



A316 Pools on the Park Junction Improvements

Safety Audit Response Report

for: Carl Jones, Transport for London

Stage 3 Road Safety Audit

Ref: 005/2010/Designer Response

Report Date: **(November 2010)**

Report Version: **0**



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report details the Clients Organisation's response to the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit Report carried out on the A316 Pools on the Park Junction Improvements scheme at the request of Carl Jones, Project Sponsor for Transport for London. The Audit was carried out during September 2010 and the results were issued in report reference (005/2010).
- 1.2 This report was compiled by [REDACTED] Senior Engineer on behalf of (client organisation).
- 1.3 The terms of reference of this response report are as described in TfL Procedure SQA-0170.
- 1.4 Where a safety audit recommendation is accepted, this report details the actions proposed to comply with the recommendation. Where a safety audit recommendation is rejected, this report details the justification for rejection.



2.0 RESPONSE TO ITEMS RAISED AT THE STAGE 3 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

General

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.1.1)

Location: Scheme Extents.

Summary: Insufficient warning to road users of change of road layout.

Detail: Item 4.2 of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit highlighted that no diagram 7014v signs were proposed. These signs have been provided, however, the one for westbound traffic is not visible to approaching traffic and this could lead to higher speeds of approach to the junction which could exacerbate any shunts likely by the introduction of signals. Photo1 shows the location of the sign below.

RECOMMENDATION

Relocate the Diagram 7014 sign for the westbound approach to a position where it can clearly be seen and sufficiently far in advance of the new signals.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Designers do not agree with recommendation.

The scheme has been completed (as-built on 17/07/2010) and the traffic signals have been in place for more than a 3 month period of time. Therefore the traffic signals are no longer considered "new" and relocating the sign may confuse drivers. This sign (including the eastbound sign) should be removed.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation rejected. The scheme was implemented in the Summer of 2009 and therefore the traffic signals have been in situ for over a three month period to be considered as 'new'. This sign will be referred to the HMWC for removal.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.1.2)

Location: Exit from RAA ground

Summary: Possible conflict between vehicles entering and exiting at the same time.

Detail: RAA staff has indicated that they have problems with road users having missed the sign to the new entrance trying to enter through the exit gate and conflicting with users exiting. Drawing No. 788365-DD-1100-001 Rev B shows 'No Entry' markings for this access, although this is not shown on the 'Traffic Signs and Road Markings' drawing. The audit team consider it would be beneficial to have these markings and also Diagram 616 signs to deter misuse of this entrance and the collisions that could arise from it.

RECOMMENDATION

Provide diagram 1046 markings and two Diagram 616 signs at the RAA exit.



DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Agreed with amended recommendation.

Provide Diagram 1046 ("NO ENTRY") markings and two Diagram 616 signs at the RAA exit as per Drawing No. 788365-DD-1100-001 Rev B.

However, it is recommended that the Highway Authority liaise with the private land owner about removing the existing posts and TSRGD Diagram no. 601.1 "STOP" sign plates and replace with wide base illuminated posts and install TSRGD Diagram no. 616 ("No Entry") and TSRGD Diagram no. 602 ("Give Way") sign plates back to back on each post. The posts should be of sufficient height as to allow the signs to be visible above the property boundary wall.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted. 'No Entry' signs to TSRGD diagram 616 to be provided on either side of the RAA exit with 'No Entry' markings to TSRGD diagram 1046. A suitable means of illumination will be required for the 'No Entry' signs. To reduce signage clutter the signs can be mounted back-to-back on the existing Stop signs.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.1.3)

Location: Exit from RAA ground

Summary: Conflicting information to drivers.

Detail: Diagram 1003 and 1023 markings have been provided at the exit from the RAA ground. These markings conflict with the existing 'Stop' signs. Given that the visibility from the exit is very limited 'Stop' signing and lining would seem to be more appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

Replace the Diagram 1003 and 1023 markings with 1002.1 and 1022 markings.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Recommendation Rejected.

This was outside the scope of the design and works area and falls within a private property boundary.

The TSRGD Diagram no's 1003 and 1023 are to remain in place as they are compliant with current design standards. The introduction of 1002.1 and 1022 would require Secretary of State Approval.

As per Item 3.1.2, it is recommended that the Highway Authority liaise with the private land owner about removing the existing posts and TSRGD Diagram no. 601.1 "STOP" sign plates and replace with wide base illuminated posts and install TSRGD Diagram no. 616 ("No Entry") and TSRGD Diagram no. 602 ("Give Way") sign plates back to back on each post. The



posts should be of sufficient height as to allow the signs to be visible above the property boundary wall.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted. The existing 'Give Way' markings conflict with the 'Stop' sign currently installed at the exit from the RAA ground. The 'Give Way' markings should be burnt off and replaced with 'STOP' line and markings to TSRGD diagrams 1002.1 and 1022. The need for Secretary of State approval should not be required as the signage is provided on private property.

TfL – LRaP are aware of the issues raised by the RAA regarding poor intervisibility between exiting vehicles and pedestrians / cyclists on the A316 footway. To further address this problem, it is recommended that the boundary wall is replaced with a railing fence in a style sensitive to the rest of the property.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.1.4)

Location: Entrance to RAA ground

Summary: Possible conflict between vehicles entering and exiting at the same time.

Detail: The relocation of the entrance to the RAA ground and signalisation of the junction has created a route which some road users are using as a short cut to avoid the signals. This will also exacerbate Problem 3.1.2 above. In addition the RAA staff that users are also using this entrance to exit the grounds. This could lead to conflict between vehicles existing and entering.

