

GG 119 Road Safety Audit Response Report

Project Details <i>(To be completed by Design Organisation)</i>	<i>New simple priority T-junction for access to new development. New & upgraded pedestrian infrastructure for direct and improved connectivity. Associated boundary works, ducting, drainage, earthworks, road pavements, kerb realignment and various street furniture amendments.</i>
---	---

1.0 Project Details <i>(To be completed by Design Organisation)</i>			
Report Title	A643 Westgate – Section 278.	Stage of RSA	Stage 2
Date	13/11/2024	Scheme Ref No.	QD1776 / 23-285-002.02
Prepared By	Queensberry Design Ltd.	On behalf of:	Kirklees Council

2.0 Authorisation Sheet <i>(To be completed by Design Organisation)</i>			
Prepared By		Approved By (Person in Design Organisation who is senior to Designer)	
Name	Michael Kinsella	Name	Nick Dunwoodie
Position	Civil Associate (Highways)	Position	Engineering Director, YORKSHIRE
Signed	<i>MUK</i>	Signed	<i>NDunwoodie</i>
Organisation	Queensberry Design Ltd.	Organisation	Queensberry Design Ltd.
Date	13/11/2024	Date	13/11/2024

3.0 Key Personnel <i>(To be completed by Design Organisation)</i>		
Overseeing Organisation	Name: Kumaravel Kurusamy, Group Engineer, Highway Service, Kirklees Council	
Road Safety Audit Team	LEADER - Adam Bradley BSc (Hons), MCIHT Associate, Bryan G Hall	MEMBER - David Bell MEng, CEng, MCIHT (Certificate of Competency in Road Safety Audit gained in October 2013) Director, Bryan G Hall
Design Organisation	Michael Kinsella, Civil Associate (Highways), Queensberry Design Ltd.	

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);

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 for retention on Audit file (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: A Location: Junction of Westgate and Quarry Road Summary: Tactile paving is shown on the western radius of the junction of Westgate and Quarry Road. There is an existing road sign within the existing tactile paving and a low wall which encroaches over the existing tactile arrangement. Part of the proposed tactile paving layout appears to be located under the existing wall and the presence of these obstacles presents a risk to visually impaired pedestrians and increases the risk of trips and falls. The crossing across Quarry Street is an inline crossing and is an insufficient depth to warn visually impaired pedestrians the presence of the carriageway. The alignment of the crossing will need to be checked on site to ensure that the proposed tactile paving lines up with the existing tactile paving on the eastern side of the junction or these are amended as necessary.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Provide a safe width and depth of tactile paving to the western side of Quarry Road at the junction with Westgate.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Disagree.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed tactile paving is intended to avoid the existing road sign and wall whilst aligning as closely as possible with the existing tactile paving on the opposite side of the junction. Though it is accepted that a min. 1200mm depth would be applicable, the 800mm shown matches the existing installation opposite and elsewhere in the vicinity and is therefore thought to be more suitable in this instance to reduce the risk of further confusion.</i></p> <p><i>The design drawings' presentation may be improved or annotated further for clarity where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Auditor's recommendations and Reject Design Organisation's Response.</p> <p>The tactile paving should be three blocks deep here, the Auditors are correct. Whether it is wrong elsewhere or not nearby, is irrelevant. Propose the paving on the opposite side three blocks deep as well, because it's part of the same</p>	<p>The RSA recommendations are to be implemented.</p> <p>Full tactile paving replacement to standard, realigned on both sides to ensure safe alignment through junction is now incorporated within the proposed design.</p>

<p>Problem: B Location: Footpath connection from the Site onto Brick Street Summary: The proposed upgraded footpath connection between the site and Brick Street will increase the risk of collisions between motorised and non-motorised users. The proposed upgraded length of footpath between the footpath link into the development and Brick Street without any form of control will lead to an increased risk of motorised users using the footway and increased risk of collisions with pedestrians. At the point the upgraded length of footway meets the carriageway of Brick Street there are no measures to warn visually impaired pedestrians that they are entering a carriageway. This will lead to an increased risk of collisions between visually impaired users and motorised users.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Provide measures to prevent motorised users from using the footpath from Brick Street and to assist visually impaired users.</p>	<p><i>Accepted – but with alternative solution.</i></p> <p><i>A footpath has been proposed linking the development to the road section of Brick Street as requested by Kirklees PRow officer. As Brick Street and the continuing unmade track to the south is private, Strata have no jurisdiction to undertake any works outside of the 1.2m wide PRow - which is the width of the footpath shown - and therefore no capability to propose installation of any vehicle deterrent without it impacting the usable PRow.</i></p> <p><i>However, it is proposed to incorporate corduroy hazard warning paving to alert visually impaired users of joining a route shared by other users i.e. motor traffic.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Auditor's recommendations and Reject Design Organisation's Response.</p> <p>If it would be possible for traffic to use this pedestrian route to access the new estate, safety measures must be taken to prevent it, regardless of land ownership issues. Provide bollards or similar within the confines of the development and where the footpath ends and make whatever changes would be necessary to the layout around that location. Corduroy hazard warning paving cannot be used to warn visually impaired people of traffic under any circumstances. Consult with PRow Kirklees Council for revised design after these recommendations are implemented.</p>	<p>The RSA recommendations are to be implemented.</p> <p>Bollards to prevent vehicular access are now incorporated within the proposed design.</p> <p>Corduroy paving may be used in any situation where vision impaired people need to be warned of a hazard and advised to proceed with caution and this has been tested for suitability as a delineator to shared space before successful implementation elsewhere. It is therefore concluded to be the most appropriate treatment here and is now incorporated within the proposed design in combination with a channel kerb for necessary set-back.</p>
<p>Problem: C Location: Northern side of zebra crossing on A643 Westgate Summary: Vegetation and obstructions in the footway to the north of the zebra crossing will increase the risk of pedestrians entering the carriageway into the path of oncoming vehicles resulting in collisions. Vegetation along the back of footway to the north of A643 Westgate encroaches on the footway and reduces the available footway width. The reduced footway width will increase the risk of pedestrians entering the carriageway to pass pedestrians</p>	<p>Recommendation: Ensure that overgrown vegetation along the back of footway is removed.</p>	<p><i>Agree.</i></p> <p><i>Full vegetation removal is already proposed for this area. The available effective footway width is proposed to increase and the number of street furniture obstructions shall be reduced.</i></p> <p><i>The design drawings' presentation may be improved or annotated further for clarity where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Agree with Auditor's recommendations and support Design Organisation's response.</p> <p>Overgrown vegetation along the back of footway to be removed and cleared.</p>	<p>The RSA recommendations are to be implemented.</p> <p>The proposed design drawings now better clarify the required vegetation removal.</p>

travelling in the opposite direction into the path of oncoming vehicles resulting in collisions.

STATEMENT – To be completed ONLY when RSA Action is agreed, and Overseeing Organisation has completed (4) (5) & (7)

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:	Michael Kinsella	Signed:		Date:	22/01/2025
Position:	Civil Associate (Highways)	Organisation:	Queensberry Design Ltd.		

(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:	Kumaravel Kurusamy	Signed:		Date:	23/01/2025
Position:	Group Engineer	Organisation:	Kirklees Council		

NOTE: The RSA will not be considered "closed out" until all boxes are completed and the form is signed and dated by both the DO and OO.

Note 1 – Advice (for the information of the Design Organisation) when responding to the RSreport 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.