

GG 119 Road Safety Audit Response Report

Project Details

(To be completed by Design Organisation)

The scheme submitted for Audit is the Lidl A69 Warwick Road, Carlisle Improvements. The Development is a proposed new Lidl store which will be approximately 1,256m², whilst the total GIA of the proposed store is 1,900m² which includes the warehouse and ancillary areas. Vehicular access to the store is proposed via a new signal junction at the Warwick Road / Victoria Road junction. As part of the proposals, the site access with Warwick Road and Victoria Road will provide designated signalised pedestrian crossing facilities.

1.0 Project Details *(To be completed by Design Organisation)*

Report Title	<i>Land at, Transvaal Terrace/Carlinghow Hill, Batley, WF17 0AA</i>	Stage of RSA	Stage 1
Date	<i>03/02/2020</i>	Scheme Ref No.	<i>16-1112</i>
Prepared By	Cora IHT	On behalf of:	Kirklees (Overseeing Organisation)

2.0 Authorisation Sheet *(To be completed by Design Organisation)*

Prepared By		Approved By (If Applicable)	
Name	<i>Garry Eyres</i>	Name	<i>Toan Chau</i>
Position	<i>Associate Highway Design Engineer</i>	Position	<i>Director</i>
Signed	<i>Gary Eyres</i>	Signed	<i>Toan Chau</i>
Organisation	Cora IHT	Organisation	Cora IHT
Date	<i>03/02/2020</i>	Date	<i>03/02/2020</i>

3.0 Key Personnel *(To be completed by Design Organisation)*

Overseeing Organisation	Cumbria County Council (Cora IHT to provide RSA Report and Designers Response Report to LA as requirement of Planning application)	
Road Safety Audit Team	<i>Martin Whittaker FIHE MSORSA</i>	<i>Elizabeth Green BEng Msc CEng MICE FCIHT</i>
Design Organisation	Cora IHT <i>Garry Eyres</i>	

GG 119 Road Safety Audit - Decision Log

INFORMATION NOTE:

STEP 1 - (1), (2) & (3) to be completed by Design Organisation (DO). Form then to be returned to Overseeing Organisation (OO), copying in the RSA Team (see contact details in Audit Report);

STEP 2 - (4) & (5) to be completed by OO and OO to sign (7), following any discussions required between the DO & OO. Form then returned to DO, by OO, for Signature; and

STEP 3 - DO sign (6) and return fully complete form to OO, copying in the RSA Team (see contact details on Audit Brief).

(1) RSA Problem	(2) RSA recommendation	(3) Design Organisation Response (see also Note 1)	(4) Overseeing Organisation Response	(5) Agreed RSA Action
<p>Problem No 1: Existing boundary walls and vegetation restrict visibility and increases the potential for a collision between a vehicle emerging from the development and traffic travelling along Carlinghow Hill.</p> <p>Location: Apartment access.</p> <p>Summary: Junction visibility splays at the secondary access serving the apartments are not indicated on the drawings provided and no vehicle speed data has been supplied to the Road Safety Audit Team. However, the existing boundary walls and vegetation to either side of the junction restrict visibility in both directions as shown within the images below. Insufficient junction visibility could lead to a collision between a vehicle emerging from the development and those travelling along Carlinghow Hill.</p>	<p>Recommendation: It is recommended that the current level of visibility is compared against the recommended level of visibility, applying Manual for Streets guidance, based on the results of a vehicle speed survey. Should the level of visibility prove to be substandard, it is recommended that the existing boundary wall and vegetation is removed and set to the rear of the visibility splay or access to the front of the apartments is taken via Transvaal Terrace to enable this access to be permanently closed.</p>	<p>Accepted Carlinghow Hill entrance for access only, with egress from the Transvaal Terrace junction.</p>		

Problem No 2: The proposed turning facilities could result in the potential for a collision between a turning service vehicle and other road users.

Location: Proposed turning facilities.

Summary: The Transport Statement includes an extract of a swept path analysis using a 10m rigid vehicle turning within the apartment car park and the turning facility at the head of the cul-de-sac. Firstly, it is noted that the swept path analysis has been undertaken on an alternative layout fronting the apartments, which does not include 9 proposed car parking spaces, thereby reducing the available space. The swept path analysis has also been undertaken using a 10m rigid vehicle rather than a standard Kirklees refuse vehicle which is 11.85m in length. Based on the tracking exercise undertaken (which is not to a scale) it appears unlikely that this size of vehicle can enter and exit the development in a forward gear, leading to potential overrunning of driveways/margins/parking spaces or excessive reverse distances in conflict with other road users.

Recommendation: It is recommended that a swept path analysis of the proposed turning facilities is undertaken using a large refuse vehicle (specification included within the Kirklees Highway Design Guide SPD) and the turning areas are amended accordingly.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that consistent 2.0m wide footways

Disagree. The tracking in the TA has been superseded by tracking using 12m refuse vehicles submitting during the post submission consultation with Kirklees. These has now been agreed.

Disagree: As these footways are existing, 1.2m

<p>Problem No 3: <i>The footway provision may lead to pedestrians stepping out into the carriageway.</i></p> <p>Location: <i>Internal access road.</i></p> <p>Summary: <i>The initial circa 120m length of Transvaal Terrace is laid out as a traditional estate road with footways to both flanks. Beyond this a shared surface is provided serving the rear portion of the development. The existing footways over the initial length of Transvaal Terrace are approximately 2.0m wide between Carlinghow Hill and the apartment access, however beyond this point the footways vary in width between circa 1.2m and 2.0m fronting the new properties and rear apartment car park. A 2.0m wide footway is generally regarded as the minimum unobstructed widths for pedestrians. A footway width below 1.5m is insufficient to accommodate a wheelchair user/pram and a pedestrian side by side and therefore could result in pedestrians discharging into carriageway when passing, resulting in the potential conflict with oncoming road users.</i></p>	<p><i>are provided to both flanks of the proposed access road.</i></p>	<p><i>footways are accepted within Manual for Streets as minimum widths for pedestrians.</i></p>		

On behalf of the Design Organisation I certify that:

- (1) *the RSA actions identified in the response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.*

Name:	<i>Toan Chau</i>	Signed:	<i>Toan Chau</i>	Date:	<i>02/02/2020</i>
Position:	<i>Director</i>	Organisation:	Cora IHT		

(7) OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENT - To be completed ONLY when RSA Action is agreed and boxes (4) &(5) above are complete.

On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation I certify that:

- (1) *the RSA actions identified in the response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Design Organisation; and*
(2) *the agreed RSA actions will be progressed.*

Name:		Signed:		Date:	
Position:		Organisation:	Kirklees Council		

Note 1 – Advice (for the information of the Design Organisation) when responding to the Report in accordance with the requirements of GG 119. The Design Organisation shall, for each RSA problem and recommendation, do one of the following.

Response	Scenario
Accepted	Accept the RSA problem and recommendation made by the RSA Team.
Accepted – but with alternative solution	Accept the RSA problem raised, but suggest an alternative solution, giving appropriate reasoning.
Disagree	Disagree with the RSA problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both.