



M & S Traffic Ltd

Road Safety Audit Stage 1

S38 Works

Hook Lane

Westergate

West Sussex

Date: 22nd May 2016

Report produced for: Rogers Cory Partnership

Report produced by: M & S Traffic Ltd

M & S Traffic Ltd
Aeolus House
32 Hamelin Road
Gillingham
Kent ME7 3EX

Tel: +44 1634 307498

Directors:
Martin Morris & Bryan Shawyer
Company Reg. No. 06730905

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL Registered Office: 32 Hamelin Road, Gillingham, Kent ME7 3EX

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Project Title Hook Lane, Westergate, West Sussex

Report Title Road Safety Audit Stage 1

Revision

Status Final

Reference RCP/E4462/1/BS

Record of Issue

Issue	Status	Author	Date	Check	Date	Authorised	Date
1	Final	BS	22/05/16	MM	22/05/16	BS	22/05/16

Distribution

Organisation	Contact	Copies
Rogers Cory Partnership	Karren Johnston	-

CONTENTS

Contents	3
1 Introduction	4
2 Items raised at previous audits	5
3 Items raised by the Stage 1 Audit	6
4 Non safety issues	8
5 Auditors Statement	9

Appendix A.....List of drawings

Appendix B.....Comment location drawing

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report describes a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on Section 38 works for an internal road layout for a residential development off Hook Lane, Westergate. The Audit was requested by the design organisation, Rogers Cory Partnership, The Old School, Old school Road, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9NJ.
- 1.2 The Audit Team membership was as follows:

Bryan Shawyer BEng (Hons), MSc, MCIHT, HA RSA Cert Comp, Audit Team Leader

Martin Morris PGD, MCIHT, HA RSA Cert Comp, Audit Team Member
- 1.3 The audit was undertaken in accordance with the audit brief and following the principles of HD 19/15, The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The documents available at the time of the report are detailed in Appendix A.
- 1.4 A site visit and inspection was undertaken during the morning of the 21st May 2016. Weather conditions at the time were overcast and the road surface was dry. Traffic flows and free flow speeds on Hook Lane were low.
- 1.5 The report has been compiled, only with regard to the safety implications for road users of the layout presented in the supplied drawings. It has not been examined or verified for compliance with any other standards or criteria. This safety audit does not perform any “Technical Check” function on these proposals. It is assumed that the Project Sponsor is satisfied that such a “Technical Check” has been successfully completed prior to requesting this safety audit.
- 1.6 The auditors have not been informed of any Departures from Standards in this scheme construction.
- 1.7 All comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed drawings and the locations have been detailed relating to the plans supplied with the audit brief, Appendix B.

2 ITEMS RAISED AT PREVIOUS AUDITS

2.1. No previous audits were supplied for assessment.

3 ITEMS RAISED AT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT

3.1 General

3.1.1 PROBLEM

Location: The scheme.

Summary: Insufficient construction details could compromise road safety.

No construction details were provided for assessment, in particular, carriageway and footway construction. Inappropriate Polished Stone Values (PSV) could lead to differential braking, particularly under severe braking conditions, insufficient slip resistance of footways could lead to trips and falls.

RECOMMENDATION

That carriageway and footway construction details should be provided for assessment at Stage 2 Safety Audit.

3.1.2 PROBLEM

Location: The scheme.

Summary: Ponding of surface water could lead to loss of control accidents.

No details of drainage or vertical profiles have been provided for assessment; any ponding at junctions or ramps could lead to loss of control accidents.

RECOMMENDATION

That drainage details and carriageway profiles should be provided at Safety Audit Stage 2.

3.2 Local Alignment

3.2.1 PROBLEM

Location: The scheme.

Summary: Lack of visibility could compromise road safety.

Visibility splays and Stopping Sight Distances have been proposed and are considered acceptable; however, at one junction and two bends, the splays appear to pass over non-highway land. Vegetation or landscaping features in this splays could restrict visibility, where insufficient visibility could lead to side swipe, side impact or rear end shunt accidents.

RECOMMENDATION

That the splays should be within the adoptable highway, or that suitable covenants should be arranged to ensure that the splay is not affected by planting or landscaping features.

3.2.2 PROBLEM

Location: Shared surfaces within the scheme.

Summary: Inappropriate parking could compromise road safety.

Swept paths were provided for a Fire Appliance. The tracking movements within the shared surfaces show that the appliance occupies the majority of the carriageway, particularly at bends. This could lead to footway over running and possible pedestrian accidents or collisions with parked vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION

That parking restrictions should be applied to the shared surface areas.

3.3 Junctions

3.3.1 No comment.

3.4 Non Motorised User Provision

3.4.1 No comment.

3.5 Road Signs, Carriageway Markings and Lighting

3.5.1 No comment.

4 NON SAFETY ISSUES

- 4.1 Safety issues identified during the audit and site inspection that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference, but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Client Organisation, are set out in this section. It is to be understood that, in raising these issues, the Audit Team in no way warrant that a full review of the highway environment has been undertaken beyond that necessary to undertake the Audit as commissioned.
- 4.2 The Audit Team has no issues to raise within this section.

5 AUDITOR TEAM STATEMENT

5.1 We certify that this audit has been carried out following the principles of HD 19/15.

Audit Team Leader

Bryan Shawyer
BEng (Hons), MSc, MCIHT, HA RSA Cert Comp
M & S Traffic Ltd
Aeolus House
32 Hamelin Road
Gillingham
Kent ME7 3EX

Signed:



Date: 22/05/16

Audit Team Member

Martin Morris
PGD, MCIHT, HA RSA Cert Comp
M & S Traffic Ltd
Aeolus House
32 Hamelin Road
Gillingham
Kent ME7 3EX

Signed:



Date: 22/05/16

APPENDIX A

List of drawings and documentation submitted for auditing:

Drawing No.

Title

See attached sheet

APPENDIX B

Plan attached showing the locations of the problems identified as part of this audit (location numbers refer to paragraph numbers in the report).