

Ringway Jacobs

A10 KINGSLAND ROAD/STAMFORD ROAD HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit

Ref: 8126

Prepared for:

Ringway Jacobs, London Bridge Office

By:

Ringway Jacobs, Chelmsford Office

Prepared by: [REDACTED], Audit Team Leader (Road Safety Engineer)

Checked by: [REDACTED] Audit Team Member (Road Safety Engineer)

Approved by: [REDACTED], Project Manager (Senior Road Safety Engineer)

Version	Status	Date
A	Audit report issued to Client	20/07/2018
B	Designers responses added	11/06/2019
C	Client responses added	25/07/2019



INTRODUCTION

1.0 Commission

- 1.0.1 This report results from a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit carried out on the A10 Kingsland Road/Stamford Road Highways Improvement proposals.
- 1.0.2 The Audit was undertaken by Ringway Jacobs Road Safety Engineering Team as requested by [REDACTED] of Ringway Jacobs on behalf of TfL in April 2019. It took place at Ringway Jacobs Chelmsford Offices on Thursday 19th April 2019 and comprised an examination of the documents provided as listed in Appendix A, plus a visit to the site of the scheme.
- 1.1 The site visit was made during the hours of daylight on Tuesday 23rd April during the hours of daylight. During the site visit the weather was mild and partly cloudy the road surface was dry and traffic was free-flowing.

1.2 Terms of Reference

- 1.2.1 The Terms of Reference of this Audit are as described in TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014. The Audit Team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and how it impacts on all road users and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria. However, to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem the Audit Team may, on occasion, have referred to a design standard without touching on technical audit. An absence of comment relating to specific road users / modes in Section 3 of this report does not imply that they have not been considered; instead the Audit Team feels they are not adversely affected by the proposed changes.
- 1.2.2 This Safety Audit is not intended to identify pre-existing hazards which remain unchanged due to the proposals; hence they will not be raised in Section 3 of this report as they fall outside the remit of Road Safety Audit in general as specified in the procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014. Safety issues identified during the Audit and site visit 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 Section 4 of this report.
- 1.2.3 Nothing in this Audit should be regarded as a direct instruction to include or remove a measure from within the scheme. Responsibility for designing the scheme lies with the Designer and as such the Audit Team accepts no design responsibility for any changes made to the scheme as a result of this Audit.
- 1.2.4 In accordance with TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014, this Audit has a maximum shelf life of 2 years. If the scheme does not progress to the next stage in its development within this period, then the scheme should be re-audited.
- 1.2.5 Unless general to the scheme, all comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed design drawings and the locations have been indicated on the plan located in Appendix B.
- 1.2.6 It is the responsibility of the Design Organisation to complete the Designer's response section of this Audit report. Where applicable and necessary it is the responsibility of the Client Organisation to complete the Client comment section of this Audit report. Signatures from both the Design Organisation and Client Organisation must be added within Section 5 of this Audit report. A copy of which must be returned to the Audit Team.

1.3 Main Parties to the Audit

1.3.1 Client Organisation

Client contact details: [REDACTED] (Ringway Jacobs)

Design Organisation

Design contact details: [REDACTED] (Ringway Jacobs)

1.3.2 Audit Team

Audit Team Leader: [REDACTED] – Road Safety Engineer, Ringway Jacobs

Audit Team Member:– [REDACTED] - Road Safety Engineer, Ringway Jacobs

Audit Team Observer: None

1.3.3 Other Specialist Advisors

Specialist Advisor Details: None

1.4 Purpose of the Scheme

1.4.1 A10 Kingsland Road is a north-south route, which runs from the A5201 Old Street in the south to the A104 Dalston Lane in the north, where it continues north as Kingsland High Street. The junction of Kingsland Road with Dalston Lane is a four-arm signalised crossroads in the centre of a busy retail area. Two lane approaches are provided on three arms of the junction. Balls Pond Road has a single lane approach to the stop line. Advanced Stop Lines (ASLs) for cyclists and controlled pedestrian crossing facilities are provided on all arms of the junction, with an additional diagonal crossing on Kingsland Road across the centre of the junction. Right turning movements from Dalston Lane, Balls Pond Road and the northern arm of Kingsland Road are prohibited. The left turn from Balls Pond Road is also prohibited.

