

# Designer Response to Road Safety Audit

# SHIPSEYBARRY

Project	Orchard Gate -Cherry Orchard	By	A.C. S/B
Date	02/05/2023	Checked	G.B. S/B
RSA by	M.H.L. Consulting Engineers		

<b>FORWORD</b>		
	The original design drawings issued to MHL 30.03.2023 formed the basis of the Road Safety Audit (RSA) completed by MHL Consulting Engineers .We confirm the the application set of drawings have been updated , modified to rectify all accepted problems as highlighted in the RSA. Details of each item as highlighted in the RSA with designer response are contained below .	
<b>Number</b>	<b>PROBLEM DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DESIGNER RESPONSE</b>
1	<p><b>Problem: Lack of appropriate connection at either end of cycle lane.</b></p> <p>The proposed roadside cycle facility does not incorporate an appropriate connection to the existing on-road cycle lane at either end of the proposed facility. Failure to provide an appropriate connection, in accordance with relevant design standards may cause confusion for users, potentially leading to collisions between vehicles on the adjoining road and cyclists errantly leaving the priority cycle route.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide an appropriate connection to and from the existing on road cycle lane, linking to the proposed segregated cycle track. This connection should be designed in accordance with relevant design standards and incorporate relevant signage and road markings.</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>The revised application design is re-aligned to form a seamless connection with North and South ends of the existng cyle way with the inclusion of relevant signage and road markings per design standards</p>
2	<p><b>Problem: Lack of appropriate connection at either end of footpath.</b></p> <p>The proposed footpath is not shown to connect to the existing footpath either end of the proposed facility. Failure to provide an appropriate connection, in accordance with relevant design standards may cause confusion for pedestrians, particularly visually impaired users, potentially leading to pedestrians colliding with cyclists on the adjoining cycle track or tripping at inadequate, undesignated crossing locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide an appropriate connection to and from the existing footpath at either end of the development in accordance with relevant design standards.</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>Additional continuous connections have been added to the revised application design to offer continuity to all pedestrian users .</p>
3	<p><b>Problem: Lack of signage, road markings and tactile paving on the cycle track.</b></p> <p>The proposed cycle track does not incorporate any signage, road markings or tactile paving to inform</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>Appropriate signage, road markings / tactile paving to inform users of crossing locations, start/end of the facility have been</p>

# Designer Response to Road Safety Audit

# SHIPSEYBARRY

Project	Orchard Gate -Cherry Orchard	By	A.C. S/B
Date	02/05/2023	Checked	G.B. S/B
RSA by	M.H.L. Consulting Engineers		

	<p>users of crossing locations, start/end of the facility or shared surface areas. Failure to inform cyclists of these hazards or conflict locations may lead to collisions with pedestrians or passing vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide appropriate signage and road markings along its route, in accordance with relevant design standards. Ensure that appropriate tactile paving is provided at shared space locations.</p>	<p>incorporated in the updated application proposal.</p>
4	<p><b>Problem: Lack of pedestrian crossing (entrance junction and Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate Road crossing).</b></p> <p>The junction of Kennelsfort Road Upper / Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate currently makes provision for pedestrians to cross the minor road with a dropped kerb located at the desire line. This crossing is not a safe arrangement. It is narrow, does not incorporate tactile paving and is excessively wide. The proposed development appears to remove this crossing and make provision for a future crossing of this road close to this location, however the crossing is only shown on one side of the road, with no connection on the opposite side of the road. Failure to provide a safe crossing may lead to pedestrians, particularly visually impaired users crossing the road at unsafe, undesignated locations leading to collisions with passing vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide a complete crossing at the new location or provide an improved crossing at the existing location, with appropriate tactile paving. Also reduce the crossing length by decreasing the junction corner radii if possible. Remove the future crossing proposal at the alternative location unless a connection can be delivered on the opposite side of the road.</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>The proposed crossing length has been reduced with the reduction on junction radius to the North side as recommended. Additionally, a dropped kerb provision with tactile paving is provided for on the desire line crossing location in the updated application proposal.</p> <p>Provision of the future crossing location is indicative only and provision is in place once potential wider improvements are made possible by third parties to the South of the application site.</p>
5	<p><b>Problem: Excessively wide junction.</b></p> <p>The width of the junction of the Kennelsfort Road Upper / Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate is excessive,</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>The Junction Radii has been reduced to improve safety and provided for lower speed</p>

Project	Orchard Gate -Cherry Orchard	By	A.C. S/B
Date	02/05/2023	Checked	G.B. S/B
RSA by	M.H.L. Consulting Engineers		

