

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

Level of Check:	Full Checklist
Type of Site:	Junction

Site Parameters:			
Pedestrians?	No	Cyclists (on carriageway)?	Yes
		Cyclists (on crossings)?	No
Equestrians?	No		
Highest Posted Speed Limit:	40mph		

Scope of Works:	
	Full modernisation of junction

Approvals:		
Signed (S1 Engineer):		Date: 22/11/2021
Signed (S2 Engineer):		Date: 29/11/2021

GEOMETRY AND LAYOUT

Item No.	Description	Stage 1 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check	S1 CHK	Stage 2 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check	S2 CHK	Stage 1 Response to Stage 2 (if Required)	S1 RES	S2 CHK
1	Will vertical and horizontal alignment of all signals be consistent with required visibility, including sight-lights unobstructed?	All proposed signals will be visible on all approaches		All ok				
	Will backing boards be required?	No, LED aspects proposed		Not needed				
	Will advance warning signs be required? If so, has this been included on the Engineering Supplementary Information form?	No, Existing junction layout		Not needed				
2	Are all signal head arrangements consistent and suitable?	Yes, proposed layout clear to all users		all ok				
3	Could any vehicular signal heads (including cycles) be visible to conflicting flows? If mitigated, what mitigation has been provided?	No conflicting signals will be visible		None				
4	Are lane widths and swept paths proposed to be adequate for all road users? (Use evidence from swept path analysis, if provided).	No swept paths provided however large open junction with no evidence of equipment or kerb damage on site		All ok				
	Is there the potential for large vehicles to overrun pedestrian or cycle facilities?	No issues foreseen		No				
	Are signals proposed to have adequate clearance?	All signal equipment to have a minimum clearance of 450mm		All ok				

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:	[REDACTED]	Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

5	Are proposed road markings and lane designations correct?	All road markings correct and clear on street	[REDACTED]	All ok	[REDACTED]			
6	Is provision for right turning vehicles required? Are right turners provided for appropriately, considering the speed of the approach? Will right turn lanes be able to accommodate queuing traffic without blocking other traffic movements?	Yes 40mph road so existing RT arrow phase C replaced with a full Traffic phase C Right turners have dedicated lane and Phase	[REDACTED]	Yes 40mph so MOC corrected to prevent gap accepting All ok	[REDACTED]			
7	Is any proposed signal infrastructure likely to impact on off-carriageway traffic movements or visibility?	No issues forseen	[REDACTED]	No	[REDACTED]			
8	Will the site impact on any private accesses?	No	[REDACTED]	No	[REDACTED]			

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

PEDESTRIAN, CYCLE & EQUESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITIES

9	<p>Will proposed crossing widths (stud to stud) be adequate to accommodate:-</p> <p>1) Pedestrians? (Refer to pedestrian flows if provided)</p> <p>2) Cyclists? (Refer to cycle flows if provided)</p>							
10	<p>Will there be sufficient footway width to accommodate:-</p> <p>1) waiting pedestrians (including those with pushchairs / wheelchairs?)</p> <p>2) Cycles?</p> <p>3) Equestrians?</p>							
11	<p>Will traffic, pedestrian and cycle refuge islands meet minimum standards?</p> <p>Will refuge islands have the capacity to accommodate:-</p> <p>1) Waiting pedestrians?</p> <p>2) Cycles?</p>							

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:	[REDACTED]	Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

12	<p>Is the proposed design of crossing points appropriate for the road width (kerb to kerb)? i.e. Staggered, straight across...</p> <p>If staggered, is the offset suitable?</p> <p>If straight-across in two halves, is the transition between two halves adequate?</p>						
13	<p>Could any crossing signal heads and/or associated PCaTS units be visible to conflicting flows? If so, what mitigation has been provided for the following:-</p> <p>1) Pedestrians?</p> <p>2) Cycles?</p> <p>3) Equestrians?</p>						
14	<p>Are all push buttons proposed to be sited in accordance with standards?</p> <p>Will tactile cones be provided?</p> <p>Will audibles be provided? If so, will these be time switched & during what time?</p>						
15	<p>Is necessary off-carriageway provision for cyclists proposed?</p> <p>If so, are routes proposed to be clearly defined with tactile paving and signage?</p>						
16	<p>Will tactile paving be to the correct standard?</p> <p>Will flush kerbs be to the correct standard?</p>	<p>Existing BUFF tactile in good order. No controlled crossings at this site</p> <p>Existing adequate</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Existing is ok</p> <p>Existing is ok</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>Existing is ok</p>			

