



DESIGNERS RESPONSE TO STAGE 1 AND 2 RSA

DATE:	31 st May 2023	CONFIDENTIALITY:	Restricted
SUBJECT:	Whitechapel Road PROWs, Cleckheaton– Designers Response		
PROJECT:	PROW, Whitechapel Road, Cleckheaton	AUTHOR:	N Smith
CHECKED:	D Bowker	APPROVED:	D Bowker

F1. PROJECT DETAILS

Report Title:	Whitechapel Road PROWs, Cleckheaton– Designers Response	
Date:	31/05/2023	
Document reference and revision:	H8040-004_Document – Engineering_AFU_._ PROW Combined Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit Phase 2– Designers Response _P01	P01
Prepared by:	N Smith	
On behalf of:	BDW Homes, West Yorkshire	



AUTHORISATION SHEET

Project:	Whitechapel Road, Cleckheaton
Report title:	Whitechapel Road PROWs, Cleckheaton – Designers Response
Prepared by:	
Name:	N Smith
Position:	Associate
Signed:	
Organisation:	WSP
Date:	
Approved By:	
Name:	D Bowker
Position:	Associate Director
Signed:	
Organisation:	WSP
Date:	



F2. INTRODUCTION

This report contains the designers' responses to the comments made within report 'Wadsworth Gardens PROWs, Cleckheaton' (ref: 22152), prepared May 2023 by Chris Yarrow at Via Solutions. The response is provided in respect of the public right of way diversion at the above site which interface with proposed S38 highways associated with the development.

The document has been set out with text shown in black being taken directly from the Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit. The responses in red are the designers' responses to each comment made by the audit team.

F3. KEY PERSONNEL

Overseeing Organisation:	Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council
RSA Team:	Via Solutions (Independent to Design Team)
Design Organisation:	WSP (Independent to RSA Team)



F4. ITEMS RAISED AT THIS STAGE 1 AND 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

2 LOCAL ALIGNMENT

PROBLEM 2.1 within report

LOCATION Adjacent to bottom of proposed ramp (plots 28 / 29)

SUMMARY Visibility for pedestrians crossing Road 1

Summary: No visibility splays shown on the drawings for pedestrians crossing Road 1 adjacent to the bottom of the proposed ramp in the new PROW near plots 28 / 29. It is unclear whether adjacent boundary treatments / retaining wall parapet would obstruct splays placing pedestrians in danger.

No visibility splays are shown on the drawings for pedestrians using the proposed crossing location for the new PROW adjacent to the bottom of the ramp near plots 28 / 29. Pedestrians crossing from south to north after emerging from the ramp would have to look left over the retaining wall to view oncoming traffic. It is not clear whether the height of this wall relative to the vertical alignment of Road 1 would prevent a pedestrian from observing an approaching vehicle and vice versa.

For pedestrians crossing at the same location but from north to south, it is not clear whether there is sufficient visibility afforded to a pedestrian within the proposed highway of vehicles approaching from the north and vice versa without cutting across into private garden areas where planting might obstruct their view.

Failure to provide adequate visibility for pedestrians to judge whether it is safe to cross a carriageway could lead to collisions.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the drawings be amended to show that adequate visibility can be achieved at this crossing point for pedestrians and boundaries / treatments be designed so as to avoid them being obstructed

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

Forward visibility splays for vehicles travelling north and south on Road 1 looking towards the ramp exit / road crossing point now shown on drawings. These indicate that adequate visibility can be provided to drivers and splays are contained within the public highway.

At the exit to the ramp a flat 2.0m long plateau has been provided prior to the Road 4 footpath. This allow unobstructed views for the 2 x 2m pedestrian visibility splay.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

AGREED RSA ACTION:



PROBLEM 2.2 within REPORT

LOCATION Off Road 1 opposite plots 28 / 29

SUMMARY Design of Proposed Ramp

The design of the proposed ramp does not fully address usage by vulnerable users with mobility difficulties. There are no measures proposed for aiding people with vision or mobility deficiencies. These issues could result in potential injuries to such users.

The proposed ramp is located just off Road 1 opposite plots 28 / 29. It will link the higher level of the existing PROW down to the new road level.

The design of the proposed ramp has gradients of 1 in 15 between platforms of 1.2m in length and will be 2m wide. The proposed alignment will place users some 1.8 – 2.0m above the proposed levels of the adjacent highway on a sharp bend in the ramp with no indication to people with vision deficiencies of a safe edge / boundary to follow or provision of hand rails or edge restraints / boundary treatments.

The proposed landings also appear to be quite short particularly for those in wheelchairs or pushing perambulators.

Therefore, the ramp as proposed may cause safety issues for users with mobility or vision deficiencies.

The Audit Team has also examined the gradients elsewhere along the proposed diversion routes of the PROW and have no comments to make.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the ramp design be reviewed against current good practice guidance and drawings be amended to provide people with vision deficiencies guidance in its use and route and protection from the level difference and adequate landing lengths for wheelchair users and those with perambulators

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

For wheelchair users or people pushing wheelchairs alternative routes to reach the footpath where the PROW ramp exits are provided. These are from the east via the multi-modal route which connects through to opposite No. 97 Whitechapel Road or the proposed site footway on Road 1 accessed from the main development site entrance (30m west of the PROW access off Whitechapel Road). The reduced width of the PROW on the initial section from Whitechapel Road (unamended by these proposals) will also preclude wheelchairs and therefore these alternative access routes are most suitable with also being at lower gradient (no less than 1:20).

