  |  | 18:35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hook Norton, Church |  | 16:38 | 17:38 | 18:42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Great Rollright, The Green |  | 16:47 | 17:47 | 18:51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Over Norton, Old Post Office |  | 16:51 | 17:51 | 18:55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, West Street (Stop B) |  | 16:56 | 17:56 | 19:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chipping Norton, Cornish Road | Arrive: | 17:01 | 18:01 | 19:05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Created by Stagecoach Group Plc on 30/07/2014 01:27. This timetable is valid at the time of download from our website. However, this may be affected by alteration at short notice. To read service updates or to re-check your journey go to www.stagecoachbus.com.

## Chipping Norton - Banbury

Saturdays (not Bank Holidays)

Operated by: MRS
Stagecoach in Oxfordshire
Timetable valid from 2 Jun 2013 until further notice


Created by Stagecoach Group Plc on 30/07/2014 01:27. This timetable is valid at the time of download from our website. However, this may be affected by alteration at short notice. To read service updates or to re-check your journey go to www.stagecoachbus.com.

## Local Transport Information



Area Bus Network



| Taxi Information |
| :--- |
| Taxis are available from the taxi rank outside <br> the station |


| $\begin{aligned} & 5050 \mathrm{~A} \\ & 5959 \mathrm{~A} \\ & 488500 \end{aligned}$ | Stagecoach (01865) 772250 wuws.stagecachbus.com/oxfordshire | GAOI | Geoff Amos Coaches (01327) 260522 wuw.geoffamos.co.uk | - traveline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 269270 | Johnson's Coaches (01564) 797000 www.johnsonscoaches.co.uk | 499508 | Tex Cars \& Coaches (01295) 257692 www.texcoaches.co.uk | 08712002233 |

## Appendix C

Collision Data


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

## Selection:

Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Causation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st: | Factor: | Failed to look properly | Participant: |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd: |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |  |  |  |  |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Front

Age of Driver

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $30 / 06 / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 THEN HIT BY C3 TRAV NE ON A361 CAUSING SERIOUS INJURY TO RIDER OF PC2

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 3 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2321212 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Crossing: Control None within 50 metres Facilities No physical crossing facility within 50 metres

Local Authority:Cherwell
Parish: 0120 Road Section: Accident Type(s) NB IB

|  | Causation | Confidence: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry | Vehicle 1 |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from $N E$ to $S \quad$ Going ahead other main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 53 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $30 / 06 / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 Pedal Cycle | Moving from |  | E to W | Turning right | On main carriageway |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact Back | Age of Driver | 50 | Sex of Driver | Male | Breath test | Not applicable |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: 1 | Age: 50 |  | Male | Driver/rider |  | Severity: Serious | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Ped. Location | Ped. Movemen |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury Not applicable | School pupil: |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Reference 3 Car | Moving from | S | to NE | Going ahead other | On main carriageway |  |  |  |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact Front | Age of Driver | 75 | Sex of Driver | Male | Breath test | Negative |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | 30/06/2014 | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation | Confidence: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Failed to look properly | Vehicle 1 |

HIGH WINDS
Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from N to S Going ahead other On main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact | Nearside |  | Age of Driver | 72 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test Negative |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: | 45 | Female |  | Pedestrian | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: |


| Ped. Location | In carr not crossin | Ped. Movement | Movement U/K | Ped. Direction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Sti $\quad$| Ped. Injury | Not applicable | School pupil: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Not a pupil $\quad l$

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

Vehicle Reference 2 Car
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Nearside

Moving from
$S$ to
Parked

Age of Driver 45 Sex of Driver Female

On main carriageway

Breath test Negative

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Monday | 08/07/2013 | Time | $1651 \quad$ Slight | at |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E: 443892 | $\mathrm{~N}: 238153$ | Junction Detail: | Crossroads | Control: Give way or controlled |  |  |
| Fine without high winds |  | Road surface | Dry | Daylight |  |  |

 WYKHAM LANE TO BODICOTE \& C1 HIT MC2

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 3 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2470713 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) ID


|  | Causation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor: |  | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 1st: | Road layout (eg bend, hill etc.) |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 2nd: | Failed to look properly |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 3rd: | Failed to look properly |  | Vehicle 2 | Very Likely |
| 4th: | Stationary or parked vehicle |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 6th: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference $1 \quad$ Car | Moving from | to W | ght |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Nearside Age of Driver 64 Sex of Driver Female Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Sunday | 28/07/2013 | Time | 0945 | Slight | at | A4260 J/W SERVICE RD S OF | ESSO FILLING STATION | BODICOTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 446204 | 8428 Junction | Junction Detai | T or s | ered ju | , | : Give way or controlled |  |  |
| Fine with | winds |  |  | urface |  | Daylight |  |  |

 Road Section: Accident Type(s) EB

Causation

|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry |  |
| 2nd: | Fatigue | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  |  | Possible |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
Moving from
N to NE
Turning left
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Nearside $\quad$ Age of Driver 38 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference $2 \quad$ Pedal C |  | Movin | rom | N | to SE | Going ahead other |  |  | Cycle lane (on main carriageway) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact Offside |  | Age of |  | 46 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test | Not applicable |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: | 46 |  | Male |  | Driver/rider |  | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  | Ped. | vem |  |  |  | Ped. | ection |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  |  |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Monday | 19/08/2013 | Time | 0944 | Serious | at | A4260 OXFORD ROAD | J/W BROAD GAP \& CANAL LANE | BODICOTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 446457 | 8115 Junc | Detail | T or | ered jun | Con | : Give way or controlled |  |  |
| Fine witho | winds |  |  | urface | Dry | Daylight |  |  |

 A4260 - HIT OCCURRED CAUSING C2 TO EXIT CWAY TO NSIDE

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1780813 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) LD


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: | Failed to judge other persons path or speed | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Goods over 3.5 ton $\quad$ Moving from $\quad$ NE to $S$ Starting carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 23 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.



| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 2 | Police Ref. P1770813 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) SG

Causation

|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Vexperienced or learner driver/rider |
| 2nd: | Nervous/Uncertain/Panic | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: | Loss of control | Vehicle 1 |  |
| 4th: |  | Vehicle 1 |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $30 / 06 / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 1 Car | Car | Moving from S | to NE | Going ahead right bend | On main carriageway |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overturned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact Front |  | Age of Driver 24 | Sex of Driver | Female Breath test | Negative |  |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: 24 | Female | Driver/rider | Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 1 |
| Ped. Location |  | Ped. Movement |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  | School pupil: | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 2 | Age: 45 | Male | Passenger | Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 1 |
| Ped. Location |  | Ped. Movement |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  | School pupil: | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front

Moving from $S$ to NE
Going ahead other
On main carriageway

Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Pedal Cycle | Moving from | S | to | NE | Going ahead other | On main carriageway |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Back |  | Age of Driver | 43 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test Not applicable |  |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: 43 | Male |  | Driver/rider | Severity: | Serious | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Friday | 27/09/2013 | Time $1830 \quad$ atight A361 J/W ACCESS TO CHADDLE BARN FARM |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E: 443562 | $\mathrm{~N}: 237199$ | Junction Detail: | Using private drive c Control: Give way or controlled |
| Fine without high winds | Road surface Dry |  |  |

 FTS

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2500913 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Road Section: Accident Type(s) NN


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Pxceeding speed limit | Vehicle 1 |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from $S$ to $N E \quad$ Going ahead right bend main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Offside Age of Driver Sex of Driver Not traced Breath test Driver not contacted

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 TO NSIDE

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2521013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) RD


|  | Causation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry |  | Participant: |

On main carriageway
Skidded

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 25 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Car |  | Moving from | SE | to N | Going | ahead other |  | On main | arriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Front |  | Age of Driver | 34 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test | Negative | Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
| Casualt | Reference: | 1 | Age: 34 |  | Male | Driver/rider |  |  | Severity: |  |  | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  | School pupil: Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Causation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |  |  |  |  |
| 1st: | Disobeyed Give Way or Stop sign or markings | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd: | Failed to look properly | Vehicle 1 | Possible |  |  |  |  |
| 3rd: | Failed to judge other persons path or speed | Vehicle 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $30 / 06 / 2014$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation | Confidence: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Pailed to look properly |  | Vehicle 1 |

[^0]No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 53 Sex of Driver Female Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Motor C | over 50 | Moving from | N | to S | Going | ahead other |  | On main c | arriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Nearside |  | Age of Driver | 56 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test | Negative | Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
|  | Reference: | 1 | Age: 56 |  | Male | Driver/rider |  |  | Severity: |  |  | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  | School pupil: |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Friday | 10/01/2014 | Time | 0819 | Serious | at | WYKHAM LANE APPR | BODICOTE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 445263 | 38072 Junc | Detail | Not | 20m of | Cont |  |  |
| Fine without | winds |  |  | urface | Frost/Ice | Daylight |  |

 HEDGE

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1010114 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) NN



Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.
Vehicle Reference 2 Car

Moving from
E to W
Going ahead other
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Front
Age of Driver
23 Sex of Driver
Male
Breath test Negative

Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Pedal cycles | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 8 | 13 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Passenger | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Motorcycle rider | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cyclist | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 10 | 15 |

Number of casualties meeting the criteria: 15

Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection

Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection

## Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Pedal cycles | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 8 | 13 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Passenger | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Motorcycle rider | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cyclist | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 10 | 15 |

Number of casualties meeting the criteria:
15


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 WALL

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1930712 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pedestrian phase at traffic signal junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) SG JS


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Pllness or disability, mental or physical |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 2nd: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  | Moving from | N | to S | Going ahead other |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.



AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $30 / 06 / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

Vehicle Reference 2 Car
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact | Front |
| :--- | :--- |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 |

Ped. Location
Ped. Injury Not applicable

Moving from
W to SE
Going ahead right bend
On main carriageway

Age of Driver 78 Sex of Driver Female
Negative
Driver/rider Severity: Slight
Ped. Direction

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.
Wednesday $10 / 10 / 2012 \quad$ Time $0823 \quad$ Slight $\quad$ at A4260 OXFORD ROAD J/W A4260 UPPER WINDSOR ST
E: $445420 \quad \mathrm{~N}: 239805$
Fine without high winds
 JOURNEY TO SCHOOL) TRAV W ON XING CROSSED FROM C1 OSIDE FROM IN FRONT OF QUEUING VEHS \& C1 HIT ONE OF PEDS

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Central refuge - no other controls | Police Ref. P0941012 | Local Authority:Cherwell limit |  |

Facilities Central refuge - no other controls
Local Authority:Cherwell
Parish: 0120 Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 1st: <br> 2nd: <br> 3rd: <br> 4th: <br> 5th: <br> 6th: | Crossed road masked by stationary veh Careless/Reckless/In a hurry Failed to look properly | Casualty 1 <br> Casualty 1 <br> Casualty 1 | Possible <br> Very Likely |



AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 ONTO A361 BLOXHAM ROAD FROM SPRINGFIELD AVENUE)

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1751012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) LD



On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 65 Sex of Driver Female Breath test Driver not contacted

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $30 / 06 / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Friday | 12/10/2012 | Time | 1818 | Slight | at | A361 SOUTH BAR ST J/W ST JOHNS RD | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 445329 | 40119 Junctio | Junction Detail | T or | ered ju | Control: Give way or controlled |  |  |
| Fine without | winds |  |  | urface | Dry | Darkness: street lights prese |  |

 HAD JUST MOVED OFF POSS IN QUEUING TRSFFIC ON APPROACH TO J/W BLOXHAM ROAD

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1291012 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pedestrian phase at traffic signal junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) RD


On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Offside Age of Driver 17 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Driver not contacted

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 LEAVE CWAY TO NSIDE \& HIT LAMP COLUMN - POSS POOR VISIBILITY DUE TO RAIN CONTRIBUTORY

$\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Road Type } & \text { Single carriageway } & \text { Vehicles } & 2 & \text { Casualties } & 1\end{array}\right]$| Police Ref. P0450113 |
| :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres |$\quad$ Facilities | Zebra crossing |  | Local Authority:Cherwell |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) LD


## On main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Front Age of Driver 32 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

Vehicle Reference 2 Car
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact | Nearside |
| ---: | ---: |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 |

Ped. Location
Ped. Injury Not applicable

Moving from
S NE Going ahead other

Male
Breath test Negative Driver/rider Severity: Slight

Ped. Direction

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | (24) months |
| :---: |
| Selection: |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 CHILD PED (AGE 4 - JOURNEY TO SCHOOL ) CROSSED ON ZIG ZAG LINES FROM NSIDE OF HGV1 \& HIT OCCURRED WITH CHILD PED

