

1 Project details

Table 1 Project details

Report title:	Stage 1 RSA Designers Response
Date:	01/10/2024
Document reference and revision:	17-321-008.01
Prepared by:	Nick Calder
On behalf of:	Bryan G Hall

Table 2 Authorisation sheet

Project:	Proposed overflow car park to serve residential development Ledgard Bridge Mills, Mirfield
Report title:	Stage 1 RSA Designers Response
Prepared by:	
Name:	Nick Calder
Position:	Principal Engineer
Signed:	
Organisation:	Bryan G Hall
Date:	
Approved by:	
Name:	Martin Crabtree
Position:	Associate Engineer
Signed:	
Organisation:	Bryan G Hall
Date:	

2 Introduction

The Designers Response has been prepared by Bryan G Hall further to a Stage 1 RSA prepared by Meraki Alliance for a new vehicular dropped crossing with Back Station Road to an overflow car park to serve residential development on land at Ledgard Bridge Mills, Mirfield.

3 Key personnel

Table 3 Key personnel

Overseeing Organisation:	Kirklees Council
RSA team:	Jonathan Birkett – Meraki Alliance Gillian Kidd – Meraki Alliance
Design organisation:	Bryan G Hall

4 Road safety audit decision log

Table F.4 Road safety audit decision log

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
1-1 A lack of an uncontrolled crossing will increase the risk of pedestrian / vehicle collisions. A new access will be created that will bisect the existing footway running along the southern side of Back Station Road. The Audit Team were concerned that without a suitable uncontrolled dropped crossing there could be an increased risk of visually impaired pedestrian collision with vehicles entering and exiting the car park.	Provide an uncontrolled dropped crossing with tactile paving at the new access junction.	The proposals are for a vehicular dropped crossing, the footway will be continuous so it will not be appropriate to provide tactile paving. In order to reinforce pedestrian priority and improve pedestrian safety, a raised table will be provided within the car park for the first 5 metres leading up to the footway to reduce vehicle speeds, and give way markings for emerging vehicles will be provided at the back of the footway.	The RSA Problem is acknowledged. However, the RSA recommendation is not accepted. HDM agree with the principles set out in the Design Organisation Response, in that a vehicle crossover is proposed, and as such, tactile paving is not appropriate. HDM also agree with the principle of the proposed mitigation measures suggested in the Design Organisation response. However, a raised table is not considered to be the best option in this location, as it would require appropriate road markings that could be confusing and reduce the effectiveness of the proposed give-way markings. Therefore, it is suggested that a 900mm wide road hump is installed 5m back from the back of footway instead. See Kirklees standard detail HD/SD/07/09B for the type of 'Road Hump' that is suggested (note a modular version may be acceptable, given that it would be installed in private land). See link: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/regeneration-and-development/pdf/highways-standard-details.pdf	The overseeing organisation response is accepted. A 900mm wide road hump will be installed 5m back from the back of footway in line with Kirklees standard detail HD/SD/07/09B. This is shown on the updated access drawing ref 17/321/TR/002 Rev E.

1-2 Vehicles waiting to turn right will increase the risk of shunt type collisions.	Consider at detailed design stage the need for some 'Keep Clear' markings over the car park access.	The junction modelling assessment presented in the submitted TA shows no significant queuing is expected along Back Station Road, therefore no queuing back across the access is expected as a result. Nevertheless, this will be considered further at detailed design stage.	The RSA Problem, Recommendation and Design Organisation Response are accepted. However, based on the traffic modelling information and HDM's on-site observations, the risk of queues blocking the access would appear to be remote. Therefore, HDM do not consider the provision of these road markings to be necessary. That said, HDM agree with the Design Organisation Response that this matter can be considered further at the detailed design stage, and can be included in the works if required by the Councils S278/S38 team.	The Overseeing Organisation response is accepted.
--	---	--	--	---

5 Design Organisation and Overseeing Organisation statements

Table 5 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:	Nick Calder
Signed	
Position:	Principal Engineer
Organisation:	Bryan G Hall
Date:	

Table 6 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:	Adam Darwin
Signed:	
Position:	Group Engineer – Highways Development Management (HDM)
Organisation:	Kirklees Council (HDM – Planning)
Date:	