1.4.2 Kingsland Road to the south of the Dalston Lane junction is a two-way single carriageway, with one traffic lane in each direction to Stamford Road, beyond which near side bus lanes are present. Stamford Road is a left in/left out junction except for cyclists who can use a right turning lane through a central traffic island. Tottenham Road is open to one-way traffic eastbound, where exiting traffic must turn left into Kingsland Road. The speed limit within the scheme extents is 20mph.

1.4.3 The scheme comprises of the following measures:

- The two-lane approach to the Dalston Lane stop line will be reduced to a single lane approach with a near side cycle feeder lane for the ASL. The central feeder for the ASL on Kingsland Road southbound will be removed and the existing central traffic island will be reduced in length. The northbound cycle feeder lane for the ASL on Kingsland Road will be extended past the Bentley Road junction.
- The junctions of Stamford Road and Tottenham Road with Kingsland Road will be closed off to motorised traffic. A two-way cycle lane will be provided for Stamford Road. The existing right turning lane for cyclists on Kingsland Road will be modified – the central traffic island will be removed; however, a central refuge will be maintained for the uncontrolled crossing to the south of the junction with Stamford Road.
- The traffic signal control for the bus gate on the eastern side of Kingsland Road will be removed. The signal-controlled pedestrian crossing and central refuge associated with this junction will be relocated further to the south.

1.5 Special Considerations

1.5.1 None

2.0 ITEMS RAISED IN PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS

The proposals were subject to a previous Stage 2 Road Safety Audit carried out by CVU. The items raised in that RSA will be reviewed as part of this Stage 2 RSA.

Problem: 3.1 The proximity of the Loading Bay on Kingsland Road to the relocated signal-controlled crossing is likely to disrupt the southbound traffic lane when the Loading Bay is occupied.

Recommendation:

The Loading Bay should be relocated further to the south away from the crossing to provide sufficient room for larger vehicles to manoeuvre around it.

Design Organisation Response

Accepted

Comment noted, proposed road markings design is carried over from ODE preliminary design. Client to instruct if the loading bay to be relocated away from the controlled crossing.

Client Organisation Response

Vehicles should sit in the offside position and there is sufficient space for larger vehicles to manoeuvre around loading bay if in use.

Drawing RJC2018_0012D-0100-06 Rev.3, shows that the central median is to be an area of light grey imprint surfacing. This will permit larger vehicles to overrun this area. This issue is considered to be resolved.

Problem: 3.2 An existing Advance Direction Sign (ADS) and lighting column in the western footway on Kingsland Road are likely to obstruct the clear view of the near side northbound primary traffic signal of the signal-controlled crossing.

Design Organisation Response

Accepted

Comment noted, TfL TI engineer to review the traffic signal design.

Client Organisation Response

Client would like to take contractors advise and install a secondary signal head

This issue is considered to be resolved.

Problem: 3.3 The provision of a new cycle feeder lane for the ASL on Balls Pond Road is likely to leave those cyclists more vulnerable to conflict with a following vehicle at the pinch-point in the near side kerbline

Design Organisation Response **Accepted**

Comment noted, proposed road markings design is carried over from ODE preliminary design. Client to instruct if the cycle feeder lane to be removed from the scheme.

Client Organisation Response

Comment noted. Cycle feeder lane to be removed from drawings.
This issue is considered to be resolved.

3.0 ITEMS RAISED AT THIS STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

This section should be read in conjunction with Paragraphs 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 of this report.

3.1 GENERAL

3.1.1 PROBLEM A

Location: Stamford Road close to junction with Kingsland Road

Summary: Potential for collisions between cyclists and powered two wheeled vehicles.