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2020113 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pelican, puffin, toucan or similar non-junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: to look properly | Wrong use of pedestrian crossing facility | Casualty 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry | Casualty 1 | Very Likely |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Goods 7.5 tonnes mg Moving from $S$ to NE Going ahead but held up Onain carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Very Likely |
| 2nd to look properly | Voor turn or manoevre | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
Moving from $S$ to $E$
Turning right
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Nearside Age of Driver 21 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Car |  | Moving from | N | to S | Going ahead other |  | On main c | arriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Front | 1 | Age of Driver 20 |  | Sex of Driver | Female | Breath test | Negative | Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
| Casualty | Reference: |  | Age: 20 |  | Female | Driver/rider |  | Severity: |  |  | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  | School pupil: Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 CENTRAL ISLAND BUT HIT MC2 TRAV N ON A4260 TO OSIDE OF C1

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P0440413 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) UU


|  | Causation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor: |  |  | Participant: |  | Confidence: |
| 1st: | Failed to look properly |  |  | Vehicle 1 |  | Very Likely |
| 2nd: | Poor turn or manoevre |  |  | Vehicle 1 |  | Possible |
| 3rd: | Illegal turn or direction of travel |  |  | Vehicle 1 |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vehicle Reference $1 \quad$ Car | Moving from | S | to S | U-turn |  |

On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Offside Age of Driver 75 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 WING MIRROR PED XING FROM OSIDE UNCLEAR IF PED WAS MASKED BY STAT TRAFFIC IN OSIDE LANE OF SAINSBURY EXIT

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1540413 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pedestrian phase at traffic signal junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

Local Authority:Cherwell Parish: 0120

|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: |  | Participant: | Very Likely |  |
| 2nd: |  |  | Vehicle 1 |  |  |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  | Moving from | NE to | SE | Turning left |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


## 

 AT J/W A361 BLOXHAM ROAD| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 3 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1300413 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) NB QQ


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd to judge other persons path or speed | Failed to look properly | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from S to $\mathrm{N} \quad$ Going ahead other main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact | Front | Age of Driver | 26 | Sex of Driver | Male | Breath test Negative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Reference 2 | Car | Moving from | S | to | N | Going ahead but held up |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Back Age of Driver 27 Sex of Driver Male Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Very Likely |
| 2nd: |  | Vehicle 1 |  |
| 3rd: look properly |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Van or Goods 3.5 to Moving from N to S Turning right On main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Nearside $\quad$ Age of Driver 63 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System

| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Motor Cycle over 1 |  | Moving from | SE | to N | Going ahead other |  | On main carriageway |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Skidded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact <br> Casualty | Nearside <br> Reference: | 1 | Age of Driver Age: |  | Sex of Driver <br> Male |  | Driver/rider | Breath test | Negative <br> Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movem School pupil | Not a pupil |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Careless/Reckless/In a hurry | Participant: |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
Moving from NE to N
Turning right
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact Front |  | Age of Driver | 71 | Sex of Driver | Female | Breath test Negative |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: 71 | Female | Driver/rider | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
|  |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Location |  | Ped. Movement |  |  |  |  |  |

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Causation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st: | Factor: | Inexperienced or learner driver/rider | Participant: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference $1 \quad$ Car Moving from $\quad \mathrm{S}$ to $\mathrm{N} \quad$ Overtaking moving vehicle $\mathrm{O} / \mathrm{S}$ On main carriageway

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Did not impact Age of Driver Sex of Driver Male Breath test Driver not contacted

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Motor C | e over 50 | Moving from | S | to N | Going | ahead other |  | On main c | arriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Offside |  | Age of Driver | 25 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test | Negative |  |  |  |
| Casualty | Reference: | 1 | Age: 25 |  | Male |  | Driver/rider |  | Severity: | Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Ped. Loc | cation |  | Ped. Movem |  |  |  | Ped. | ection |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Inju |  |  | School pupil: |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 PC2

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1060813 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pelican, puffin, toucan or similar non-junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) EB ON



[^1]No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Nearside Age of Driver 23 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Pedal Cy |  | Moving from | N | to S | Overtaking nearside |  | On main carriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Front | 1 | Age of Driver | 18 | Sex of Driver | Female | Breath test Not applicable |  | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Casualty | Reference: |  | Age: 18 |  | Female | Driver/rider | Severity: Slight |  |  |  |
| Ped. Lo Ped. In |  | Ped. Location | Ped. Movem School pupil |  | Not a pupil | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: |  | Vehicle 2 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car
Moving from
S
to NE
Stopping
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Front
Age of Driver 48 Sex of Driver Female
Breath test Not requested

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Pedal Cy |  | Moving from | N | to SE | Going | ahead other |  | On main carriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Nearside |  | Age of Driver | 14 | Sex of Driver | Male | Driver/rider | Breath test Not applicable |  |  |  |
| Casualty | Reference: | 1 | Age: 14 |  | Male |  |  |  | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Ped. Lo | cation |  | Ped. Movem |  |  |  | Ped. | ection |  |  |  |
| Ped. In |  |  | School pupil |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Saturday | 05/10/2013 | Time | 0101 | Slight | at | GRANGE ROAD AT J/W CUL DE SACS AT SOUTH END OF ROAD | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 445424 | 8839 Junctic | Detai | Not | 20 m of |  |  |  |
| Fine witho | winds |  |  | urface |  | Darkness: street lights present and lit |  |

 SAC TO END PURSUIT - C2 LEFT CWAY TO W SIDE OF GRANGE ROAD JUST NORTH OF JUNCTION

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 2 | Police Ref. P0641013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) ZZ

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |  |
| 1st: | Stolen vehicle | Vehicle 2 | Very Likely |
| 2nd: | Vehicle in course of crime | Vehicle 2 | Very Likely |
| 3th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | 30/06/2014 | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| E: $444943 \quad \mathrm{~N}: 239572$ | Junction Detail: | Not within 20 m of j Control: <br> Fine without high winds | Road surface Dry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

 PEDS CAUSING SLIGHT INJURY

| Road Type Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1141013 | Speed limit 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities |  | sing |  | Local Authority:Cherwell | Parish: 0120 |

Crossing: Control None within 50 metres Facilities Zebra crossing
Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

|  | Causation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Pailed to look properly |  | Conticipant: |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: to look properly | Nervous/Uncertain/Panic | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 3rd: |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

## Vehicle Reference 1 Car

Moving from
N to SE
Going ahead other
On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Front Age of Driver 52 Sex of Driver Female Breath test Driver not contacted

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

## Selection:

Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Wednesday | 23/10/2013 | Time | 1540 | Serious | at | A361 SOUTH BAR ST J/W ST JOHNS RD | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 445329 | 40126 Junc | Detail | T or staggered junct Control: Give way or controlled |  |  |  |  |
| Fine without | winds |  | Road surface Dry |  |  | Daylight |  |

 SPEED / POSS ALSO STAT TRAFFIC IN OSIDE SBOUND LANE (FOR VEHS RT TO A361 BLOXHAM ROAD)

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P2721013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

Parish: 0120

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| $1 \mathrm{st}:$ | Failed to look properly | Casualty 1 | Very Likely |
| 2nd: <br> 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |

Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from $N$ to $S$ Going ahead other On main carriageway


AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Thursday | 24/10/2013 | Time | 1731 | Serious | at | A4260 OXFORD ROAD | J/W HORTON VIEW | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 445528 | 39540 Junctic | Detai | Control: Automatic traffic sign |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fine witho | winds |  |  | urface |  | Daylight |  |  |

## 

Cl INTO PATH OF C1 \& HIT OCCURRED

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P3061013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | Pedestrian phase at traffic signal junction | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Very Likely |
| 2nd: to look properly |  | Casualty 1 |  |
| 3rd: |  |  |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |



AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Saturday | 02/11/2013 | Time | 0844 Slight | at | WOODGREEN AVE J/W BRETCH HILL | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 444415 | 40126 Junc | Detail | T or staggered ju | Contr | 1: Give way or controlled |  |
| Fine witho | winds |  | Road surface | Wet/Da | mp Daylight |  |

 WOODGREEN AVE \& C1 HIT R OSIDE OF C2 - C2 EXITED CWAY TO OSIDE ONTO CENTRAL RESERVE

| Road Type | Dual carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P0681113 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) RB

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: | Failed to look properly <br> 3rd: <br> Junction overshoot <br> Other | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 5th: |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |
| 6th: |  | Vehicle 1 | Possible |

DRIVER SNEEZED
Vehicle Reference 1 Car Moving from S to SE Turning right On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Nearside $\quad$ Age of Driver 37 Sex of Driver $\quad$ Female $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation | Confidence: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Ced to look properly | Vehicle 1 |

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates $\quad 01 / 07 / 2012$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014 \quad$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | 30/06/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Monday | 18/11/2013 | Time | 2000 Slight | at | WOODGREEN AVE J/W BRETCH HILL | BANBURY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E: 444389 | 40129 Junction | Detai | T or staggered ju | Control: Give way or controlled |  |  |
| Fine witho | winds |  | Road surface | Dry | Darkness: street lights prese |  |

 TREE ON CENTRAL RESERVATION

| Road Type | Dual carriageway | Vehicles | 2 | Casualties | 2 | Police Ref. P2131113 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Crossing: Control None within 50 metres | Facilities | No physical crossing facility within 50 metres | Local Authority:Cherwell |  |  |  | Road Section: Accident Type(s) LD


|  | Causation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Disobeyed Give Way or Stop sign or markings |  | Participant: |

On main carriageway
No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

| First point of impact Front |  | Age of Driver | 51 | Sex of Driver | Male | Breath test Negative |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Casualty Reference: | 1 | Age: | 51 | Male | Driver/rider | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: |
| Ped. Location |  | Ped. Movement |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection: Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Car |  | Moving from | S | to N | Going | ahead other |  | On main | arriage |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Nearside |  | Age of Driver | 36 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test | Negative | Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
| Casualt | Reference: | 2 | Age: 36 |  | Male | Driver/rider |  |  | Severity: |  |  | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  | Not a pupil | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  | School pupil: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query: |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: |  | Participant: | Confidence: |  |
| 2nd: | Failed to look properly |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |  |
| 3rd: |  |  | Vehicle 1 | Very Likely |  |
| 4th: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  | Moving from | S | to | $\mathrm{N} \quad$ Turning left |

No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning

First point of impact Offside Age of Driver 66 Sex of Driver Male $\quad$ Breath test Negative

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Pedal C |  | Moving from |  | to N | Startin |  |  | On main carriagewa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Front | 1 | Age of Driver |  | Sex of Driver | Male | Driver/rider | Breath test | Not applicable | Injured by vehicle: | 2 |
| Casual | Reference: |  | Age: $63$ |  | Male |  |  |  | Severity: Serious |  |  |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. I |  |  | School pupil: Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | 30/06/2014 | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.




AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | 30/06/2014 | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: | Notes: |  |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.



No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning
First point of impact Front

| Age of Driver | 29 | Sex of Driver | Female | Breath test Negative |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: | :--- |
| Age: $\quad 56$ | Female | Passenger | Severity: Slight | Injured by vehicle: | 1 |
| Ped. Movement |  |  |  |  |  |
| School pupil: | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |

AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Vehicle Reference 2 | Taxi/Pri | hire car | Moving from | N | to SE | Going a | ahead other |  | On main c | arriagew |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No skidding, jack-knifing or overturning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| First point of impact | Front |  | Age of Driver | 35 | Sex of Driver | Male |  | Breath test Negative |  | Slight | Injured by vehicle: |  |
| Casualty | Reference: | 1 | $\text { Age: } \quad 35$ |  | Male | Driver/rider |  |  | Severity: |  |  | 2 |
| Ped. Location |  |  | Ped. Movement |  |  | Ped. Direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ped. Injury |  |  | School pupil: |  | Not a pupil |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

 SLOW \& QUICKENED PACE BUT WAS UNABLE TO AVOID HIT)

| Road Type | Single carriageway | Vehicles | 1 | Casualties | 1 | Police Ref. P1810314 | Speed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crossing: C | trol None within 50 metres | Facilities |  | sing |  | Local Authority:Cherwell | Parish: |

Road Section: Accident Type(s) PY

|  | Causation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Confidence: |
| 2nd: | Failed to judge other persons path or speed <br> 3rd: <br> Careless/Reckless/In a hurry <br> 4th: <br> Failed to look properly <br> 5th: | Wrong use of pedestrian crossing facility | Vehicle 1 |



AccsMap - Accident Analysis System
Accidents between dates 01/07/2012 and 30/06/2014 (24) months

Selection:
Notes:
Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |
| Selected using Build Query : |  |  |  |

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.


|  | Causation |  | Confidence: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1st: | Factor: | Participant: | Possible |
| 2nd to look properly | Vehicle 1 | Possible |  |
| 3rd: | Exceeding speed limit | Vehicle 1 |  |
| 4th: |  | Vehicle 1 |  |
| 5th: |  |  |  |
| 6th: |  |  |  |



Selected using Build Query :

## CONFIDENTIAL ROAD ACCIDENT INFORMATION - NOT TO BE TRANSMITTED TO THIRD PARTIES:

The description of the accident circumstances (and causation factors if supplied) reflect the reporting officer's opinion at the time of reporting and may not be the result of extensive investigation.

## Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 0 | 4 | 20 | 24 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Pedal cycles | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 5 | 26 | 31 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| Passenger | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Motorcycle rider | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Cyclist | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 5 | 32 | 37 |

Number of casualties meeting the criteria:
37

Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and | $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (24) months |  |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |  |

## Selection:

Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $01 / 07 / 2012$ | and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6} / 2014$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (24) months |  |  |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |

Selection:
Selected using Manual Selection


| Accidents between dates | $\mathbf{0 1 / 0 7 / 2 0 1 2}$ and $\mathbf{3 0 / 0 6 / 2 0 1 4}$ | (24) months |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Selection: |  | Notes: |
| Selected using Manual Selection |  |  |

Selected using Manual Selection


Selected using Manual Selection

Accidents involving:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Motor vehicles <br> only (excluding <br> 2-wheels) | 0 | 4 | 20 | 24 |
| 2-wheeled motor <br> vehicles | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Pedal cycles | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Horses \& other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 5 | 26 | 31 |

Casualties:

|  | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle driver | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| Passenger | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| Motorcycle rider | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Cyclist | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Pedestrian | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 5 | 32 | 37 |

## Number of casualties meeting the criteria:

## Appendix D

TRICS Report

## TRI P RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

Land Use : 03-RESIDENTIAL
Category : M - MIXED PRIVATE/AFFORDABLE HOUSING

## MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

Selected regions and areas:

| 02 | SOUTH EAST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SC SURREY | 2 days |
| 03 | SOUTH WEST |  |
|  | DV DEVON | 1 days |
| 06 | WEST MI DLANDS |  |
|  | HE HEREFORDSHIRE | 1 days |
| 07 | YORKSHI RE \& NORTH LI NCOLNSHI RE |  |
|  | NY NORTH YORKSHIRE | 1 days |
| 09 | NORTH |  |
|  | CB CUMBRIA | 1 days |
| 10 | WALES |  |
|  | CM CARMARTHENSHIRE | 1 days |
| 11 | SCOTLAND |  |
|  | FA FALKIRK | 1 days |

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

## Filtering Stage $\mathbf{2}$ 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 dwellings |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 14 to 500 (units: ) |

Range Selected by User: 14 to 500 (units: )
Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 04$ to $13 / 10 / 11$
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 |
| Thursday | 5 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 8 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:
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 5
Edge of Town 3
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:
Industrial Zone 1
Residential Zone 6
No Sub Category 1

## Filtering Stage $\mathbf{3}$ selection:

Use Class:
C3 8 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 ${ }^{\circledR}$.

Population within 1 mile:

| 1,001 to 5,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5,001 to 10,000 | 2 days |
| 10,001 to 15,000 | 1 days |
| 20,001 to 25,000 | 4 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 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 25,001 to 50,000 | 2 days |
| 50,001 to 75,000 | 1 days |
| 75,001 to 100,000 | 1 days |
| 100,001 to 125,000 | 1 days |
| 125,001 to 250,000 | 2 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 | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1.1 to 1.5 | 6 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 | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| No | 6 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.

## LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 CB-03-M-03 SEMI-DETACHED
MOORCLOSE ROAD
SALTERBECK
WORKINGTON
Edge of Town
No Sub Category
Total Number of dwellings:
Survey date: MONDAY
2 CM-03-M-01 HOUSES \& FLATS
COLLEGE ROAD
CARMARTHEN
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: Survey date: THURSDAY
3 DV-03-M-01
HOUSES \& FLATS
TOPSHAM ROAD

## EXETER

Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: Survey date: THURSDAY

61
06/10/11
4 FA-03-M-01
SEMI D./ TERRACED
FAIRLIE STREET
FALKIRK
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 138 Survey date: WEDNESDAY 29/06/05
5 HE-03-M-01
SEMI D./ TERRACED
WHITECROSS ROAD
WIDEMARSH
HEREFORD
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Industrial Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 5
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 01/03/06
6 NY-03-M-03 SEMI D./ TERRACED
CAWTHORN AVENUE
HARROGATE
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings
Survey date: THURSDAY
7 SC-03-M-03 HOUSES \& FLATS
ST ANNE'S DRIVE
REDHILL
Edge of Town
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 500
Survey date: THURSDAY 08/09/11

CUMBRIA

Survey Type: MANUAL
CARMARTHENSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL

## DEVON

Survey Type: MANUAL

## FALKIRK

Survey Type: MANUAL

## HEREFORDSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL

## NORTH YORKSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL SURREY

Survey Type: MANUAL

## LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters (Cont.)

8 \begin{tabular}{lll}

| SC-03-M-04 |
| :--- |
| EPSOM ROAD | \& HOUSES/ FLATS \& <br>

<br>
\& \& <br>
GUILDFORD \& \& <br>
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) \& \& <br>
Residential Zone \& <br>
Total Number of dwellings: \& 130 \& Survey Type: MANUAL
\end{tabular}

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 | Reason for Deselection |
| :--- | :--- |
| BR-03-M-02 | Location |
| KC-03-M-01 | Location |
| MS-03-M-01 | Location |
| RE-03-M-01 | Location |

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/M - MIXED PRIVATE/AFFORDABLE HOUSING
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS

## BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 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 | 8 | 129 | 0.077 | 8 | 129 | 0.222 | 8 | 129 | 0.299 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.103 | 8 | 129 | 0.262 | 8 | 129 | 0.365 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.120 | 8 | 129 | 0.145 | 8 | 129 | 0.265 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.117 | 8 | 129 | 0.117 | 8 | 129 | 0.234 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.132 | 8 | 129 | 0.137 | 8 | 129 | 0.269 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.128 | 8 | 129 | 0.132 | 8 | 129 | 0.260 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.138 | 8 | 129 | 0.134 | 8 | 129 | 0.272 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.154 | 8 | 129 | 0.153 | 8 | 129 | 0.307 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.173 | 8 | 129 | 0.141 | 8 | 129 | 0.314 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.227 | 8 | 129 | 0.160 | 8 | 129 | 0.387 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.291 | 8 | 129 | 0.140 | 8 | 129 | 0.431 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.213 | 8 | 129 | 0.161 | 8 | 129 | 0.374 |
| 19:00-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.873 |  |  | 1.904 |  |  | 3.777 |

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.

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

```
14-500 (units:)
01/01/04-13/10/11
8
0
0
7
```

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 for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/M - MIXED PRIVATE/AFFORDABLE HOUSING
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL PEOPLE
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { Days } \end{aligned}$ | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 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 | 8 | 129 | 0.113 | 8 | 129 | 0.414 | 8 | 129 | 0.527 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.193 | 8 | 129 | 0.630 | 8 | 129 | 0.823 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.189 | 8 | 129 | 0.263 | 8 | 129 | 0.452 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.186 | 8 | 129 | 0.196 | 8 | 129 | 0.382 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.195 | 8 | 129 | 0.242 | 8 | 129 | 0.437 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.229 | 8 | 129 | 0.217 | 8 | 129 | 0.446 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.233 | 8 | 129 | 0.220 | 8 | 129 | 0.453 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.258 | 8 | 129 | 0.242 | 8 | 129 | 0.500 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.438 | 8 | 129 | 0.264 | 8 | 129 | 0.702 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.412 | 8 | 129 | 0.294 | 8 | 129 | 0.706 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.515 | 8 | 129 | 0.234 | 8 | 129 | 0.749 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 8 | 129 | 0.378 | 8 | 129 | 0.259 | 8 | 129 | 0.637 |
| 19:00-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.339 |  |  | 3.475 |  |  | 6.814 |

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.

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

```
14-500 (units:)
01/01/04-13/10/11
8
0
0
7
```

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.

## Appendix E

Traffic Flow Diagrams











## Appendix F Junction Capacity Tests

- Bloxham Road / Springfield Avenue


## Junctions 8

## PICADY 8 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 8.0.4.487 [15039,24/03/2014]
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2014
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
Tel: +44 (0)1344770758 email: software@trl.co.uk Web: http://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: Existing [AK MEASURES].arc8
Path: S:\W14129-Banbury\Calculations\Traffic\Picady\16102014\Springfield Ave
Report generation date: 29/10/2014 13:28:48

[^2]
## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
|  | Existing Layout - 2014 Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.24 | 9.01 | 0.20 | A | 0.53 | 12.52 | 0.35 | B |
| Stream B-A | 0.97 | 30.26 | 0.50 | D | 2.42 | 47.14 | 0.72 | E |
| Stream C-AB | 0.45 | 9.03 | 0.31 | A | 0.24 | 8.01 | 0.19 | A |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Existing Layout - 2027 + Dev Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.52 | 13.96 | 0.34 | B | 2.19 | 35.07 | 0.69 | E |
| Stream B-A | 44.23 | 1546.58 | 1.45 | F | 96.38 | 2413.53 | 1.75 | F |
| Stream C-AB | 1.15 | 14.85 | 0.54 | B | 0.50 | 12.21 | 0.34 | B |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Existing Layout - 2027 Base (with Committed Dev) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.37 | 11.53 | 0.27 | B | 0.95 | 18.58 | 0.49 | C |
| Stream B-A | 3.23 | 90.48 | 0.78 | F | 23.34 | 396.08 | 1.07 | F |
| Stream C-AB | 0.67 | 11.03 | 0.40 | B | 0.33 | 9.41 | 0.25 | A |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Values shown are the maximum values over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.
"D1-2014 Base, AM " model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D2-2014 Base, PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00
"D3-2027 Base (with Committed Dev), AM" model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D4-2027 Base (with Committed Dev), PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00
"D5-2027 + Dev Traffic, AM" model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D6 - 2027 + Dev Traffic, PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00

Run using Junctions 8.0.4.487 at 29/10/2014 13:28:46
File summary

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Location |  |
| Site Number |  |
| Date | $10 / 09 / 2014$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | AKaushik |
| Description |  |

Analysis Options

| Vehicle Length <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Do Queue <br> Variations | Calculate Residual <br> Capacity | Residual Capacity Criteria <br> Type | RFC <br> Threshold | Average Delay Threshold <br> $(\mathbf{s})$ | Queue Threshold <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.75 |  |  | N/A | 0.85 | 36.00 |  |

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 | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Existing Layout - 2014 Base, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 <br> Base, <br> AM | 2014 | Base | AM |  | FLAT | $08: 00$ | $09: 00$ | 60 | 15 |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 15.31 | C |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

[^3]Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor Arm Type | Lane Width (m) | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 665.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 214.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 901.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 186.000 | 479.000 |
|  | B | 117.000 | 0.000 | 97.000 |
|  | C | 720.000 | 181.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.72 |
|  | B | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.20 | 9.01 | 0.24 | A |
| B-A | 0.50 | 30.26 | 0.97 | D |
| C-AB | 0.31 | 9.03 | 0.45 | A |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 97.00 | 96.05 | 0.00 | 499.23 | 0.194 | 0.24 | 8.909 | A |
| B-A | 117.00 | 113.32 | 0.00 | 236.46 | 0.495 | 0.92 | 28.471 | D |
| C-AB | 181.00 | 179.21 | 0.00 | 579.47 | 0.312 | 0.45 | 8.956 | A |
| C-A | 720.00 | 720.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 186.00 | 186.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 479.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B-C | 97.00 | 96.99 | 0.00 | 496.81 | 0.195 | 0.24 | 9.003 |
| B-A | 117.00 | 116.87 | 0.00 | 235.82 | 0.496 | 0.95 | 30.182 |
| C-AB | 181.00 | 180.99 | 0.00 | 579.47 | 0.312 | 0.45 | 9.034 |
| C-A | 720.00 | 720.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 186.00 | 186.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - |  |
| A-C | 479.00 | 479.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 97.00 | 97.00 | 0.00 | 496.73 | 0.195 | 0.24 | 9.005 | A |
| B-A | 117.00 | 116.96 | 0.00 | 235.81 | 0.496 | 0.96 | 30.242 | D |
| C-AB | 181.00 | 181.00 | 0.00 | 579.47 | 0.312 | 0.45 | 9.034 | A |
| C-A | 720.00 | 720.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 186.00 | 186.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 479.00 | 479.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 97.00 | 97.00 | 0.00 | 496.71 | 0.195 | 0.24 | 9.006 | A |
| B-A | 117.00 | 116.98 | 0.00 | 235.81 | 0.496 | 0.97 | 30.260 | D |
| C-AB | 181.00 | 181.00 | 0.00 | 579.47 | 0.312 | 0.45 | 9.034 | A |
| C-A | 720.00 | 720.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 186.00 | 186.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 479.00 | 479.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

## Existing Layout - 2014 Base, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> $(\mathbf{m i n})$ | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base, <br> RM | Base | RM |  | FLAT | $17: 00$ | $18: 00$ | 60 | 1 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 26.08 | $D$ |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