	<p>with large corner radius kerbs employed, contrary to urban design principles. Such large corner radii encourage high speed vehicle movements, potentially leading to collisions between pedestrians crossing the road at the junction and passing vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Decrease the junction corner radii where possible.</p>	<p>turning while also offering provision for lower speed HGV movements to the existing commercial functions within the industrial estate.</p>
6	<p><b>Problem: Confusing designation of cycle parking surface type at the pedestrian crossing.</b></p> <p>Cycle parking stands are proposed in the line of the proposed "Future" pedestrian crossing. Failure to provide a clear unobstructed pedestrian route for pedestrians, particularly visually impaired users may lead to trips or encourage them to cross at an alternative unsafe location leading to collisions with passing vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> If the applicant intends to propose a crossing at this location the pedestrian route should be made safe for pedestrians, without any obstructions along the route.</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>Cycle parking and seating has been removed in the highlighted area to allow for safe unobstructed passage of pedestrians in this location.</p>
7	<p><b>Problem: Lack of safe cycle route at the crossing of Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate Road.</b></p> <p>The existing on road cycle lane extends through the Kennelsfort Road Upper / Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate junction. This on road facility presents a consistent service for cyclists and a clear understanding of cycle priority to drivers travelling in parallel. The segregation of cyclists from the road with the proposed cycle track facility means that drivers may not expect cyclists to re-enter the road space at the crossing location potentially leading to conflicts between cyclists and turning vehicles.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide an appropriate connection to the existing on road cycle lane in advance of the crossing in accordance with relevant design standards. Include yield road markings on the cycle track at the location to ensure that cyclists give way to turning vehicles at the crossing.</p>	<p><b>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</b></p> <p>An appropriate connection to the existing on road cycle lane in advance of the crossing in accordance with relevant design standards to include yield road markings on the cycle track at the location to ensure that cyclists give way to turning vehicles at the crossing as recommended.</p>

Project	Orchard Gate -Cherry Orchard	By	A.C. S/B
Date	02/05/2023	Checked	G.B. S/B
RSA by	M.H.L. Consulting Engineers		

<p>8</p>	<p><b>Problem:</b> Poorly defined pedestrian route (surface paving arrangement) at the corner of Kennelsfort Rd Upper and Cherry Orchard Industrial Estate Road.</p> <p>The provision of directional paving along, in conflict with the intended pedestrian route may lead to confusion for visually impaired users potentially encouraging them to walk onto the cycle track or carriageway.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide a consistent footpath surface and paving arrangement along the footpath to ensure that visually impaired user can clearly identify the intended pedestrian route.</p>	<p>ShipseBarry -Designer response –</p> <p>A consistent footpath surface and paving arrangement along the footpath to ensure that visually impaired user can clearly identify the intended pedestrian route has been provided for in the updated application proposal.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p><b>Problem:</b> Incorrect tactile paving arrangement at signalised pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian crossing across Kennelsfort Road Upper shows a controlled crossing but with buff (yellow) coloured tactile paving. The tactile paving tail also does not extend to the rear of the footpath. No dropped kerb/raised table treatment or road markings are shown. Also, the crossing extends through the proposed cycle track requiring particular ramp and surface treatments. Failure to provide appropriate road design details at the crossing may lead to collisions involving pedestrian and cyclists or vehicles who may misinterpret priority at the crossing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Ensure that the crossing is designed in accordance with relevant design standards, incorporating appropriate road markings, signage, cycle track connections details, dropped kerbs, ramps, signal heads etc.</p>	<p>ShipseBarry -Designer response –</p> <p>We confirm the crossing has been re-designed in accordance with relevant design standards, incorporating appropriate road markings, signage, cycle track connections details, dropped kerbs, ramps, signal heads in the updated design proposal as per recommendations.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p><b>Problem:</b> Raised entry treatment should be provided at the entrance.</p> <p>The proposed development vehicular entrance incorporates a proposed cycle and pedestrian crossing with a raised table located internally, beyond these crossing locations. The effectiveness of this ramp will not benefit vulnerable road users at the crossing location.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p>	<p>ShipseBarry -Designer response –</p> <p>We confirm the raised table has been modified and extended to incorporate the crossings, forming a raised entry treatment at the development entrance in the revised updated proposal design per recommendation.</p>

Project	Orchard Gate -Cherry Orchard	By	A.C. S/B
Date	02/05/2023	Checked	G.B. S/B
RSA by	M.H.L. Consulting Engineers		

	Extend the raised table to incorporate the crossings, forming a raised entry treatment at the development entrance.	
11	<p><b>Problem: Lack of buffer area alongside roadside parking spaces, to accommodate car doors opening onto the cycle track.</b></p> <p>The layout incorporates 2 number parking spaces alongside the proposed cycle track. Failure to provide an appropriate buffer between these parking spaces and the cycle facility may lead to collisions between vehicle doors and cyclists.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide appropriate buffer alongside the parking spaces to protect cyclists at the location.</p>	<p>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</p> <p>An appropriate buffer zone has added alongside the parallel parking spaces to protect cyclists at the location in the revised and updated application proposal as recommended.</p>
12	<p><b>Problem: No provision for bus stop in the layout alongside the cycle track. No connection for bus users to the footway at the location.</b></p> <p>No provision is made for the existing bus stop in the scheme layout. Providing for this bus stop requires that the cycle track is designed to accommodate the movement of intending passengers to from the adjoining footpath. Failure to provide an appropriate connection for pedestrians may lead to collisions between passing cyclists and pedestrians accessing the bus stop.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Provide appropriate connection between the bus stop and the adjoining footpath, with appropriate treatment of the cycle facility at the location, in accordance with relevant design standards.</p>	<p>ShipseyBarry -Designer response –</p> <p>An updated connection between the bus stop and the adjoining footpath, with appropriate treatment of the cycle facility at the location, in accordance with National Cycle Manual has been provided for in the revised updated application proposal.</p>