

Recommendation	Design Organisation Response	Client Organisation Comments
Fully Accepted		
It is recommended that passively safe signposts should be provided, or where two conventional 89mm signposts are used, they should be provided with at least 1500mm between them.	The proposed sign width cannot accommodate the posts to have a 1500mm spacing. A single post of increased size has now been proposed	I agree with the Designer's comments.
Care should be taken to ensure that any redundant speed limit roundel markings are completely removed. Where hydro-blasting proves to be ineffective it is recommended that strip surfacing should be undertaken.	Previously the speed roundels have been painted over in black thermoplastic paint. The hydroblasting should fully remove the roundels. Strip surfacing can be considered at the request of the client.	I agree with the Designer's comments.
Partially Accepted		
It is recommended that a review of the locations of the existing speed cameras, and the locations of the proposed weight restriction signage should be undertaken with the intention to reduce the risk that motorists are distracted from the seeing the proposed weight restriction signs.	The first weight restriction sign is positioned approx. 50m east of the speed camera and both weight restriction signs are located in the central reserve. Due to the curvature of the road, the weight restriction signs have a 300m+ visibility range in lane 1. Whereas the speed camera only has approx. 30m visibility range due to its location and tree foilage – this reduced visibility may also be a factor for motorists abruptly slowing. Two inforamatory weight restriction signs have been proposed on the approach to increase the awareness of the restriction and also prevent them from being missed through 'distraction'. The change in speed limit from 50mph to 30mph just after the speed camera would lead to abrupt slowing, regardless of a speed camera being positioned at this location. A review of the speed camera location is not within the scope of this work.	I agree with the Designer's comments.

	Relocation of the Informatory Weight restriction signs could be considered so that they are both seen prior to the speed camera.	
It is recommended that the information on the existing map type advanced directional signs be revised to reflect the new weight restrictions on the flyover. It may be particularly beneficial to include the appropriate weight limit roundel signs on the flyover section of the map type signs.	As per The Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 3, an informatory sign may be used to indicate a restriction on a road in addition to the advanced directional signage to reduce overall size and/or sign overload. Having reviewed all 4 ADS signs which have incorporated mechanical louvres, some may require extensive work to allow for the inclusion of weight restriction signage – especially on the westbound approach. For consistency, the design has proposed for both approaches to have the same informatory weight restriction signage. The existing weight restriction on the flyover has been imposed as an interim measure. Extensive changes to the existing large directional signage may not be appropriate if it is expected for the weigh restriction to be removed in the near future. It may be considered to relocate the informatory weight restriction signage so that one sign is before the ADS and the other is after to reaffirm the	I agree with the Designer's comments.
Proposed location of sign ref: P17 Reason considered to be outside the Terms of Reference: Minor drafting issue / oversight	Informatory Weight Restriction sign proposed to the east of the blank faced sign. Location of blank faced sign added to the drawing for clarity.	I agree with the Designer's comments.

Where it is proposed to locate proposed weight restriction sign (Ref: P17) within the central reservation facing A127 westbound traffic, it was noted during the site visit that there is an existing blank faced sign facing eastbound traffic located in broadly the same area. Care should be taken to ensure that the proposed sign is not obscured, and/or does not obscure forward visibility the existing sign assembly.

Throughout scheme extents

Reason considered to be outside the Terms of Reference: Existing maintenance issue
During the site visit it was observed that there were a number of areas of water ponding throughout the scheme extents. This could result in an increased risk of loss of control type collisions, particularly where this water may turn to ice during colder conditions. There is particular concerns where these areas were within the extents of non-motorised user crossings as it could present slip hazard to non-motorised users. It is recommended that the existing drainage issues should be highlighted to the relevant maintenance team for urgent resolution.

Resolution of drainage issues not within current scope of works.
Drainage issues can be considered at the request of the client.