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) | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10 m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Proportions Over Entry |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 744.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 345.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 652.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 161.000 | 583.000 |
|  | B | 191.000 | 0.000 | 154.000 |
|  | C | 545.000 | 107.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.78 |
|  | B | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
|  | C | 0.84 | 0.16 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.35 | 12.52 | 0.53 | B |
| B-A | 0.72 | 47.14 | 2.42 | E |
| C-AB | 0.19 | 8.01 | 0.24 | A |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 154.00 | 151.94 | 0.00 | 446.54 | 0.345 | 0.52 | 12.139 | B |
| B-A | 191.00 | 182.37 | 0.00 | 266.86 | 0.716 | 2.16 | 39.451 | E |
| C-AB | 107.00 | 106.06 | 0.00 | 556.13 | 0.192 | 0.24 | 7.982 | A |
| C-A | 545.00 | 545.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 161.00 | 161.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 583.00 | 583.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 154.00 | 153.95 | 0.00 | 442.01 | 0.348 | 0.53 | 12.493 | B |
| B-A | 191.00 | 190.35 | 0.00 | 266.52 | 0.717 | 2.32 | 46.332 | E |
| C-AB | 107.00 | 106.99 | 0.00 | 556.13 | 0.192 | 0.24 | 8.015 | A |
| C-A | 545.00 | 545.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 161.00 | 161.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 583.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 154.00 | 153.99 | 0.00 | 441.67 | 0.349 | 0.53 | 12.510 | B |
| B-A | 191.00 | 190.75 | 0.00 | 266.52 | 0.717 | 2.39 | 46.915 | E |
| C-AB | 107.00 | 107.00 | 0.00 | 556.13 | 0.192 | 0.24 | 8.015 | A |
| C-A | 545.00 | 545.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 161.00 | 161.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 583.00 | 583.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 154.00 | 153.99 | 0.00 | 441.55 | 0.349 | 0.53 | 12.519 | B |
| B-A | 191.00 | 190.87 | 0.00 | 266.52 | 0.717 | 2.42 | 47.144 | E |
| C-AB | 107.00 | 107.00 | 0.00 | 556.13 | 0.192 | 0.24 | 8.015 | A |
| C-A | 545.00 | 545.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 161.00 | 161.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 583.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

## Existing Layout - 2027 Base (with Committed Dev), AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings
Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Model Finish <br> Time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Model Time <br> Period <br> Length (min) | Time <br> Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2027 Base (with <br> Committed Dev), <br> AM | 2027 Base <br> (with Committed <br> Dev) | AM |  | FLAT | $08: 00$ | $09: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LoS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 34.14 | D |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.
Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Minor } \\ \text { Arm } \\ \text { Type } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Lane Width (m) | Lane Width (Left) $(m)$ | Lane Width (Right) $(m)$ | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate <br> Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | PCU <br> Vehicle Mix <br> Source | Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 780.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 251.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1091.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 216.000 | 564.000 |
|  | B | 136.000 | 0.000 | 115.000 |
|  | C | 872.000 | 219.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.72 |
|  | B | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.46 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.27 | 11.53 | 0.37 | B |
| B-A | 0.78 | 90.48 | 3.23 | F |
| C-AB | 0.40 | 11.03 | 0.67 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 115.00 | 113.60 | 0.00 | 437.46 | 0.263 | 0.35 | 11.069 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 125.75 | 0.00 | 174.81 | 0.778 | 2.56 | 64.459 | F |
| C-AB | 219.00 | 216.37 | 0.00 | 545.50 | 0.401 | 0.66 | 10.855 | B |
| C-A | 872.00 | 872.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 564.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 115.00 | 114.96 | 0.00 | 428.88 | 0.268 | 0.36 | 11.467 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 134.43 | 0.00 | 173.87 | 0.782 | 2.95 | 85.169 | F |
| C-AB | 219.00 | 218.97 | 0.00 | 545.50 | 0.401 | 0.66 | 11.023 | B |
| C-A | 872.00 | 872.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 564.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 115.00 | 114.99 | 0.00 | 427.65 | 0.269 | 0.36 | 11.513 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 135.31 | 0.00 | 173.86 | 0.782 | 3.13 | 88.794 | F |
| C-AB | 219.00 | 0.00 | 545.50 | 0.401 | 0.67 | 11.025 | B |  |
| C-A | 872.00 | 872.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 564.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 115.00 | 114.99 | 0.00 | 427.11 | 0.269 | 0.37 | 11.533 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 135.61 | 0.00 | 173.86 | 0.782 | 3.23 | 90.476 | F |
| C-AB | 219.00 | 219.00 | 0.00 | 545.50 | 0.401 | 0.67 | 11.025 | B |
| C-A | 872.00 | 872.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 564.00 | 564.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

## Existing Layout - 2027 Base (with Committed Dev), PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time <br> (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time <br> (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period <br> Length (min) | Time <br> Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2027 Base (with <br> Committed Dev), <br> PM | 2027 Base <br> (with Committed <br> Dev) | PM |  | FLAT | $17: 00$ | $18: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 173.16 | F |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

## Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

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) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) (m) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ (\text { Right })(m) \end{gathered}$ | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15 m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

[^4]
## Traffic Flows

## Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | PChicle Mix <br> Source | Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Turning <br> Vroportions |  |  |  |  |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 898.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 409.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 778.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 189.000 | 709.000 |
|  | B | 223.000 | 0.000 | 186.000 |
|  | C | 650.000 | 128.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.79 |
|  | B | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
|  | C | 0.84 | 0.16 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.49 | 18.58 | 0.95 | C |
| B-A | 1.07 | 396.08 | 23.34 | F |
| C-AB | 0.25 | 9.41 | 0.33 | A |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 186.00 | 182.30 | 0.00 | 379.65 | 0.490 | 0.92 | 17.931 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 187.50 | 0.00 | 208.62 | 1.069 | 8.88 | 115.536 | F |
| C-AB | 128.00 | 126.68 | 0.00 | 510.64 | 0.251 | 0.33 | 9.345 | A |
| C-A | 650.00 | 650.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 709.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 186.00 | 185.93 | 0.00 | 379.65 | 0.490 | 0.94 | 18.564 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 201.74 | 0.00 | 208.15 | 1.071 | 14.19 | 235.914 | F |
| C-AB | 128.00 | 127.99 | 0.00 | 510.64 | 0.251 | 0.33 | 9.407 | A |
| C-A | 650.00 | 650.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 709.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 186.00 | 185.98 | 0.00 | 379.65 | 0.490 | 0.95 | 18.577 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 204.14 | 0.00 | 208.14 | 1.071 | 18.91 | 319.259 | F |
| C-AB | 128.00 | 128.00 | 0.00 | 510.64 | 0.251 | 0.33 | 9.407 | A |
| C-A | 650.00 | 650.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 709.00 | 709.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 186.00 | 185.99 | 0.00 | 379.65 | 0.490 | 0.95 | 18.582 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 205.28 | 0.00 | 208.14 | 1.071 | 23.34 | 396.082 | F |
| C-AB | 128.00 | 128.00 | 0.00 | 510.64 | 0.251 | 0.33 | 9.407 | A |
| C-A | 650.00 | 650.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 709.00 | 709.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

## Existing Layout - 2027 + Dev Traffic, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic, AM | $2027+$ Dev <br> Traffic | AM |  | FLAT | $08: 00$ | $09: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 392.63 | F |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

[^5]Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor Arm Type | Lane Width (m) | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10 m (m) | Width at 15 m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 855.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 270.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1400.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 216.000 | 639.000 |
|  | B | 136.000 | 0.000 | 134.000 |
|  | C | 1119.000 | 281.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
|  | B | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.50 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.34 | 13.96 | 0.52 | B |
| B-A | 1.45 | 1546.58 | 44.23 | F |
| C-AB | 0.54 | 14.85 | 1.15 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 131.97 | 0.00 | 391.87 | 0.342 | 0.51 | 13.749 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 87.83 | 0.00 | 95.12 | 1.430 | 12.04 | 291.440 | F |
| C-AB | 281.10 | 276.62 | 0.00 | 523.47 | 0.537 | 1.12 | 14.338 | B |
| C-A | 1118.90 | 1118.90 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 133.98 | 0.00 | 391.87 | 0.342 | 0.51 | 13.957 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 92.76 | 0.00 | 93.52 | 1.454 | 22.85 | 730.236 | F |
| C-AB | 281.10 | 281.02 | 0.00 | 523.47 | 0.537 | 1.14 | 14.834 | B |
| C-A | 1118.90 | 1118.90 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 133.99 | 0.00 | 391.87 | 0.342 | 0.52 | 13.959 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 93.18 | 0.00 | 93.50 | 1.455 | 33.56 | 1138.260 | F |
| C-AB | 281.10 | 281.07 | 0.00 | 523.47 | 0.537 | 1.15 | 14.843 | B |
| C-A | 1118.90 | 1118.90 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 134.00 | 0.00 | 391.87 | 0.342 | 0.52 | 13.959 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 93.32 | 0.00 | 93.49 | 1.455 | 44.23 | 1546.584 | F |
| C-AB | 281.10 | 281.09 | 0.00 | 523.47 | 0.537 | 1.15 | 14.846 | B |
| C-A | 1118.90 | 1118.90 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

## Existing Layout - 2027 + Dev Traffic, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings
Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Layout | N/A | AK Measures |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only | Locked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2027+$ Dev <br> Traffic, PM | $2027+$ Dev <br> Traffic | PM |  | FLAT | $17: 00$ | $18: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 909.01 | F |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 6.40 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.80 | 150.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.
Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Minor } \\ & \text { Arm } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Lane Width (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15 m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 3.60 | 2.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 552.258 | 0.099 | 0.250 | 0.157 | 0.357 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 721.478 | 0.109 | 0.275 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 775.903 | 0.295 | 0.295 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vary Over Entry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1124.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 454.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 902.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 189.000 | 935.000 |
|  | B | 223.000 | 0.000 | 231.000 |
|  | C | 753.000 | 149.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.83 |
|  | B | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.51 |
|  | C | 0.83 | 0.17 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.69 | 35.07 | 2.19 | E |
| B-A | 1.75 | 2413.53 | 96.38 | F |
| C-AB | 0.34 | 12.21 | 0.50 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 222.91 | 0.00 | 333.09 | 0.694 | 2.02 | 30.799 | D |
| B-A | 223.00 | 123.51 | 0.00 | 128.48 | 1.736 | 24.87 | 392.211 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 147.02 | 0.00 | 443.88 | 0.336 | 0.50 | 12.050 | B |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.56 | 0.00 | 333.09 | 0.694 | 2.13 | 34.742 | D |
| B-A | 223.00 | 127.55 | 0.00 | 127.77 | 1.745 | 48.73 | 1076.178 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 148.98 | 0.00 | 443.88 | 0.336 | 0.50 | 12.205 | B |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.84 | 0.00 | 333.09 | 0.694 | 2.17 | 34.975 | D |
| B-A | 223.00 | 127.68 | 0.00 | 127.76 | 1.745 | 72.56 | 1744.074 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 148.99 | 0.00 | 443.88 | 0.336 | 0.50 | 12.207 | B |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.91 | 0.00 | 333.09 | 0.694 | 2.19 | 35.066 | E |
| B-A | 223.00 | 127.72 | 0.00 | 127.76 | 1.745 | 96.38 | 2413.526 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 149.00 | 0.00 | 443.88 | 0.336 | 0.50 | 12.207 | B |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

## Junctions 8

## PICADY 8 - Priority Intersection Module

Version: 8.0.4.487 [15039,24/03/2014]
© Copyright TRL Limited, 2014
For sales and distribution information, program advice and maintenance, contact TRL:
Tel: +44 (0)1344770758 email: software@trl.co.uk Web: http://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: Improved Junction Layout.arc8
Path: S:IW14129 - Banbury\Calculations\Traffic\Picady\16102014\Springfield Ave
Report generation date: 29/10/2014 13:32:34

```
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev, AM
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev, PM
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, AM
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, PM
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Local Plan, AM
» Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Local Plan, PM
```


## Summary of junction performance

|  | AM |  |  |  | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS | Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | RFC | LOS |
|  | Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.38 | 10.37 | 0.28 | B | 1.41 | 22.33 | 0.59 | C |
| Stream B-A | 2.26 | 62.17 | 0.70 | F | 13.39 | 229.15 | 0.99 | F |
| Stream C-AB | 0.91 | 11.79 | 0.48 | B | 0.40 | 9.76 | 0.29 | A |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.47 | 12.15 | 0.32 | B | 2.04 | 29.54 | 0.68 | D |
| Stream B-A | 8.48 | 213.73 | 0.95 | F | 42.98 | 741.38 | 1.20 | F |
| Stream C-AB | 1.11 | 13.24 | 0.53 | B | 0.47 | 10.79 | 0.32 | B |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | 1 mproved Layout - 2027 Base + Local Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stream B-C | 0.43 | 11.50 | 0.30 | B | 1.61 | 24.56 | 0.62 | C |
| Stream B-A | 4.66 | 116.83 | 0.85 | F | 26.22 | 429.96 | 1.09 | F |
| Stream C-AB | 0.98 | 12.31 | 0.50 | B | 0.43 | 10.15 | 0.30 | B |
| Stream C-A | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stream A-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Values shown are the maximum values over all time segments. Delay is the maximum value of average delay per arriving vehicle.
"D5 - 2027 Base + Dev, AM " model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D6 - 2027 Base + Dev, PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00
"D7 - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, AM" model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D8 - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00
"D9-2027 Base + Local Plan, AM" model duration: 08:00-09:00
"D10-2027 Base + Local Plan, PM" model duration: 17:00-18:00

