ROAD SAFETY AUDIT (RSA) DESIGNERS RESPONSE FORM

RSA Ref No : **NA**

RSA Stage : **Stage 1**

RSA Auditors : **Go Surveys**

Scheme : **Cross Rd Deal**

Response By: **Croft Transport Planning & Design 23.10.2019**

Problem No. in RSA Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure Accepted (Yes/No)	Alternative Measure / Design Team Response
1	Y	Y	Problem noted high visibility bollards with reflective banding are now shown on the plan.
2	Y	Y	Problem noted, aapriority give way narrowing is now shown with signing
3	N	N	The quoted set back of 1.5m is a standard derived from DMRB TA90/05. MFS advises that the DMRB is the design standard for Trunk Roads and Motorways and the strict application of DMRB standards to non-trunk roads is rarely appropriate for highway design in built up areas (para 4 page 4). The road narrowing should serve to reduce speeds less than existing and we do not anticipate speeds in excess of 25mph on either approach given the congested narrow setting of the streets. LT 2-95 The Design of Pedestrian Crossings is more appropriate for local roads and does not advocate an excessive setback save to say that pedestrains and vehicles must be visible to each other for a distance commensurate with the SSD for the location.We have therefore shown a splay of 31m in keeping with speeds of 25mph. MFS para 7.8.5 advises that 'parking in visibility splays in built up areas is quite common yet it does not appear to create significant problems in practice.
4	N	N	Issue noted however the depth of tactile paving is in accordance with DETR Guidance on Tactile Surfaces and Figure 6 for an indented uncontrolled crossing at a side road. I nany event this is a matter of detail that can be amended if necessary at detail design stage.
5	Y	Y	Problem noted, the existing centre lines have been removed in areas less than 4.8m save for in the immediate vicinity of the priority give ways.

6	N	Y	Comments noted however MFS is clear in advising that infrequent turning manoeuvres such as will be the case with waste vehicles should not be allowed to dictate junction layouts and overrun of the centreline is to be expected, tighter junctions (in some cases with 6m radii) can encourage slower approach speeds. Manual For Streets advises further in para 6.8.1 “The design of local roads should accommodate service vehicles without allowing their requirements to dominate the layout. On streets with low traffic flows and speeds, it may be assumed that they will be able to use the full width of the carriageway to manoeuvre.” Notwithstanding this we have now removed the build out at the corner of Sydney Road as this will no longer be required and the right turning waste vehicle from Sydney Road can make the turn with no encroachment over the footway
7	N	N	Comment noted however the crossing point on the corner of Station Rd/Sydney Rd was removed in previous revisions on account of the more recent crossing point improvments at at the Station Rd Station Drive junction. This can be reinstated if deemed necessary by KCC
8	Y	Y	Problem noted, however it is has been accepted from early on in the design process that we are woking in area where there is currently no footway provision whatsoever and whilst a 1m footway might not represent the preferred width of 1.8m, 1m still provides considerable general betterment over the existing nil provision and is in excess of the 0.9m MFS requirement to safely accomodate a wheelchair. Speeds will be considerabley reduced through this section of road by virtue of the priority arrangements and the main access for the site is located on Cross Rd. In terms of the provision of passing places, short sections of low height 25mm face kerbs can be introduced at detail design stage to enable any wheeled users or otherwise to safely pass each other.
9	Y	Y	Problem noted a cast iron bollard has been added to the drawing to increase conspicuity of the build out
10	Y	Y	Problem noted, a taper has now been provided
11	Y	Y	The quoted set back of 1.5m is a standard derived from DMRB TA90/05. MFS advises that the DMRB is the design standard for Trunk Roads and Motorways and the strict application of DMRB standards to non-trunk roads is rarely appropriate for highway design in built up areas (para 4 page 4). The road narrowing should serve to reduce speeds less than existing and we do not anticipate speeds in excess of 25mph on either approach given the congested narrow setting of the streets. LT 2-95 The Design of Pedestrian Crossings is more appropriate for local roads and does not advocate an excessive setback save to say that pedestrains and vehicles must be visible to each other for a distance commensurate with the SSD for the location. MFS para 7.8.5 advises that 'parking in visibility splays in built up areas is quite common yet it does not appear to create significant problems in practice
12	Y	Y	Problem noted a cast iron bollard has been added to the drawing to increase conspicuity of the build out.
13	Y	Y	Problem noted a cast iron bollards have been added to the drawing to increase conspicuity of the junction radii

Mike Coogan Signed: M Coogan

Associate Director