It was noted at the time of the site visit that there is a motorcycle parking bay with close proximity to the proposed cycle lane. Whilst it is appreciated that bollards with a sign to Diag. 955 are to be installed, the Road Safety Audit Team are concerned that motorcyclists may choose to use the cycle lane to access Kingsland Road. This could lead to collisions between cycles and motorcyclists.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that additional measures are used to deter motorcyclists from using the cycle lane.

Design Organisation Response	Accepted
------------------------------	----------

Further design measures to deter motorcyclist for consideration include:

- Option 1: use of coloured surfacing denoting the cycle lane.
- Option 2: use of sign diag. 619 - motor vehicles prohibited.

As TfL's cycle design guidance recommends only using coloured surfacing to highlight cyclists movements to encroaching traffic, this may not be the best solution as motorcyclist would knowingly be entering a cycle path so would be expecting

3.1.2 them, as such it is considered that option 2 to provide signs to diag. 619 would be the better option as this will highlight the legal restrictions to offending motorcyclists.

Client Organisation Comments

Accepted

EM B

Location: Tottenham Road close to junction with Kingsland Road

Summary: Potential for collisions reversing vehicles and pedestrians.

It is proposed to close the junction of Tottenham Road and Kingsland Road as part of the works. It was noted at the time of the site visit that there is a car parking bay close to the junction in Tottenham Road. Vehicles using the parking bay will have to turn their vehicles to face westward or reverse into the private access several metres west in order to exit Tottenham Road. Both these manoeuvres could lead to conflicts between turning vehicles and pedestrians resulting in injury.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the parking bay is removed as part of these works and that Waiting Restrictions including a Loading Ban are also introduced.

3.2	Design Organisation Response	Part Accepted
-----	------------------------------	---------------

Regarding a turning manoeuvre, vehicle speeds and flow would be very low plus the layout is not an unusual arrangement. As such, it is expected that the risk would be low. Whilst we necessarily don't agree that there is a substantial risk with a parked car undertaking a manoeuvre around in this area, it is recommended that a risk assessment is undertaken to substantiate that view point and vehicle tracking undertaken.

It is recommended to implement a waiting/loading restrictions at the existing double yellow lines to ensure there is space for the manoeuvre however this will require a change to the Traffic Order.

It is also noted that the parking spot could still be removed if the client so wished, and that the adjacent motorcycle parking could be extended into it.

3.2.1 Client to instruct if they would like to implement a change via SMI.

Client Organisation Comments

Accepted – leave the parking bay as it is

**A
D SAFETY PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED**

3.3 THE JUNCTIONS

3.3.1 NO ROAD SAFETY PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

3.4 SIGNING, LIGHTING & ROAD MARKINGS

3.4.1 NO ROAD SAFETY PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

3.5 NON-MOTORISED ROAD USERS

3.5.1 NO ROAD SAFETY PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

End of list of problems identified and recommendations offered in this Stage 3 Road Safety Audit

4.0 ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

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 warrants that a full review of the highway environment has been undertaken beyond that necessary to undertake the Audit as commissioned.

NO ROAD SAFETY ISSUES IDENTIFIED

5.0 SIGNATURES AND SIGN-OFF

5.1 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

We certify that we have examined the drawings and documents listed in Appendix A. to this Safety Audit report. The Road Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014, with the sole purpose of identifying any feature that could be removed or modified in order to improve the safety of the measures. The problems identified have been noted in this report together with associated suggestions for safety improvements that we recommend should be studied for implementation.

No-one on the Audit Team has been involved with the design of the measures.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER:

Name:

MIHE MSORSA

Signed:

Position:

Road Safety Engineer

Date: 14/5/2019

Organisation:

Ringway Jacobs

Address:

Seax House, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH

Telephone:

Email:

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER:

Name:

Signed:

Position:

Road Safety Engineer

Date: 14/5/2019

Organisation:

Ringway Jacobs

Address:

Seax House, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH

Telephone:

Email:

Both members of the Audit Team are holders of a Certificate of Competency in Road Safety Audit complying with HD 19/15 Road Safety Audit and EC Directive 2008/96/EC.

5.2 DESIGN TEAM STATEMENT

In accordance with SQA-0170 dated May 2014, I certify that I have reviewed the items raised in this Stage 1/2 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 Client Organisations endorsement of my proposals.