Run using Junctions 8.0.4.487 at 29/10/2014 13:32:32
File summary

| Title | (untitled) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Location |  |
| Site Number |  |
| Date | $10 / 09 / 2014$ |
| Version |  |
| Status | (new file) |
| Identifier |  |
| Client |  |
| Jobnumber |  |
| Enumerator | AKaushik |
| Description |  |

Analysis Options

| Vehicle Length <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | Do Queue <br> Variations | Calculate Residual <br> Capacity | Residual Capacity Criteria <br> Type | RFC <br> Threshold | Average Delay Threshold <br> $(\mathbf{s})$ | Queue Threshold <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.75 |  |  | N/A | 0.85 | 36.00 |  |

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 | PCU | PCU | perHour | s | -Min | perMin |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings
Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only | Locked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 23.88 | C |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

[^6]Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | Minor Arm Type | Lane Width (m) | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 855.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 270.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1400.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 216.000 | 639.000 |
|  | B | 136.000 | 0.000 | 134.000 |
|  | C | 1119.000 | 281.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
|  | B | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.50 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.28 | 10.37 | 0.38 | B |
| B-A | 0.70 | 62.17 | 2.26 | F |
| C-AB | 0.48 | 11.79 | 0.91 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 132.51 | 0.00 | 488.64 | 0.274 | 0.37 | 10.070 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 128.23 | 0.00 | 194.20 | 0.700 | 1.94 | 50.118 | F |
| C-AB | 281.02 | 277.43 | 0.00 | 586.46 | 0.479 | 0.90 | 11.523 | B |
| C-A | 1118.98 | 1118.98 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 133.96 | 0.00 | 482.03 | 0.278 | 0.38 | 10.341 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 135.22 | 0.00 | 192.99 | 0.705 | 2.14 | 60.581 | F |
| C-AB | 281.02 | 280.97 | 0.00 | 586.46 | 0.479 | 0.91 | 11.780 | B |
| C-A | 1118.98 | 1118.98 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 133.99 | 0.00 | 481.42 | 0.278 | 0.38 | 10.361 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 135.70 | 0.00 | 192.98 | 0.705 | 2.21 | 61.718 | F |
| C-AB | 281.02 | 281.00 | 0.00 | 586.46 | 0.479 | 0.91 | 11.783 | B |
| C-A | 1118.98 | 1118.98 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 039.00 |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 134.00 | 134.00 | 0.00 | 481.18 | 0.278 | 0.38 | 10.368 | B |
| B-A | 136.00 | 135.84 | 0.00 | 192.97 | 0.705 | 2.26 | 62.165 | F |
| C-AB | 281.02 | 281.01 | 0.00 | 586.46 | 0.479 | 0.91 | 11.785 | B |
| C-A | 1118.98 | 1118.98 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 216.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 639.00 | 039.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dev, PM | Dase <br> + Dev | RM |  | FLAT | $17: 00$ | $18: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 95.71 | F |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> (PCU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.
Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Minor } \\ & \text { Arm } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Lane Width (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) (m) } \end{gathered}$ | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vary Over Entry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1124.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 454.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 902.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 189.000 | 935.000 |
|  | B | 223.000 | 0.000 | 231.000 |
|  | C | 753.000 | 149.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.83 |
|  | B | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.51 |
|  | C | 0.83 | 0.17 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.59 | 22.33 | 1.41 | C |
| B-A | 0.99 | 229.15 | 13.39 | F |
| C-AB | 0.29 | 9.76 | 0.40 | A |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 225.63 | 0.00 | 393.61 | 0.587 | 1.34 | 20.829 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 196.31 | 0.00 | 225.73 | 0.988 | 6.67 | 90.159 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 147.41 | 0.00 | 517.74 | 0.288 | 0.40 | 9.680 | A |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.81 | 0.00 | 392.03 | 0.589 | 1.39 | 22.265 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 211.60 | 0.00 | 225.20 | 0.990 | 9.52 | 162.521 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 148.99 | 0.00 | 517.74 | 0.288 | 0.40 | 9.762 | A |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.94 | 0.00 | 392.03 | 0.589 | 1.41 | 22.311 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 214.51 | 0.00 | 225.19 | 0.990 | 11.64 | 199.816 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 149.00 | 0.00 | 517.74 | 0.288 | 0.40 | 9.762 | A |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 935.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 231.00 | 230.97 | 0.00 | 392.03 | 0.589 | 1.41 | 22.326 | C |
| B-A | 223.00 | 216.00 | 0.00 | 225.19 | 0.990 | 13.39 | 229.155 | F |
| C-AB | 149.00 | 149.00 | 0.00 | 517.74 | 0.288 | 0.40 | 9.762 | A |
| C-A | 753.00 | 753.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 189.00 | 189.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 935.00 | 035.00 |  | - | - | - | - | - |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time <br> $(H H: m m)$ | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period <br> Length (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment <br> Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2027 Base + <br> Dev + Barwood, <br> AM | Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dev + <br> Barwood | AM |  | FLAT | $08: 00$ | $09: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 64.53 | F |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Minor } \\ & \text { Arm } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Lane Width (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) }(\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Right) }(\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 897.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 295.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1513.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 222.000 | 675.000 |
|  | B | 154.000 | 0.000 | 141.000 |
|  | C | 1209.000 | 304.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
|  | B | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.48 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.32 | 12.15 | 0.47 | B |
| B-A | 0.95 | 213.73 | 8.48 | F |
| C-AB | 0.53 | 13.24 | 1.11 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 141.00 | 139.19 | 0.00 | 446.13 | 0.316 | 0.45 | 11.661 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 135.22 | 0.00 | 164.01 | 0.939 | 4.70 | 96.670 | F |
| C-AB | 304.08 | 299.74 | 0.00 | 575.82 | 0.528 | 1.09 | 12.849 | B |
| C-A | 1208.92 | 1208.92 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 675.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 141.00 | 140.94 | 0.00 | 437.24 | 0.322 | 0.47 | 12.146 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 147.01 | 0.00 | 162.54 | 0.947 | 6.44 | 163.480 | F |
| C-AB | 304.08 | 304.02 | 0.00 | 575.82 | 0.528 | 1.10 | 13.237 | B |
| C-A | 1208.92 | 1208.92 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 675.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 141.00 | 140.99 | 0.00 | 437.24 | 0.322 | 0.47 | 12.151 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 149.35 | 0.00 | 162.52 | 0.948 | 7.61 | 192.971 | F |
| C-AB | 304.08 | 304.06 | 0.00 | 575.82 | 0.528 | 1.11 | 13.242 | B |
| C-A | 1208.92 | 1208.92 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 675.00 | 675.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 141.00 | 141.00 | 0.00 | 437.24 | 0.322 | 0.47 | 12.151 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 150.50 | 0.00 | 162.51 | 0.948 | 8.48 | 213.735 | F |
| C-AB | 304.08 | 304.07 | 0.00 | 575.82 | 0.528 | 1.11 | 13.244 | B |
| C-A | 1208.92 | 1208.92 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 675.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Dev + Barwood, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

## Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario Name | Time Period Name | Description | Traffic Profile Type | Model Start Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish Time (HH:mm) | Model Time Period Length (min) | Time Segment Length (min) | Single Time Segment Only | Locked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2027 \text { Base + } \\ \text { Dev + } \\ \text { Barwood, PM } \end{gathered}$ | 2027 Base + <br> Dev + <br> Barwood | PM |  | FLAT | 17:00 | 18:00 | 60 | 15 |  |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 280.24 | F |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

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) | Lane Width (Left) (m) | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10 m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1222.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 485.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 966.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 201.000 | 1021.000 |
|  | B | 231.000 | 0.000 | 254.000 |
|  | C | 807.000 | 159.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.84 |
|  | B | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.52 |
|  | C | 0.84 | 0.16 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.68 | 29.54 | 2.04 | D |
| B-A | 1.20 | 741.38 | 42.98 | F |
| C-AB | 0.32 | 10.79 | 0.47 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 254.00 | 246.36 | 0.00 | 375.42 | 0.677 | 1.91 | 26.553 | D |
| B-A | 231.00 | 179.10 | 0.00 | 192.90 | 1.197 | 12.97 | 160.107 | F |
| C-AB | 159.00 | 157.13 | 0.00 | 492.71 | 0.323 | 0.47 | 10.671 | B |
| C-A | 807.00 | 807.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 1021.00 | 1021.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 254.00 | 253.66 | 0.00 | 375.42 | 0.677 | 1.99 | 29.355 | D |
| B-A | 231.00 | 190.08 | 0.00 | 192.27 | 1.201 | 23.20 | 374.779 | F |
| C-AB | 159.00 | 158.98 | 0.00 | 492.71 | 0.323 | 0.47 | 10.787 | B |
| C-A | 807.00 | 807.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 1021.00 | 1021.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 254.00 | 253.88 | 0.00 | 375.42 | 0.677 | 2.02 | 29.492 | D |
| B-A | 231.00 | 191.24 | 0.00 | 192.27 | 1.201 | 33.15 | 558.944 | F |
| C-AB | 159.00 | 158.99 | 0.00 | 492.71 | 0.323 | 0.47 | 10.787 | B |
| C-A | 807.00 | 807.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 1021.00 | 1021.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 254.00 | 253.94 | 0.00 | 375.42 | 0.677 | 2.04 | 29.541 | D |
| B-A | 231.00 | 191.66 | 0.00 | 192.27 | 1.201 | 42.98 | 741.382 | F |
| C-AB | 159.00 | 159.00 | 0.00 | 492.71 | 0.323 | 0.47 | 10.787 | B |
| C-A | 807.00 | 807.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 1021.00 | 1021.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Local Plan, AM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings

## Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario <br> Name | Time <br> Period <br> Name | Description | Traffic <br> Profile <br> Type | Model Start <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish <br> Time (HH:mm) | Model Time <br> Period Length <br> (min) | Time Segment <br> Length (min) | Single Time <br> Segment Only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Locked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Plan, <br> AM | 2027 Base <br> Local Plan <br> Lon Base | AM |  | FLAT | $08: 00$ | $09: 00$ | 60 | 15 |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 39.92 | $E$ |

## Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Visibility For Right <br> Turn (m) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

Minor Arm Geometry

| Arm | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Minor } \\ & \text { Arm } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Lane Width (m) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) }(\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Right) }(\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

## Entry Flows

General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 875.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 290.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1442.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 222.000 | 653.000 |
|  | B | 154.000 | 0.000 | 136.000 |
|  | C | 1153.000 | 289.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
|  | B | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.47 |
|  | C | 0.80 | 0.20 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.30 | 11.50 | 0.43 | B |
| B-A | 0.85 | 116.83 | 4.66 | F |
| C-AB | 0.50 | 12.31 | 0.98 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (08:00-08:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 136.00 | 134.37 | 0.00 | 464.29 | 0.293 | 0.41 | 10.860 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 140.60 | 0.00 | 182.58 | 0.843 | 3.35 | 72.184 | F |
| C-AB | 289.03 | 285.18 | 0.00 | 581.37 | 0.497 | 0.96 | 12.005 | B |
| C-A | 1152.97 | 1152.97 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 653.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:15-08:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 136.00 | 135.93 | 0.00 | 452.53 | 0.301 | 0.42 | 11.368 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 151.10 | 0.00 | 181.29 | 0.849 | 4.07 | 104.309 | F |
| C-AB | 289.03 | 288.98 | 0.00 | 581.37 | 0.497 | 0.98 | 12.306 | B |
| C-A | 1152.97 | 1152.97 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 653.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:30-08:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 136.00 | 135.98 | 0.00 | 450.17 | 0.302 | 0.43 | 11.456 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 152.54 | 0.00 | 181.27 | 0.850 | 4.44 | 112.512 | F |
| C-AB | 289.03 | 289.01 | 0.00 | 581.37 | 0.497 | 0.98 | 12.311 | B |
| C-A | 1152.97 | 1152.97 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 653.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

Main results: (08:45-09:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 136.00 | 135.99 | 0.00 | 448.98 | 0.303 | 0.43 | 11.501 | B |
| B-A | 154.00 | 153.10 | 0.00 | 181.26 | 0.850 | 4.66 | 116.826 | F |
| C-AB | 289.03 | 289.02 | 0.00 | 581.37 | 0.497 | 0.98 | 12.311 | B |
| C-A | 1152.97 | 1152.97 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 222.00 | 222.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 653.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |  |

## Improved Layout - 2027 Base + Local Plan, PM

## Data Errors and Warnings

No errors or warnings
Analysis Set Details

| Name | Roundabout Capacity Model | Description | Locked | Network Flow Scaling Factor (\%) | Reason For Scaling Factors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improved Layout | N/A |  |  | 100.000 |  |