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

CYCLIST ON CARRIAGEWAY FACILITIES

17	Will widths of all cycle lanes be adequate? (Refer to cycle flows if provided)	N/A		N/A				
19	Are two-stage right turn facilities proposed? If so, are the waiting areas clearly defined with adequate sight-lines for cyclists undertaking the manoeuvre?	N/A N/A		N/A N/A				
19	Are ASLs appropriate in this design? If so, will the depth of ASLs be adequate? (Refer to cycle flows if provided)	Existing ASLs 4m, Little cycle activity noted during site visit Adequate		All ok Adequate				
20	Will blind spot safety mirrors be provided? If so, are they proposed with adequate clearance, an ASL and a permitted left turn?	Proposed Alongside ASLs on left turns		Proposed where necessary All ok				
21	Could left hooking and / or right turning conflicts between vehicles and cycles be a safety issue or has any mitigation been provided?	None foreseen		No issues				

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

BUSES

22	Will proposed / existing bus stop locations have any impact on the flow of vehicular traffic or has any mitigation been provided?	Bus stops on approaches do not impact on traffic movements	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>			
23	Is iBus existing or proposed at this site?	No IBUS proposed at NPs request	<input type="checkbox"/>	No iBus	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	If existing, is a new iBus design required with the changes proposed in this design?	N/A		N/A				

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

SIGNAL OPERATION AND TIMINGS

24	Will the method of control (MOC) be safe for all road users? Are any prohibited/alternative stage moves required? Why? Will all stages be appropriate for use in all modes of operation?	Yes Yes, Filter arrows Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All ok Covered in design Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
25	<u>For existing sites, Engineer must check live running timings in the controller if these are to be used for proposed design</u> Does the Junction Traffic Signal Design Sheet (SQA-8448) / Proposed Pedestrian Timing Sheet (SQA-8696) comply with standards with no errors or omissions?				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
26	Is an early start proposed? If so, will the signal layout be appropriate? Is an early cut off proposed? If so, will it be safe given the speed of traffic? Will any proposed phase delays cause an early cut off, early start or other unsafe signal sequence?	No early starts No early cut offs Intergreens squared off, so no phase delays required. Thus, no early starts or cut offs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No No No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
27	At internal stop lines, has clearance been accounted for by using phase delays and / or leaving amber links?	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
28	Will Speed Assessment (SA) equipment be required according to current standards? Where SA is required, but cannot be provided, please record why. If so, have intergreens been proposed to be increased to provide additional clearance time?	Existing to remain. Contractor to test and repair if damaged SA provided on this 40mph road	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Existing to be retained. N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
	Are any regulatory signs proposed?	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

29	Are all Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) in place? Are any new TROs required? (Detail these on Engineering Supplementary Information form)	N/A No	N/A N/A	
----	---	---------------	----------------	--

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

CONSTRUCTION, ACCEPTANCE TESTING, MAINTENANCE AND DECOMMISSIONING

30	Is all traffic infrastructure proposed to be located to minimise risk to operational staff over lifetime of asset?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All ok	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
31	Is Engineering required to attend a Factory Acceptance Test (FAT)?	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
32	Are there any errors or omissions on the LAT Attendance Requirement Form (SQA-8695)?			None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
33	Is the LAT Check List for ATS Form (SQA-8704) appropriate for this design's LAT?			All ok	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
34	Are there any errors or omissions on the Design Hazard Register (SQA-8700)?			None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
35	Are there any errors or omissions on the Design Risk Assessment (SQA-8701)?			None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
36	Are there any errors or omissions on the Engineering Supplementary Information Form (SQA-8702)?			None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2

Site Reference:	06/000042	Stage 1 Engineer:		Unique ID:	113733
Site Visit Date:	04/11/2021	Address:	ROCHESTER WAY - WELLING WAY	Drawing No:	PRO/06/000042/03
				WBS Code:	SC.3039.706.042

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

37	Are any special facilities proposed to be provided? If so, please detail how these will operate.	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>			
38	Are there any other assets proposed to be attached to the traffic signals, or existing (ANPR, etc.)? If so, please detail design considerations, including power and networking.	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	no	<input type="checkbox"/>			
39	Are there any errors or omissions on the Authorised Drawing?			All ok PRO approved.	<input type="checkbox"/>			
40	Does the design propose deviation from legislation, standards or local guidance?	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	No.	<input type="checkbox"/>			
	If so, what legislation, standard or local guidance is being deviated from?	N/A						
	Is it appropriate for Stage 2 Checker to authorise this deviation?	N/A						
	If it is not appropriate, who has the deviation been escalated to (name & role) and has their authorisation been granted?	N/A						

SQA-8189 Traffic Signal Safety and Quality Check List 1 and 2 - V 3.0