RECOMMENDATION

Provide TSRGD Diagram no. 613 signs for the Pools on the Park access road and physical measures to discourage or prevent exiting at the entrance.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Recommendation rejected.

This is an existing one-way system that is operated and managed on private property and was outside the scope of the works.

However, the private property owner should consider installing wide base illuminated posts and install TSRGD Diagram no. 616 ("No Entry") and TSRGD Diagram no. 619 & 620 ("ACCESS ONLY") sign plates back to back on each post. The posts would be installed on private property and maintained at the land owner's expense.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted and partially addressed already. Since the scheme has been implemented, further work has been carried out at this junction in response to drivers turning left into the RAA ground to bypass the traffic signals before continuing east on the A316. To deter this movement, the kerb-line has been built out.



A 'No Left Turn' sign (to TSRGD diagram 613) should be provided on the kerb build-out with a suitable means of illumination to discourage drivers from entering the RAA ground from the Pools in the Park centre. In addition, TfL – LRaP will provide the RAA ground with funding to install a lockable 'dragon's teeth' speed reduction feature at the entrance to the RAA ground and two pre-moulded speed humps within the car park to deter this movement.

Should these measures fail to address the issue of vehicles turning left into the RAA ground, consideration will be given to providing 'No Entry' signs facing drivers trying to exit the car park at this location, mounted back-to-back with 'Except for Access' plates (to TSRGD diagram 620).

Non- Motorised Users

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.2.1)

Location: Northern Footway on Twickenham Road, east of Richmond Athletic Association (RAA) exit.

Summary: No signing of change of use of footway.

Detail: Item 3.4 of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit highlighted incorrect signing of the change of footway from shared use to segregated use. Signs to Diagram 957(v) were agreed to be provided. The site visit shows that no signing of the change of use has been provided (see photo 3 below), although corduroy paving has been provided.

RECOMMENDATION

Provide appropriate Diagram 956 and 957 signs on the lamp column at the change of use.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Designers agree with recommendation.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted. This issue has been highlighted on the snagging list for the scheme and should be addressed imminently by the HMWC.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.2.2)

Location: RAA exit

Summary: Conflict between exiting vehicles and pedestrians and cyclists.

Detail: The footway across the frontage of the RAA ground has changed from segregated use to shared use. This means that cyclists can now ride close to the boundary wall of the ground. It is understood from the RAA staff who attended the site visit that a number of collisions with cyclists have occurred. The visibility for vehicles exiting the ground is minimal (see Photos 4 & 5 below). Whilst pedestrians are more likely to hear a vehicle



approaching the exit and stop, or be able to stop, before a collision occurs, cyclists are less likely to do so and so intervisibility between exiting vehicles and cyclists is crucial.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure exiting vehicles can see approaching cyclists. This may be achieved by providing an alternative boundary delineator or perhaps by re-introducing the segregated cycle lane across this entrance or frontage to keep cyclists as far from the exit as possible.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Designers agree with recommendation.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted. Legal enquiries have shown that the boundary is not a listed structure as previously believed. The boundary wall should be replaced with a railing fence in a style sensitive to the rest of the property.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.2.3)

Location: St John's Grove Junction

Summary: Possible conflict between cyclists and turning vehicles.

Detail: The cycleway on the east side of St. John Grove junction footway has no markings. This could lead to cyclists failing to give way to motorised traffic at the junction resulting in conflict and possible injury (see Photo 6 below).

RECOMMENDATION

Provide Diagram 1003, 1023 and 1057 markings on the cycleway as provided at all other similar locations.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

Designers agree with recommendation.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation accepted. Since this Stage 3 Road Safety Audit has been carried out, the markings have been installed.

SAFETY AUDIT PROBLEM (3.2.4)

Location: West of Pools on the Park Junction

Summary: Confusing or incorrect tactile paving and signing.

Detail: To the west of the crossing point at Pools on the Park junction there are two footways, one has a Diagram 951 'Riding of pedal cycle prohibited' on the adjacent bollard,



the other has a Diagram 956 'Route for use by pedal cycles and pedestrians any' sign but corduroy paving is also provided (see Photo 7 below). If this route is meant to be shared use then corduroy paving is not required as there is no change in use. If the route is meant to be for cycles only then the signing is incorrect and this could lead to conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Walking down the route would seem to indicate it is meant to be for cyclists only.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that the correct signing and corduroy paving are provided.

DESIGNERS RESPONSE

The "ladder" and "Tramline" paving are correct. However, the incorrectly installed TSRGD Diagram no. 956 sign is to be replaced with TSRGD Diagram no. 955, indicating that this route is for Cycle use only.

CLIENT ORGANISATION RESPONSE

Recommendation partially accepted. The ladder and tramline paving is correct. The issue of the incorrect signing was highlighted on the snagging list for this scheme and the bollard and sign have been altered to show shared use when travelling east and No Cycling / Cycling Permitted in the respective pedestrian / cycle segregated areas when travelling west.



3.0 CLIENT ORGANISATION STATEMENTS

3.1 Client Officer's Statement

In accordance with SQA-0170, I certify that I have reviewed the items raised in the Stage 3 Safety Audit Report. I have given due consideration to each issue raised and have stated my proposed course of action for each in this report. I seek the Senior Client Officer's endorsement of my proposals.

Name: Anya Bownes

Position: Senior Regional Planner

Organisation: TfL – London Routes and Places

Signed: [REDACTED] **Dated:** 7 February 2011

3.2 Senior Client Officer's Statement

I accept these proposals by the Client Officer.

Name: David McKenna

Position: Regional Planning Manager

Organisation: TfL – London Routes and Places

Signed: [REDACTED] **Dated:** 20 February 2011