Demand Set Details

| Name | Scenario Name | Time Period Name | Description | Traffic Profile Type | Model Start Time (HH:mm) | Model Finish Time (HH:mm) | Model Time Period Length (min) | Time Segment Length (min) | Single Time Segment Only | Locked |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2027 \text { Base + } \\ \text { Local Plan, } \\ \text { PM } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2027 \text { Base + } \\ & \text { Local Plan } \end{aligned}$ | PM |  | FLAT | 17:00 | 18:00 | 60 | 15 |  |  |

## Junction Network

## Junctions

| Junction | Name | Junction Type | Major Road Direction | Arm Order | Junction Delay (s) | Junction LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (untitled) | T-Junction | Two-way | A,B,C | 171.60 | F |

Junction Network Options

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

## Arms

Arms

| Arm | Arm | Name | Description | Arm Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | A | Bloxham Road (N) |  | Major |
| B | B | Springfield Ave |  | Minor |
| C | C | Bloxham Road (S) |  | Major |

## Major Arm Geometry

| Arm | Width of <br> carriageway (m) | Has kerbed central <br> reserve | Width of kerbed central <br> reserve $(\mathbf{m})$ | Has right <br> turn bay | Width For Right <br> Turn $(\mathbf{m})$ | Visibility For Right <br> Turn ( $\mathbf{m}$ ) | Blocks? | Blocking Queue <br> $($ PCU $)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C}$ | 10.16 |  | 0.00 | $\checkmark$ | 3.30 | 250.00 | $\checkmark$ | 14.00 |

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) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lane } \\ \text { Width } \\ \text { (Left) }(\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | Lane Width (Right) (m) | Width at give-way (m) | Width at 5m (m) | Width at 10 m (m) | Width at 15m (m) | Width at 20m (m) | Estimate Flare Length | Flare Length (PCU) | Visibility To Left (m) | Visibility To Right (m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | Two lanes |  | 4.30 | 4.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 140 | 90 |

## Slope / Intercept / Capacity

Priority Intersection Slopes and Intercepts

| Junction | Stream | Intercept <br> (PCU/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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-A | 626.361 | 0.093 | 0.236 | 0.149 | 0.337 |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | B-C | 769.175 | 0.097 | 0.244 | - | - |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | C-B | 804.787 | 0.255 | 0.255 | - | - |

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 Flows

Demand Set Data Options

| Default <br> Vehicle <br> Mix | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Time | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Turn | Vehicle <br> Mix Varies <br> Over Entry | Vehicle Mix <br> Source | PCU <br> Factor <br> for a HV <br> (PCU) | Default <br> Turning <br> Proportions | Estimate <br> from <br> entry/exit <br> counts | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Time | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Turn | Turning <br> Proportions <br> Vary Over Entry |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | HV <br> Percentages | 2.00 |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |

## Entry Flows

## General Flows Data

| Arm | Profile Type | Use Turning Counts | Average Demand Flow (PCU/hr) | Flow Scaling Factor (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 1168.00 | 100.000 |
| B | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 470.00 | 100.000 |
| C | FLAT | $\checkmark$ | 925.00 | 100.000 |

## Turning Proportions

Turning Counts / Proportions (PCU/hr) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.000 | 201.000 | 967.000 |
|  | B | 231.000 | 0.000 | 239.000 |
|  | C | 773.000 | 152.000 | 0.000 |

Turning Proportions (PCU) - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.83 |
|  | B | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.51 |
|  | C | 0.84 | 0.16 | 0.00 |

## Vehicle Mix

Average PCU Per Vehicle - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | B | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | C | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Heavy Vehicle Percentages - Junction 1 (for whole period)

|  | To |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From |  | A | B | C |
|  | A | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Results

## Results Summary for whole modelled period

| Stream | Max RFC | Max Delay (s) | Max Queue (PCU) | Max LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 0.62 | 24.56 | 1.61 | C |
| B-A | 1.09 | 429.96 | 26.22 | F |
| C-AB | 0.30 | 10.15 | 0.43 | B |
| C-A | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | - | - | - | - |

## Main Results for each time segment

Main results: (17:00-17:15)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 239.00 | 232.89 | 0.00 | 385.30 | 0.620 | 1.53 | 22.804 | C |
| B-A | 231.00 | 192.85 | 0.00 | 213.07 | 1.084 | 9.54 | 118.813 | F |
| C-AB | 152.00 | 150.31 | 0.00 | 506.50 | 0.300 | 0.42 | 10.061 | B |
| C-A | 773.00 | 773.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 967.00 | 967.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:15-17:30)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 239.00 | 238.80 | 0.00 | 385.30 | 0.620 | 1.58 | 24.482 | C |
| B-A | 231.00 | 206.91 | 0.00 | 212.50 | 1.087 | 15.56 | 248.380 | F |
| C-AB | 152.00 | 151.99 | 0.00 | 506.50 | 0.300 | 0.43 | 10.154 | B |
| C-A | 773.00 | 773.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 967.00 | 967.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:30-17:45)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 239.00 | 238.93 | 0.00 | 385.30 | 0.620 | 1.60 | 24.540 | C |
| B-A | 231.00 | 209.17 | 0.00 | 212.50 | 1.087 | 21.02 | 342.033 | F |
| C-AB | 152.00 | 152.00 | 0.00 | 506.50 | 0.300 | 0.43 | 10.154 | B |
| C-A | 773.00 | 773.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 967.00 | 967.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

Main results: (17:45-18:00)

| Stream | Total Demand (PCU/hr) | Entry Flow (PCU/hr) | Pedestrian Demand (Ped/hr) | Capacity (PCU/hr) | RFC | End Queue (PCU) | Delay (s) | LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-C | 239.00 | 238.96 | 0.00 | 385.30 | 0.620 | 1.61 | 24.562 | C |
| B-A | 231.00 | 210.20 | 0.00 | 212.50 | 1.087 | 26.22 | 429.959 | F |
| C-AB | 152.00 | 152.00 | 0.00 | 506.50 | 0.300 | 0.43 | 10.154 | B |
| C-A | 773.00 | 773.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-B | 201.00 | 201.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| A-C | 967.00 | 967.00 | 0.00 | - | - | - | - | - |

- Bloxham Road / Queensway

TRL LIMITED
(C) COPYRIGHT 2010

## CAPACITIES, QUEUES, AND DELAYS AT 3 OR 4-ARM MAJOR/MINOR PRIORITY JUNCTIONS

PICADY 5.1 ANALYSIS PROGRAM
RELEASE 5.0 (JUNE 2010)
ADAPTED FROM PICADY/3 WHICH IS CROWN COPYRIGHT
BY PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HMSO

FOR SALES AND DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION,
PROGRAM ADVICE AND MAINTENANCE CONTACT TRL SOFTWARE SALES
TEL: CROWTHORNE (01344) 770758, FAX: 770356 EMAIL: software@trl.co.uk

THE USER OF THIS COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR THE SOLUTION OF AN ENGINEERING PROBLEM IS IN NO WAY RELIEVED OF HIS/HER RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CORRECTNESS OF THE SOLUTION

Run with file:-
"S:\W14129 - Banbury\Calculations\Traffic\Picady\Queens Way Junction\29102014\Queens Way Junction_AM JUBB_B.vpi" (drive-on-the-left) at 10:01:29 on Wednesday, 29 October 2014

## RUN INFORMATION

## ***************

```
RUN TITLE : Queens Way Junction
LOCATION : Banbury
DATE
    04/09/14
CLIENT
ENUMERATOR
JOB NUMBER
STATUS
W14129
STATUS : Preliminary
DESCRIPTION :
```

MAJor/MInor Junction capacity and delay
***************************************
INPUT DATA
MAJOR ROAD (ARM C) ----------------MAJOR ROAD (ARM A)

ARM A IS Bloxham Road (South)
ARM B IS Queens Way
ARM C IS Bloxham Road (North)
STREAM LABELLING CONVENTION
STREAM A-B CONTAINS TRAFFIC GOING FROM ARM A TO ARM B
ETC.



I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I
I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| $\mathbf{I} 787.00$ | 0.25 | 0.25 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA
-------------------------------------

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I

| I A I | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| I | $B$ | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2014 Base AM

TIME PERIOD BEGINS 08.00 AND ENDS 09.00
LENGTH OF TIME PERIOD - 60 MIN.
LENGTH OF TIME SEGMENT - 15 MIN DEMAND FLOW PROFILES ARE INPUT DIRECTLY


TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA

ARM A: FLOW IS 60.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

I ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT I


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET
2014 Base AM
```




| I | TIME | DEMAND | CAPACITY | DEMAND/ | PEDESTRIAN | START | END | DELAY | GEOMETRIC DELAY | AVERAGE DELAY | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | (VEH/MIN) | (VEH/MIN) | CAPACITY | FLOW | QUEUE | QUEUE | (VEH.MIN/ | (VEH.MIN/ | PER ARRIVING | I |
| I |  |  |  | (RFC) | (PEDS/MIN) | (VEHS) | (VEHS) | TIME SEGMENT) | TIME SEGMENT) | VEHICLE (MIN) | I |
| I | 08.45- | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | B-C | 4.89 | 6.91 | 0.707 |  | 2.30 | 2.33 | 34.7 |  | 0.49 | I |
| I | B-A | 4.68 | 5.45 | 0.860 |  | 5.19 | 5.38 | 79.4 |  | 1.22 | I |
| I | C-A | 6.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 2.45 | 9.67 | 0.253 |  | 0.34 | 0.34 | 5.1 |  | 0.14 | I |
| I | A-BC | 13.95 | 42.90 | 0.325 | 1.0 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 7.2 |  | 0.03 | I |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |


| QUEUE FOR | STREAM | M B-C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  | NO. OF |  |
| SEGMENT |  | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING |  | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 |  | 2.1 | ** |
| 08.30 |  | 2.2 | ** |
| 08.45 |  | 2.3 | ** |
| 09.00 |  | 2.3 | ** |
| QUEUE FOR | STREAM | M B-A |  |
| TIME |  | NO. OF |  |
| SEGMENT |  | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING |  | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 |  | 4.2 | **** |
| 08.30 |  | 4.9 | ***** |
| 08.45 |  | 5.2 | ***** |
| 09.00 |  | 5.4 | ***** |

QUEUE FOR STREAM C-B


## QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD

| QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | STREAM | I | TOTAL | DEMAND I | I | * QUEUE | ING | I | INCLUSI |  | JEIN | I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | * DELA |  | I | * |  |  | I |
| I |  | I- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I |  | I | (VEH) | (VEH/H) I | I | (MIN) | (MIN/VEH) | I | (MIN) |  | N/VE | I |
| I | B-C | I | 293.1 | I 293.1 I | I | 127.8 I | 0.44 | I | 128.2 | I | 0.44 | I |
| I | B-A | I | 281.1 | I 281.1 I | I | 271.0 I | 0.96 | I | 273.7 | I | 0.97 | I |
| I | C-A | I | 384.0 I | I 384.0 I | I |  |  | I |  | I |  | I |
| I | C-B | I | 147.0 I | I 147.0 I | I | 20.0 I | 0.14 | I | 20.0 | I | 0.14 | I |
| I | A-BC | I | 837.0 | I 837.0 I | I | 28.7 I | 0.03 | I | 28.7 | I | 0.03 | I |
| I | ALL | I | 1942.2 | I 1942.2 I | I | 447.5 I | 0.23 | I | 450.6 | I | 0.23 | I |
| * DELAY IS THAT OCCURRING ONLY WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD <br> * INCLUSIVE DELAY INCLUDES DELAY SUFFERED BY VEHICLES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHICH ARE STILL QUEUEING AFTER THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * THESE WILL ONLY BE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT IF THERE IS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A LARGE QUEUE REMAINING AT THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*******END OF RUN*******


## I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I

I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| I | 787.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA

|  |
| :---: |

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I
I A I 100 I

| I B | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2027 Base AM

TIME PERIOD BEGINS 08.00 AND ENDS 09.00
LENGTH OF TIME PERIOD - 60 MIN
LENGTH OF TIME SEGMENT - 15 MIN

DEMAND FLOW PROFILES ARE INPUT DIRECTLY


TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA

ARM A: FLOW IS 60.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

I ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT I


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET
2027 Base AM
```




| I | TIME | DEMAND | CAPACITY | DEMAND/ | PEDESTRIAN | START | END | DELAY | GEOMETRIC DELAY | AVERAGE DELA | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | (VEH/MIN) | (VEH/MIN) | CAPACITY | FLOW | QUEUE | QUEUE | (VEH.MIN/ | (VEH.MIN/ | PER ARRIVING | I |
| I |  |  |  | (RFC) | (PEDS/MIN) | (VEHS) | (VEHS) | TIME SEGMENT) | TIME SEGMENT) | VEHICLE (MIN) | I |
| I | 08.45- | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | B-C | 5.67 | 6.41 | 0.883 |  | 6.23 | 6.49 | 95.6 |  | 1.21 | I |
| I | B-A | 5.48 | 4.77 | 1.149 |  | 37.42 | 48.31 | 643.0 |  | 9.34 | I |
| I | C-A | 7.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 2.85 | 8.96 | 0.318 |  | 0.46 | 0.46 | 6.9 |  | 0.16 | I |
| I | A-BC | 16.82 | 42.90 | 0.392 | 1.0 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 9.7 |  | 0.04 | I |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |

QUEUE FOR STREAM B-C

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE | $* * * * *$ |
| 08.15 | 4.9 | $* * * * *$ |
| 08.30 | 5.8 | $* * * * *$ |
| 08.45 | 6.2 | $* * * * *$ |
| 09.00 | 6.5 |  |

QUEUE FOR STREAM B-A

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 | 14.9 | *************** |
| 08.30 | 26.4 | ************************* |
| 08.45 | 37.4 | ************************* |
| 09.00 | 48.3 | ****** |

QUEUE FOR STREAM C-B

| TIME |  | NO. OF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT |  | VEHICLES |
| ENDING |  | IN QUEUE |
| 08.15 |  | 0.5 |
| 08.30 |  | 0.5 |
| 08.45 |  | 0.5 |
| 09.00 |  | 0.5 |
| QUEUE FOR | STREAM | M A-BC |
| TIME |  | NO. OF |
| SEGMENT |  | VEHICLES |
| ENDING |  | IN QUEUE |
| 08.15 |  | 0.6 |
| 08.30 |  | 0.6 |
| 08.45 |  | 0.6 |
| 09.00 |  | 0.6 |

## QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD

 A LARGE QUEUE REMAINING AT THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD.
*******END OF RUN*******


## I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I

I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| I | 787.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA
----------------------------------

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I

| I | A | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | $B$ | I | 100 | I |


| $I$ | $B$ | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2027 Base AM + Dev

TIME PERIOD BEGINS 08.00 AND ENDS 09.00
LENGTH OF TIME PERIOD - 60 MIN
LENGTH OF TIME SEGMENT - 15 MIN DEMAND FLOW PROFILES ARE INPUT DIRECTLY


TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA

ARM A: FLOW IS 60.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

I ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT I


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET 2027 Base AM + Dev
AND FOR TIME PERIOD 1
```




| I | TIME | DEMAND | CAPACITY | DEMAND/ | PEDESTRIAN | START | END | DELAY | GEOMETRIC DELAY | AVERAGE DELAY | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | (VEH/MIN) | (VEH/MIN) | CAPACITY | FLOW | QUEUE | QUEUE | (VEH.MIN/ | (VEH.MIN/ | PER ARRIVING | I |
| I |  |  |  | (RFC) | (PEDS/MIN) | (VEHS) | (VEHS) | TIME SEGMENT) | TIME SEGMENT) | VEHICLE (MIN) | I |
| I | 08.45- | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | B-C | 5.67 | 5.94 | 0.953 |  | 10.56 | 11.59 | 166.5 |  | 2.17 | I |
| I | B-A | 6.01 | 4.07 | 1.477 |  | 89.18 | 118.33 | 1556.3 |  | 25.81 | I |
| I | C-A | 8.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 2.85 | 7.94 | 0.359 |  | 0.56 | 0.56 | 8.4 |  | 0.20 | I |
| I | A-BC | 20.95 | 42.90 | 0.488 | 1.0 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 14.3 |  | 0.05 | I |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |

## QUEUE FOR STREAM B-C

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 | 6.9 | $* * * * * *$ |
| 08.30 | 9.2 | $* * * * * * *$ |
| 08.45 | 10.6 | $* * * * * * * * *$ |
| 09.00 | 11.6 | $* * * * * * * * * *$ |

QUEUE FOR STREAM B-A

| TIME | NO. OF |
| :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |
| 08.15 | 30.8 |
| 08.30 | 60.0 |
| 08.45 | 89.2 |
| 09.00 | 118.3 |

QUEUE FOR STREAM C-B

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 | 0.5 | * |
| 08.30 | 0.6 | $*$ |
| 08.45 | 0.6 | $*$ |
| 09.00 | 0.6 | $*$ |

QUEUE FOR STREAM A-BC

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 08.15 | 0.9 | $*$ |
| 08.30 | 1.0 | $*$ |
| 08.45 | 1.0 | $*$ |
| 09.00 | 1.0 | $*$ |

## QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD

| I | STREAM | I | TOTAL | DEMAND | I | * QUEUEING * |  |  | I | INCLUSIVE QUEUEING * I |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | * DELAY |  | * | I | * DE |  |  | I |
| I |  | I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I |  | I | (VEH) | (VEH/H) | I | (MIN) |  | (MIN/VEH) | I | (MIN) |  | (MIN/VEH) | I |
| I | B-C | I | 339.9 | I 339.9 | I | 508.8 | 1 | 1.50 | I | 520.1 | I | 1.53 | I |
| I | B-A | I | 360.9 | I 360.9 | I | 3597.3 |  | 9.97 | I | 5316.6 | I | 14.73 | I |
| I | C-A | I | 493.9 | I 493.9 | I |  | I |  | I |  | I |  | I |
| I | C-B | I | 170.9 | I 170.9 | I | 32.7 | I | 0.19 | I | 32.7 | I | 0.19 | I |
| I | A-BC | I | 1257.0 | I 1257.0 | I | 56.7 | I | 0.05 | I | 56.7 | I | 0.05 | I |
| I | ALL | I | 2622.6 | I 2622.6 | I | 4195.6 | I | 1.60 | I | 5926.2 | I | 2.26 | I |

* DELAY IS THAT OCCURRING ONLY WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD * INCLUSIVE DELAY INCLUDES DELAY SUFFERED BY VEHICLES WHICH ARE STILL QUEUEING AFTER THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD * THESE WILL ONLY BE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT IF THERE IS

A LARGE QUEUE REMAINING AT THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD.
***END OF RUN*******

TRL LIMITED
(C) COPYRIGHT 2010

## CAPACITIES, QUEUES, AND DELAYS AT 3 OR 4-ARM MAJOR/MINOR PRIORITY JUNCTIONS

PICADY 5.1 ANALYSIS PROGRAM
RELEASE 5.0 (JUNE 2010)
ADAPTED FROM PICADY/3 WHICH IS CROWN COPYRIGHT
BY PERMISSION OF THE CONTROLLER OF HMSO

FOR SALES AND DISTRIBUTION INFORMATION,
PROGRAM ADVICE AND MAINTENANCE CONTACT TRL SOFTWARE SALES
TEL: CROWTHORNE (01344) 770758, FAX: 770356 EMAIL: software@trl.co.uk

THE USER OF THIS COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR THE SOLUTION OF AN ENGINEERING PROBLEM IS IN NO WAY RELIEVED OF HIS/HER RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE CORRECTNESS OF THE SOLUTION

Run with file:-
"S:\W14129 - Banbury\Calculations\Traffic\Picady\Queens Way Junction\29102014\Queens Way Junction_PM JUBB_B.vpi" (drive-on-the-left) at 09:58:52 on Wednesday, 29 October 2014

## RUN INFORMATION

## ***************

```
RUN TITLE : Queens Way Junction
LOCATION : Banbury
DATE
    04/09/14
CLIENT
ENUMERATOR
JOB NUMBER
STATUS
W14129
STATUS : Preliminary
DESCRIPTION :
```

MAJor/MInor Junction capacity and delay
***************************************
INPUT DATA
MAJOR ROAD (ARM C) -------------------MAJOR ROAD (ARM A)

ARM A IS Bloxham Road (South)
ARM B IS Queens Way
ARM C IS Bloxham Road (North)
STREAM LABELLING CONVENTION
STREAM A-B CONTAINS TRAFFIC GOING FROM ARM A TO ARM B
ETC.



I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I
I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| $\mathbf{I} 787.00$ | 0.25 | 0.25 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA
------------------------------------

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I

| I A I | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| I | $B$ | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2027 Base PM

TIME PERIOD BEGINS 17.00 AND ENDS 18.00
LENGTH OF TIME PERIOD - 60 MIN.
LENGTH OF TIME SEGMENT - 15 MIN DEMAND FLOW PROFILES ARE INPUT DIRECTLY


TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA
ARM A: FLOW IS 30.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT I


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET 2027 Base PM
AND FOR TIME PERIOD 1
```




| I | TIME | DEMAND | CAPACITY | DEMAND/ | PEDESTRIAN | START | END | DELAY | GEOMETRIC DELAY | AVERAGE DELAY | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | (VEH/MIN) | (VEH/MIN) | CAPACITY | FLOW | QUEUE | QUEUE | (VEH.MIN/ | (VEH.MIN/ | PER ARRIVING | I |
| I |  |  |  | (RFC) | (PEDS/MIN) | (VEHS) | (VEHS) | TIME SEGMENT) | TIME SEGMENT) | VEHICLE (MIN) | 1 |
| I | 17.45-1 | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | B-C | 4.87 | 6.88 | 0.708 |  | 2.33 | 2.36 | 35.2 |  | 0.50 | I |
| I | B-A | 5.48 | 4.45 | 1.232 |  | 50.09 | 65.68 | 868.3 |  | 13.35 | I |
| I | C-A | 9.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 5.12 | 9.53 | 0.537 |  | 1.15 | 1.15 | 17.2 |  | 0.23 | I |
| I | A-BC | 14.53 | 44.17 | 0.329 | 0.5 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 7.3 |  | 0.03 | I |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |


| QUEUE FOR STREAM B-C |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME No | NO. OF |  |
| SEGMENT V | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING I | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 2.2 | ** |
| 17.30 | 2.3 | ** |
| 17.45 | 2.3 | * |
| 18.00 | 2.4 | ** |
| QUEUE FOR STREAM | M B-A |  |
| TIME No | NO. OF |  |
| SEGMENT V | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING I | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 18.5 | ******************* |
| 17.30 | 34.4 | **** |
| 17.45 | 50.1 | ** |
| 18.00 | 65.7 |  |


| QUEUE FOR | AM C-B |
| :---: | :---: |
| TIME | NO. OF |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |
| 17.15 | 1.1 |
| 17.30 | 1.1 |
| 17.45 | 1.1 |
| 18.00 | 1.2 |

QUEUE FOR STREAM A-BC

| TIME | NO. OF |
| :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |
| 17.15 | 0.5 |
| 17.30 | 0.5 |
| 17.45 | 0.5 |
| 18.00 | 0.5 |

## QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD


*******END OF RUN*******


## I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I

I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| I | 787.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I |  |  |  |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA
---------------------------------

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I

| I | A | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | $B$ | I | 100 | I |


