

Road Safety Audit

Designer's Response

The Demolition of 'The Steddles' North End Road, Yapton and erection of 11 New Dwellings

at

The Steddles

North End Road

Yapton

BN18 0DT

Ref: 19-185

Rev P3 – 12th March 2020



Road Safety Audit - Designer's Response

1.0 Introduction & Site Assessment

- 1.1 MH Architects Ltd (MHA) has been appointed by Elberry Properties to prepare a designer's response statement for development on the land at The Steddles, North End Road, Yapton, BN18 ODT.
- 1.2 This designer's response follows the Stage I Road Safety Audit prepared by M & S Traffic, dated 5th February, 2020

Overseeing Organisation	West Sussex County Council
RSA Team	M & S Traffic Aeolus House 32 Hamelin Road Gillingham Kent ME7 3EX
Design Organisation	MH Architects Ltd Ground Floor Bicentennial Building Southern Gate, Chichester West Sussex, PO19 8EZ

2.0 The Designer's Response

2.1 The table below sets out the Problem and Recommendation provided by M & S Traffic, together with the Designer's Response by MHA.

Item.	RSA Problem	RSA Recommendation	Designer Organisation Response	Overseeing Organisation's Response	Agreed RSA Action
3.1.1	New kerblines are being introduced, where no details of carriageway drainage or carriageway vertical profiles have been provided for assessment. North End Road appears to be super elevated on the bend or where water moving across the carriageway or ponding on the carriageway could lead to loss of control collisions	It is recommended that drainage details should be provided at Safety Audit Stage 2, or that the carriageway should be shaped so that the highway drains	The new junction design for the development will be the subject of a Section 278 Agreement with WSCC. Liaison with WSCC on the detailed design will include a Stage 2 RSA, and would be expected to address any issues affecting drainage/ponding that are directly related to the proposed development	Agree that details should be provided at detailed design / Stage 2 RSA.	A detailed design and Stage 2 RSA to address any issues will be submitted.
3.3.1	Visibility splays were provided for assessment where existing vegetation could restrict visibility splays- see figures 1 & 2 overleaf. Restricted visibility could lead to could lead to side impact or rear end shunt collisions.	It is recommended that the visibility splays should be free of obstruction	Visibility splays will be provided in accordance with the guidance contained in Manual for Streets. Visibility splays at the site access will be 2.4m. x 45m. in each direction along North end Road as illustrated on Dwg No. 0003 rev. P04. The visibility splays to be kept free of vegetation.	Agree. It is noted that MfS suggests that splays of 2.4 x 43m are provided. The application shows splays of 45m which are in excess of the requirements.	Details illustrating the visibility splays in accordance with MfS guidance will be submitted

Road Safety Audit - Designer's Response

3.3.2	Vehicle swept paths have been provided for assessment, where the refuse vehicle tracking shows incursion into the opposing carriageway of the site access and North End Road. This could cause conflict with vehicles travelling in the opposing direction leading to possible head on collisions or side swipe collisions. However, it is also recognised that this is an infrequent vehicle movement, where an inappropriately wide carriageway for the access road and junction radii would be required to accommodate the swept paths	It is recommended that the junction radii should be eased to provide sufficient carriageway space for all expected movements.	Given the frequency of a large vehicle exiting the site and turning north, this is not considered to be a highway safety issue that requires amendments to the proposed junction design. Visibility can be achieved in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance and therefore any manoeuvre will be made with the driver being able to see approaching traffic.	Agree that large vehicle movements would be infrequent, and visibility can be provided in line with MfS	No further information is required at this stage although visibility splay dimensions will be submitted as 3.3.1 above.
3.3.3	There is a development on the eastern side of North End Lane where Auditors were unsure if a junction was to be constructed or a simple crossover, should this be a junction this could create a 'left / right' stagger, with side road centre lines scaled at 23m apart where GG123 recommends a minimum stagger distance of 50m. Vehicles waiting to right turn into one side road could obstruct the visibility to the left out of the opposite side road such that an exiting vehicle could pull out into the path of an unseen main road vehicle, which could lead to side impact collisions or rear end shunts	It is recommended that it should be clarified as to whether the eastern access is a junction and that queuing lengths should be checked to ensure that visibility plays are not adversely affected by queuing vehicles., to ensure safe operation, however, these developments appear small and traffic flows on North End Road were observed as being low.	Although the distance between the two access points is 23m, this is not considered to result in a highway safety issue. It is unlikely that vehicles will travel between the two sites, and visibility from the proposed development access meets current guidance contained in Manual for Streets. The issues raised by the auditor are not uncommon and given the density of development and likely traffic movements, this is not regarded as a manoeuvre that will have a high frequency.	No queue vehicles are anticipated with the levels of development served by the accesses. It is not anticipated that significant volumes would travel between the two accesses.	No further information will be submitted at this stage given agreement has been reached between the Designer and Overseeing Organisation.

Road Safety Audit - Designer's Response

3.4.1	North End Road has a continuous footway on the eastern side, the proposals seek to introduce a short section of footway from the development on the western side with and associated crossing point. However, no details of the drop kerbs and tactile paving at the crossing point have been provided for assessment, in addition pedestrian and vehicle intervisibility could be restricted due to the adjacent hedge line. Further the proposals show an option to continue the footway beyond the crossing point where the footway will then terminate. Inappropriate drop kerb height or incorrect or absent tactile paving or a terminating footway could cause confusion and difficulties particularly the mobility and visually impaired and could lead to pedestrians walking in the carriageway leading to vehicle to pedestrian collisions. In addition, restricted intervisibility between vehicles and pedestrians could compromise pedestrian safety.	• That tactile paving and dropped kerbs be provided to Department for Transport standards, and that details should be supplied at Stage 2 Safety Audit. • That pedestrian and vehicle intervisibility splays should be unobstructed. • That the footway should terminate at the crossing point.	The design of the dropped crossing and extent of footway to be provided south of the proposed junction serving the development site would be considered in line with the safety audit comments as part of any future Section 278 Application and the final proposed scheme reviewed as part of a Stage 2 RSA. The tactile paving and dropped kerb details will be constructed in accordance with the WSCC's design guidance/standard details. In regard to the pedestrian visibility splays these will be unobstructed	As the adjoining site Clays Farm has now received planning permission the provision of footway should be reviewed at S278 in order to ensure a link is provided between the two sites without the need to cross North End Road.	A detailed design of the footway and accompanying Stage 2 RSA to address any issues will be submitted.
3.4.2	On the eastern side of North End Road ponding was observed close to a gully which appears to be in the vicinity of the proposed crossing point- see figure 3 overleaf. The presence of ponding could lead to pedestrians not using the crossing point and crossing at less safe places and the presence of a gully grating could lead to pedestrian trips and falls	• That carriageway should drain and not pond at the crossing point. • That the gully should not be within the crossing area or that a pedestrian friendly gully cover should be installed.	Liaison with WSCC on the detailed design at the Section 278 Agreement stage will include a Stage 2 RSA, and would be expected to address any issues affecting drainage/ponding that are directly related to the proposed development.	Agree that details should be provided as part of detailed design	Further details regarding the drainage will form part of the S278 submission and include the Stage 2 RSA to address any issues.

Road Safety Audit - Designer's Response

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	Harry Groucott
Signed	
Position	Managing Director
Organisation	MH Architects
Date	27 March 2020

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	Stephen Gee
Signed	 S.Gee
Position	Principal Transport Planner

Road Safety Audit - Designer's Response

Organisation	West Sussex County Council
Date	30/3/2020