Designers response completed by;

Name: [REDACTED]

Position: Engineer

Organisation: Ringway Jacobs

Signed: [REDACTED]

Dated: 11/06/2019

Checked by;

Designers response completed by;

Name: [REDACTED]

Position: Senior Engineer

Organisation: Ringway Jacobs

Signed: [REDACTED]

Dated: 11/06/2019

5.3 CLIENT ORGANISATION STATEMENT

I accept these proposals by the Design Organisation.

Name: [REDACTED]

Position: Sponsor

Organisation: Transport for London, Investment Delivery Planning

Signed: [REDACTED]

Dated: 25/07/2019

5.4 SECONDARY CLIENT ORGANISATION STATEMENT (where appropriate)

I accept these proposals by the Design Organisation.

Name:

Position:

Organisation:

Signed:

Dated:

APPENDIX A

Documents Forming the Audit Brief

Doc. No.	Document title
RJC2018-0012D-0100-01	Cover Sheet
RJC2018-0012D-0100-02	Existing Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-03	Existing Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-04	Existing Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-05	Proposed Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-06	Proposed Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-07	Proposed Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0100-08	Existing Utilities
RJC2018-0012D-0100-09	Existing Utilities
RJC2018-0012D-0100-10	Existing Utilities
RJC2018-0012D-0100-11	GPR Survey
RJC2018-0012D-0100-12	GPR Survey
RJC2018-0012D-0200-01	Site Clearance
RJC2018-0012D-0200-02	Site Clearance
RJC2018-0012D-0200-03	Site Clearance
RJC2018-0012D-0500-01	Drainage
RJC2018-0012D-0500-02	Drainage
RJC2018-0012D-0500-03	Drainage
RJC2018-0012D-0500-04	Iron Works
RJC2018-0012D-0500-05	Iron Works
RJC2018-0012D-0700-01	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0700-02	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0700-03	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0700-04	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0700-05	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-0700-06	Proposed Pavement Layout
RJC2018-0012D-1100-01	Proposed Kerb & Footway
RJC2018-0012D-1100-02	Proposed Kerb & Footway
RJC2018-0012D-1100-03	Proposed Kerb & Footway
RJC2018-0012D-1100-04	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1100-05	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1100-06	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1100-07	Proposed Contours

RJC2018-0012D-1100-08	Cross Sections
RJC2018-0012D-1100-09	Cross Sections
RJC2018-0012D-1100-10	Standard Details
RJC2018-0012D-1100-11	Standard Details
RJC2018-0012D-1100-12	Standard Details
RJC2018-0012D-1100-13	Standard Details
RJC2018-0012D-1100-14	Standard Details
RJC2018-0012D-1200-01	Proposed Road Markings
RJC2018-0012D-1200-02	Proposed Road Markings
RJC2018-0012D-1200-03	Proposed Road Markings
RJC2018-0012D-1200-04	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1200-05	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1200-06	Setting Out
RJC2018-0012D-1200-07	Proposed Sign Schedule
RJC2018-0012D-1200-08	Proposed Sign Schedule
RJC2018-0012D-1200-09	Proposed Sign Schedule
RJC2018-0012D-1200-10	New Signs
RJC2018-0012D-1200-11	New Signs
RJC2018-0012D-1200-12	New Signs
RJC2018-0012D-1200-13	New Signs
RJC2018-0012D-1200-14	New Signs
RJC2018-0012D-1200-15	Standard Details

DOCUMENTS

- Safety Audit Brief
- Traffic signal details
- TfL signal safety checklist
- Departures from standard
- Previous Road Safety Audits
- Previous Designer Responses
- Collision data
- Collision plot
- Traffic flow / modelling data
- Pedestrian flow / modelling data
- Speed survey data
- Other documents

DETAILS (where appropriate)

Road Safety Audit Brief – Dated 23rd May 2019
 As listed in the drawing schedule
 Not provided
 No details provided

Not provided
 Not provided

APPENDIX B Problem Locations