The design has been revised to include a handrail on the ramped (1:15) section of the PROW to assist people with vision deficiencies. Tactile pavers at the exit to the ramp have now been included to direct users to the formal crossing point on Road 1.

It has not been possible to provide a ramp with increased platform widths or reduced gradients due to the space and alignment constraints on the route. The 1:15 gradient was agreed with the PROW Officer.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

AGREED RSA ACTION:



PROBLEM 4.2.1 within Report

LOCATION Location: Adjacent to bottom of proposed ramp (plots 28 / 29)

SUMMARY Location of crossing point of Road 1

The location of this crossing point is not clear to approaching drivers.

The location of this crossing point on a tight bend is not readily apparent to approaching drivers and the latter might be taken by surprise if say a group of walkers suddenly emerged from the ramp and needed to cross the road.

The above deficiencies could result in collisions with pedestrians crossing at less safe locations.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the presence of the crossing point is highlighted by either the provision of a different colour / texture of road surface and / or placed on a flat top speed hump

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

The PROW alignment and crossing point has been selected to follow as close as possible the existing alignment in agreement with the PROW officer. The crossing point is visible to drivers approaching in both directions as indicated by visibility splays shown on revised drawings. A guard rail has been provided to direct pedestrians from the bottom of the ramp to the defined tactile dropped crossing points to avoid informal crossings.

Therefore provision of different surfacing or speed ramp is not considered necessary.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

AGREED RSA ACTION:



PROBLEM 4.2.2 within Report

LOCATION Location: Road 1 adjacent to Plot 111

SUMMARY Location of crossing point of Road 1

The proposals indicate that part of the diverted PROW will cross Road 1 in the vicinity of plot 111. This uses the vehicle crossover to the drive to plot 111 and there is no dropped kerb or tactile paving on the opposite footway. Failure to indicate a safe crossing point for pedestrians could lead them to use less safe locations.

The drawings indicate that part of the diverted PROW will cross Road 1 in the vicinity of plot 111 using the vehicle crossover to its driveway. The Audit Team has noted that there is no dropped kerb or tactile paving on the opposite footway in this location.

Whilst the potential for a crossing pedestrian being in conflict with a vehicle using the driveway to plot 111 is small, the location is not ideal and would make it difficult to provide tactile paving in that location. The lack of a dropped crossing and tactile paving on the opposite footway would result in people in wheelchairs or with perambulators

having to bump over full height kerbing.

Failure to indicate a safe crossing point for pedestrians could lead them to use less safe locations.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the design team review the location of this crossing point and place it away from driveways so as to allow the provision of dropped crossings and tactile paving.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

The crossing point has been moved slightly north on Road 1 so that it does not conflict with proposed driveway entrances.

The crossing point is now specified with a tactile paved dropped crossing on either side of the road people in wheelchairs or with perambulators.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

--

AGREED RSA ACTION:

--



PROBLEM 4.2.3 within Report

LOCATION Location: Adjacent to bottom of proposed ramp (opposite plots 28 / 29)

SUMMARY Proposed ramp might encourage children to over run into the carriageway

The proposals indicate that the ramp will approach Road 1 with a 1 in 15 gradient with no measures to prevent children from using it and over run in to the carriageway and conflict with traffic. The drawings indicate that the proposed ramp will have a 1 in 15 straight gradient down towards the footway to the south side of Road 1. A dropped crossing is also proposed in this location. The Audit team consider the ramp will be very attractive to children playing on it with skateboards / scooters / cycles etc.

There is potential for the above usage to result in children over shooting the footway and landing in the live carriageway of Road 1 and be in conflict with moving vehicles

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that a staggered barrier be provided at the bottom of the last gradient of the ramp which may require localised widening of the latter to facilitate this.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

A guardrail has been provided directly opposite the exit from the ramp to prevent overshoot of the footway and riders entering the carriageway.

The tactile pavers also to be provided at the bottom of the ramp will also discourage the use of skateboards / scooters.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

--

AGREED RSA ACTION:

--



PROBLEM 5.1 within Report

LOCATION Location: Along PROW routes

SUMMARY Lack of signage details provided

The drawings do not show whether the PROW signage is single or double sided.

The drawings do not show whether the PROW signage proposed will be single or double sided in the different locations and so routes may not be clear to all users and take alternative and perhaps less safe routes.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. To show whether they are single or double sided as the need arises for each location.
2. The designated crossing points where PROW users cross the new estate roads be sign posted / clearly marked and / or warning signage provided as necessary.

This applies to the locations near plots 28 / 29 and 111.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE:

Requirement for all PROW signs to be double sided now indicated on design drawings.

Both crossing locations are marked by tactile dropped crossings and therefore no different to the other pedestrian dropped crossing points within the site. This is a residential area where pedestrians crossing highways should be expected and no extra over warning signage or markings are considered necessary. The forward visibility / stopping sight distance to the crossing points is achieved for the design road speed.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION RESPONSE:

AGREED RSA ACTION:



F5. DESIGN ORGANISATION AND OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENTS

DESIGN ORGANISATION STATEMENT

On behalf of the design organisation I certify that:	
1) The RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.	
Name:	
Signed:	
Position:	
Organisation:	
Date:	

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENT

On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation I certify that:	
1) The RSA actions identified in 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:	
Position:	
Organisation:	
Date:	