



Broadoak Farm, Linthwaite

# Designers Response



26.04.2022

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT - DESIGNERS RESPONSE

AJP Ref: 219-174

PREPARED BY JOHN MARSHALL



## ROAD SAFETY AUDIT - DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Client Ref: 219-174

P CASEY & CO

	Originator:	Approved:	Date:
Record of Approval	J Marshall - Snr Engineer		26/04/2022
Version	Author:	Change Description:	
01	J Marshall	Initial Issue	
02	J Marshall	Amended to latest RSA	11.12.2022

## Contents

Introduction ..... 3

..... 3

Items Raised ..... 3



Alan Johnston Partnership Ltd.

Company No. 13204766

## Broakoak Farm, Linthwaite

### Designers Response

#### Introduction

The report has been produced in response to the Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit produced by Highways Associates (REF 2022/AJP/1590) to comment on the items raised in respect of the future use and safety of the proposed highways at the development of Broadoak Farm, Linthwaite.



#### Items Raised

##### 3.1.1 PROBLEM

**LOCATION:** Road 2, outside Plot 10,11

**SUMMARY:** Vertical traffic calming measures could result in conflicts

The proposed junction table extends and terminates within the vehicular crossing alignments of the above plots. As such, concern is expressed that vehicles, particularly powered two wheelers could become destabilised by the transitional levels whilst manoeuvring potentially at speed resulting in loss of control conflict.

##### RECOMMENDATION

The termination of the junction tables should occur outside of any vehicular crossings.

##### DESIGNER'S COMMENTS

Item rejected, the necessary traffic calming feature has been positioned optimally to avoid vehicular crossings and ensure effective traffic calming for safety.

### 3.2.1 PROBLEM

**LOCATION:** Roads 1 and 4

**SUMMARY:** Horizontal traffic calming measures not conspicuous

Concern is expressed that the proposed build-outs may not be suitable conspicuous particularly during poor weather events or dark conditions increasing the potential for the build-outs to be struck by passing traffic potentially resulting in loss of control or conflicts with passing

pedestrians established on the adjacent footways.

### RECOMMENDATION

Suitable retroreflective bollards should be provided to demarcate the build-outs paying particular attention to obstruction of the footway or visibility for crossing pedestrian requirements.

### DESIGNER'S COMMENTS

Item accepted and reflective bollards noted as required on drawings.

### 3.7.1 PROBLEM

**LOCATION:** LOCATION: Plots 10, 16, 41, 42, 60, 68, 73, 75, 77, 80, 81, 85, 88, 91, 95, 96, 100, 102, 105, 107, 109, 111, 121

**SUMMARY:** Drainage gully locations could cause loss of control

Drainage gulleys appear to be located within the channels adjacent to the proposed vehicular crossings. Due to the inherent lack of skid resistance afforded by cast iron gulleys particularly when wet, concern is expressed that should they be struck particularly by powered or unpowered two wheelers whilst turning into the private driveway that it could increase the risk of loss of control.

### RECOMMENDATION

The gulleys should be relocated to a suitable position along the kerb line outside of any dropped kerb areas.

### DESIGNER'S COMMENTS

Gullies have been positioned at low points and to accommodate the highway surface water flows. Where it's not possible to locate gullies outside vehicular crossings, they have been positioned outside the likely wheel tracking of vehicles accessing the proposed driveways.