| $I$ | $B$ | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2014 Base PM


TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA

ARM A: FLOW IS 30.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

I ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT I


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET
2014 Base PM
```




| I | TIME | DEMAND | CAPACITY | DEMAND/ | PEDESTRIAN | START | END | DELAY | GEOMETRIC DELAY | AVERAGE DELAY | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | (VEH/MIN) | (VEH/MIN) | CAPACITY | FLOW | QUEUE | QUEUE | (VEH.MIN/ | (VEH.MIN/ | PER ARRIVING | I |
| I |  |  |  | (RFC) | (PEDS/MIN) | (VEHS) | (VEHS) | TIME SEGMENT) | TIME SEGMENT) | VEHICLE (MIN) | I |
| I | 17.45-1 | . 00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | B-C | 4.17 | 7.22 | 0.577 |  | 1.33 | 1.34 | 20.0 |  | 0.33 | I |
| I | B-A | 4.53 | 5.17 | 0.878 |  | 5.77 | 6.04 | 88.7 |  | 1.42 | I |
| I | C-A | 7.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 4.38 | 10.09 | 0.435 |  | 0.76 | 0.76 | 11.5 |  | 0.18 | I |
| I | A-BC | 12.25 | 44.17 | 0.277 | 0.5 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 5.8 |  | 0.03 | I |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |



QUEUE FOR STREAM C-B

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 0.8 | $*$ |
| 17.30 | 0.8 | $*$ |
| 17.45 | 0.8 | $*$ |
| 18.00 | 0.8 | $*$ |

QUEUE FOR STREAM A-BC
TIME
SEGMENT VEHICLES
ENDING IN QUEUE
$17.15 \quad 0.4$
$17.30 \quad 0.4$
$17.45 \quad 0.4$
$18.00 \quad 0.4$

## QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD

| QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | STREAM | I | TOTAL | DEMAND I | I | * QUEUE | NG | I | INCLUSIV |  | JEING | I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | * DELA |  | I | * |  |  | I |
| I |  | I- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I |  | I | (VEH) | (VEH/H) I | I | (MIN) | (MIN/VEH) | I | (MIN) |  | N/VE | I |
| I | B-C | I | 250.0 | I 250.0 I | I | 75.7 I | 0.30 | I | 75.8 | I | 0.30 | I |
| I | B-A | I | 272.0 | I 272.0 I | I | 296.5 I | 1.09 | I | 300.0 | I | 1.10 | I |
| I | C-A | I | 473.1 | I 473.1 I | I |  |  | I |  | I |  | I |
| I | C-B | I | 263.1 | I 263.1 I | I | 44.9 I | 0.17 | I | 44.9 | I | 0.17 | I |
| I | A-BC | I | 735.0 | I 735.0 I | I | 22.9 I | 0.03 | I | 22.9 | I | 0.03 | I |
| I | ALL | I | 1993.2 | I 1993.2 I | I | 439.9 I | 0.22 | I | 443.6 | I | 0.22 | I |
| * DELAY IS THAT OCCURRING ONLY WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHICH ARE STILL QUEUEING AFTER THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * THESE WILL ONLY BE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT IF THERE IS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A LARGE QUEUE REMAINING AT THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*******END OF RUN*******


## I Intercept For Slope For Opposing Slope For Opposing I

I STREAM C-B STREAM A-C STREAM A-B I

| I | 787.00 | 0.25 | 0.25 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(NB These values do not allow for any site specific corrections)

TRAFFIC DEMAND DATA
----------------------------------

I ARM I FLOW SCALE(\%) I

| I | A | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I | $B$ | I | 100 | I |


| I | I | 100 | I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Demand set: 2027 Base PM +Dev

TIME PERIOD BEGINS 17.00 AND ENDS 18.00
LENGTH OF TIME PERIOD - 60 MIN
LENGTH OF TIME SEGMENT - 15 MIN

DEMAND FLOW PROFILES ARE INPUT DIRECTLY

|  | nd set: | 2027 Base PM +Dev |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I |  | I | TURNING PROPORTIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  | I | TURNING COUNTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  | I | (PERCENTAGE OF H.V.S) I |  |  |  |  |  |
| I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | TIME | I | FROM/TO |  | I | ARM A I | ARM B I ARM C I |  |
| I | 17.00-18.00 | I |  |  | I | I | I | I |
| I |  | I | ARM | A | I | 0.000 I | 0.601 I | 0.399 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | 0.0 I | 586.0 I | 389.0 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | I | I | I |
| I |  | I | ARM | B | I | 0.585 I | 0.000 I | 0.415 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | 412.0 I | 0.0 I | 292.0 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | I | I | I |
| I |  | I | ARM | C | I | 0.699 I | 0.301 I | 0.000 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | 712.0 I | 307.0 I | 0.0 I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I | ( 0.0)I |
| I |  | I |  |  | I | I | I |  |

TURNING PROPORTIONS ARE CALCULATED FROM TURNING COUNT DATA THE PERCENTAGE OF HEAVY VEHICLES VARIES OVER TURNING MOVEMENTS

## PEDESTRIAN CROSSING DATA

ARM A: FLOW IS 30.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 1
ARM A: FLOW IS 0.0 PEDESTRIANS PER HOUR AND IS CONSTANT THROUGHOUT PERIOD 2

ARM I LENGTH OF CROSSING I QUEUEING SPACE BETWEEN I QUEUEING SPACE WITHOUT


QUEUE AND DELAY INFORMATION FOR EACH 15 MIN TIME SEGMENT

```
FOR DEMAND SET 2027 Base PM +Dev
```

AND FOR TIME PERIOD 1



| I I I | TIME | DEMAND (VEH/MIN) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAPACITY } \\ & \text { (VEH/MIN) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DEMAND/ } \\ \text { CAPACITY } \\ \text { (RFC) } \end{gathered}$ | PEDESTRIAN FLOW (PEDS/MIN) | START <br> (VEHS) | END QUEUE (VEHS) | DELAY (VEH.MIN/ TIME SEGMENT) | GEOMETRIC DELAY <br> (VEH.MIN/ <br> time Segment) | AVERAGE DELAY PER ARRIVING VEHICLE (MIN) | I I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 17.45-18.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | B-C | 4.87 | 6.70 | 0.726 |  | 2.54 | 2.56 | 38.3 |  | 0.54 | I |
| I | B-A | 6.86 | 3.93 | 1.749 |  | 133.15 | 177.24 | 2328.0 |  | 39.80 | I |
| I | C-A | 11.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | I |
| I | C-B | 5.12 | 9.10 | 0.562 |  | 1.27 | 1.27 | 19.0 |  | 0.25 | 1 |
| I | A-BC | 16.25 | 44.17 | 0.368 | 0.5 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 8.7 |  | 0.04 | I |

## QUEUE FOR STREAM B-C

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 2.4 | $* *$ |
| 17.30 | 2.5 | $* *$ |
| 17.45 | 2.5 | $* *$ |
| 18.00 | 2.6 | $* *$ |

QUEUE FOR STREAM B-A

| TIME | NO. OF |
| :---: | :---: |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |
| 17.15 | 44.9 |
| 17.30 | 89.1 |
| 17.45 | 133.1 |
| 18.00 | 177.2 |

QUEUE FOR STREAM C-B

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 1.2 | * |
| 17.30 | 1.3 | $*$ |
| 17.45 | 1.3 | $*$ |
| 18.00 | 1.3 | $*$ |

QUEUE FOR STREAM A-BC

| TIME | NO. OF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| SEGMENT | VEHICLES |  |
| ENDING | IN QUEUE |  |
| 17.15 | 0.6 | * |
| 17.30 | 0.6 | $*$ |
| 17.45 | 0.6 | $*$ |
| 18.00 | 0.6 | $*$ |

QUEUEING DELAY INFORMATION OVER WHOLE PERIOD


* DELAY IS THAT OCCURRING ONLY WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD * INCLUSIVE DELAY INCLUDES DELAY SUFFERED BY VEHICLES WHICH ARE STILL QUEUEING AFTER THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD * THESE WILL ONLY BE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT IF THERE IS

A LARGE QUEUE REMAINING AT THE END OF THE TIME PERIOD.
***END OF RUN*******

Full Results Summary
Full Results Summary

## User and Project Details

| Project: | W14129 - Banbury |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title: | Proposed Signalised Queensway Junction |
| Location: | Banbury |
| File name: | Bloxham Road - Queensway Proposed JUBB (AK Review).Isg3x |
| Author: | SR |
| Company: | Jubb |
| Address: |  |
| Notes: |  |



## Stage Diagram



Phase Intergreens Matrix


Scenario 1: '2027 AM Base + DEV' (FG1: 'Year 2027 Base AM Peak + Dev', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1') Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

| Origin | Destination |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A | B | C | Tot. |
|  | A | 0 | 572 | 685 | 1257 |
|  | B | 361 | 0 | 340 | 701 |
|  | C | 494 | 171 | 0 | 665 |
|  | Tot. | 855 | 743 | 1025 | 2623 |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results




Scenario 2: '2027 PM Base + DEV' (FG2: 'Year 2027 Base PM Peak + Dev', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1') Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin |  | A | B | C | Tot. |  |
|  | A | 0 | 586 | 389 | 975 |  |
|  | B | 412 | 0 | 292 | 704 |  |
|  | C | 712 | 307 | 0 | 1019 |  |
|  | Tot. | 1124 | 893 | 681 | 2698 |  |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results




Scenario 3: '2027 AM Base + DEV + Barwood' (FG3: 'Year 2027 Base + Dev + Others AM Peak', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')
Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin |  | A | B | C | Tot. |  |
|  | A | 0 | 630 | 734 | 1364 |  |
|  | B | 382 | 0 | 340 | 722 |  |
|  | C | 515 | 171 | 0 | 686 |  |
|  | Tot. | 897 | 801 | 1074 | 2772 |  |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results




Scenario 4: '2027 PM Base + DEV + Barwood' (FG4: 'Year 2027 Base + Dev + Others PM Peak', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1')
Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin |  | A | B | C | Tot. |  |
|  | A | 0 | 625 | 410 | 1035 |  |
|  | B | 455 | 0 | 292 | 747 |  |
|  | C | 767 | 307 | 0 | 1074 |  |
|  | Tot. | 1222 | 932 | 702 | 2856 |  |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results




Scenario 5: '2027 + Local Plan AM Peak' (FG5: 'Year 2027 Base + Local Plan', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1') Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin |  | A | B | C | Tot. |  |
|  | A | 0 | 604 | 703 | 1307 |  |
|  | B | 373 | 0 | 340 | 713 |  |
|  | C | 502 | 171 | 0 | 673 |  |
|  | Tot. | 875 | 775 | 1043 | 2693 |  |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg Sat <br> (\%) | Turners In Gaps (pcu) | Turners When Unopposed (pcu) | Turners In Intergreen (pcu) | Total Delay (pcuHr) | Av. <br> Delay <br> Per PCU <br> (s/pcu) | Mean Max Queue (pcu) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 89.9\% | 5 | 96 | 60 | 32.0 | - | - |
| Bloxham Road / Queens Way | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 89.9\% | 5 | 96 | 60 | 32.0 | - | - |
| 1/2+1/1 | Bloxham Road South Left Ahead | U | A |  | 1 | 72 | - | 1307 | 2130:1809 | 1453 | 89.9\% | - | - | - | 9.8 | 27.1 | 30.3 |
| 3/1 | Queens Way Left | U | C |  | 1 | 32 | - | 340 | 1709 | 470 | 72.3\% | - | - | - | 5.0 | 53.0 | 11.5 |
| 3/2 | Queens Way Right | U | B |  | 1 | 27 | - | 373 | 1828 | 427 | 87.4\% | - | - | - | 7.7 | 74.4 | 15.0 |
| 5/1+5/2 | Bloxham Road North Ahead Right | U+O | D | 1 | 1 | 48 | 8 | 673 | 1965:1914 | 810 | 83.1\% | 5 | 96 | 60 | 9.5 | 50.7 | 17.9 |
| C1 |  |  |  |  | RC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32.01 \\ & 32.01 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 120 |  |  |  |  |



Scenario 6: '2027 + Local Plan PM Peak' (FG6: 'Year 2027 Base + Local Plan', Plan 1: 'Network Control Plan 1') Traffic Flows, Actual
Actual Flow :

|  | Destination |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin |  | A | B | C | Tot. |  |
|  | A | 0 | 605 | 397 | 1002 |  |
|  | B | 436 | 0 | 292 | 728 |  |
|  | C | 732 | 307 | 0 | 1039 |  |
|  | Tot. | 1168 | 912 | 689 | 2769 |  |

Full Results Summary

## Network Results

| Item | Lane Description | Lane Type | Full Phase | Arrow Phase | Num Greens | Total Green <br> (s) | Arrow Green (s) | Demand <br> Flow <br> (pcu) | Sat Flow (pcu/Hr) | Capacity (pcu) | Deg Sat <br> (\%) | Turners In Gaps (pcu) | Turners When Unopposed (pcu) | Turners In Intergreen (pcu) | Total Delay (pcuHr) | Av. <br> Delay <br> Per PCU <br> (s/pcu) | Mean Max Queue (pcu) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 89.4\% | 50 | 223 | 34 | 32.7 | - | - |
| Bloxham Road / Queens Way | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 89.4\% | 50 | 223 | 34 | 32.7 | - | - |
| 1/2+1/1 | Bloxham Road South Left Ahead | U | A |  | 1 | 60 | - | 1002 | 2130:1809 | 1137 | 88.2\% | - | - | - | 9.7 | 35.0 | 26.0 |
| 3/1 | Queens Way Left | U | C |  | 1 | 44 | - | 292 | 1709 | 641 | 45.6\% | - | - | - | 2.7 | 33.4 | 7.7 |
| 3/2 | Queens Way Right | U | B |  | 1 | 31 | - | 436 | 1828 | 487 | 89.4\% | - | - | - | 8.8 | 73.0 | 17.6 |
| 5/1+5/2 | Bloxham Road North Ahead Right | U+O | D | 1 | 1 | 67 | 16 | 1039 | 1965:1914 | 1187 | 87.6\% | 50 | 223 | 34 | 11.4 | 39.5 | 27.1 |
| C1 |  |  |  |  | RC for Signalled Lanes (\%): PRC Over All Lanes (\%): |  |  | Total Delay for Signalled Lanes (pcuHr): Total Delay Over All Lanes(pcuHr): |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32.70 \\ & 32.70 \end{aligned}$ | Cycle Time (s): 120 |  |  |  |  |




[^0]:    On main carriageway

[^1]:    On main carriageway

[^2]:    » Existing Layout - 2014 Base, AM
    » Existing Layout - 2014 Base, PM
    » Existing Layout - 2027 Base (with Committed Dev), AM
    » Existing Layout - 2027 Base (with Committed Dev), PM
    » Existing Layout - 2027 + Dev Traffic, AM
    » Existing Layout - 2027 + Dev Traffic, PM

[^3]:    Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

[^4]:    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.

[^5]:    Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

[^6]:    Geometries for Arm C are measured opposite Arm B. Geometries for Arm A (if relevant) are measured opposite Arm D.

