Subject: Re: crossing of 2 continuous tracks
Posted by Matthias Hengartner on Wed, 09 Feb 2005 10:37:43 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,

> Well, what I don't like about the first solution is the flood of
> <connection>-elements which are provoked. Theoretically they are not
> neccessary, since no track starts or end at a crossing. It's just that
> accidently two tracks share the same physical position.
> So what if we just declare this physical point? I could be similar to
> the following code (let's call it "Version 3"):

I partly agree with you. But: For a "simple" <switch> we have 2
<connection>-elements, so it would be not so farfetched if we have 4
<connection>s for a double-switch-crossing. Nevertheless I agree with you
that it's not necessary to have redundant and partially useless elements and
data just for purposes of datastructure consistency...

>
> <track1>
>   <crossing pos="InsertRelativePositionOnTrack1Here" crossingTrackId="2"
>   crossingLineID="42"
>   crossingTrackPos="InsertRelativePositionOnTrack2Here"/>
> </track1>
>
> <track2>
>   <crossing pos="InsertRelativePositionOnTrack2Here" crossingTrackId="1"
>   crossingLineID="42"
>   crossingTrackPos="InsertRelativePositionOnTrack1Here"/>
> </track2>
>
> Additionally, we could introduce a kind of "length"-attribute for the
> crossing. Thus, a collision of two trains at a crossing could be
> detected (very much like a level crossing).

This version would be nice for simple-crossings, but for switch-crossings it
would be useful (or even necessary) to have the possibilities + attributes
of <connection>-elements.

How about combining versions 2&3?
We could use <connection>-elements for switch-crossings and do without them
for single-crossings. And we could introduce some/all of the proposed
attributes in version 3 for single crossings.

Best regards,
Matthias


```
***************************
```

Matthias Hengartner

hengartner@ivt.baug.ethz.ch
++ 41 1 633 68 16
```
***************************
```