

## Cambridgeshire County Council Road Safety Audit Response Sheet

<b>Project name</b>	Kings Parade, Cambridge – HVM
<b>Audit Number &amp; Stage</b>	2162: Combined Stage 1 & 2
<b>Date:</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> November 2019
<b>Prepared by:</b>	
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Cambridge City Council

### Road safety audit decision log

RSA Problem	Recommendation	Designer Organisation Response	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed Action(s)
2.1 - Increased risk of southbound cycles losing control traversing the granite setts and kerb upstands when bypassing the HVM installation.	It is recommended that a suitable surface is provided along the route cyclists are expected to take and kerb upstands dropped flush to reduce the risk of cyclists falling from their cycle.	The intention is that both the northbound and southbound cycles use the cycle gap on the Kings College side. This will work in a similar way to the gate at Sidney Street / St Andrews Street junction. The observed main southbound flow of cycles is before 9:30am when the gate is open.	Route for cyclists needs to be clearly signed as it cannot be assumed that all cyclists will use the western side.	Additional signage to be added. On the east side, sign Diagram 966 (TSRGD 2016) "Cyclists Dismount" to be mounted on the light column for cyclists approaching from the north. On the west there shall be a sign Diagram 967 (TSRGD 2016), rectangular signs of blue background and white cycle to advise of the cycle route, to be viewed in both directions.

<p>2.2 - Increased risk of cyclists riding on footways and colliding with pedestrians or other cyclists due to the obstruction caused by the HVM installation.</p>	<p>Increased risk of cyclists riding on footways and colliding with pedestrians or other cyclists due to the obstruction caused by the HVM installation.</p>	<p>The intention is that both the northbound and southbound cycles use the cycle gap on the Kings College side. This will work in a similar way to the gate at Sidney Street / St Andrews Street junction. Observing this location there are very few cycles who chose to cut across the footway. Observing the cycle behaviour on Kings Parade, generally the cycles stay on the surfaced road and do not go onto the sets in the loading / disabled bays or the overrun area on the corner.</p>	<p>The footway at Sidney St/St Andrews is considerably wider. As above clear signing will need to be provided.</p>	<p>As point 2.1 above.</p>
<p>2.3 – Large / long vehicles turning left out of Bene't Street are likely to collide with vehicles parked in the proposed disabled bay.</p>	<p>It is recommended that swept path analysis is undertaken for all design vehicles and the disabled bays removed or relocated as necessary if large vehicles are likely to overrun the bays.</p>	<p>A swept path analysis (Autotrac) of the junction has been completed. The disabled bay has been amended following this analysis and has been shortened to a one vehicle bay (6m long). Due to the tight bend at the north end of Corn Exchange Street there are very few large vehicles exiting Bene't Street. There are HGV's which</p>	<p>Modification accepted</p>	

		access to the two theatres. We are talking to the theatres regarding their access and egress into Bene't Street. Drawing 018 RevA included.		
2.4 - Vehicles parked in the proposed disabled bay are likely to obstruct road users view to vehicles (including cyclists) when exiting Bene't Street.	It is recommended that the disabled bays removed or relocated as outside the junction visibility splay.	The area has a 20MPH speed limit. With the amendment (Point 2.3) to the proposed disabled parking bay at the north end on Trumpington Street there is the appropriate visibility from the junction.	With amendment proposed in 2.3 accept this is improved for correct visibility splays and note it is 20mph.	
2.5 - Increased risk of collisions involving road users reversing into the path of vehicles exiting Bene't Street as well as NMUs crossing at the junction.	It is recommended that appropriate turning provision is made on the southern side of the HVM installation to reduce the likelihood of road users using Bene't Street as a turning head or make Trumpington Street one-way in the southbound direction between Bene't Street and Silver Street to negate the requirement for a turning head.  Update 20/11/19	There is little change from the existing priorities of the junction. Only blue badge holders, taxis and loading permit holders can currently enter Kings Parade. Vehicles are turning in this area currently. We have suggested to retailers (to pass details to their suppliers) and taxis to use Corn Exchange Street and come along Bene't Street and exit southbound on Trumpington Street.	Creating a one-way street will require a TRO necessitating full consultation and consideration of any objections by CJAC. The ATTRO to reduce the risk of a hostile vehicle attack could not be implemented until this process is completed.	

	<p>Junctions would not normally be promoted or designated as a turning head and there is a foreseeable safety risk with using the junction for this purpose.</p> <p>If the scheme can only be implemented in its current form (maintaining a two-way flow along the northern end of Trumpington Street) then it is an unavoidable risk, with the probability of a collision occurring being governed vehicle flows out of Bene't Street, flows of crossing NMUs and the number of vehicles using the junction as a turning head.</p> <p>Weigh up the benefit of the HVM installation (and risk of a hostile vehicle attack) versus the road safety risk to determine if this is a bearable risk (suggest that a specific risk assessment is undertaken and decision documented)</p>	<p>We will look to change signing on Trumpington Street to the south of Silver Street to advise drivers to use this route. Making Trumpington Street one way is outside the scope of this project. This may be considered by GCP in their works. Making Trumpington Street one way also causes issues for the two theatres in getting HGV access to service the theatres. The HVM is a temporary measure and will be monitored with amendments made if required. Learning from this temporary HVM will be incorporated into any permanent design.</p>	<p>An assessment to compare the potential road safety risk as a result of road users using the Bene't Street junction as a turning head against the potential safety risk posed by a Hostile Vehicle attack concluded that the risk value of a hostile vehicle attack (10) is</p>	
--	---	---	---	--

			higher than the risk of additional collisions occurring at the Bene't Street junction (8). Additional control measures (in the form of the proposed HVM installation) are likely to reduce into the low category.	
2.6 - Increased risk of collisions between pedestrians and cyclists due to a combination the HVM measures and dining furniture causing an obstruction.	It is recommended that the area in the immediate vicinity of HVM installation is kept clear of table and chairs.	It is not considered that cycles will run on the footway. See point 2.1 & 2.2 The tables and chairs licence outside The Cambridge Wine Merchants is temporary until the HVM is installed. They are aware of the proposal and also that their tables and chairs licence is temporary. The Chop House have discussed that the last table will need to be removed when the barrier is installed.	Pavement licence will be revoked upon installation of the HVM.	
2.7 - Increased risk of pedestrians and cyclists colliding with the HVM installation during the hours of darkness.	It is recommended that both the gate and ballasted barges are conspicuously marked with reflective bands.	There are street lights located adjacent to the proposed HVM locations. The area is generally well illuminated and have a 20MPH speed limit.	Accepted	

		<p>The gate will be yellow in colour. The barges will have reflective strips on the ends.</p> <p>The HVM installation will be monitored and amendments made if required.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

**Design organisation statement:**

On behalf of the design organisation I certify that the actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.

Name:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: Project Officer \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation: Cambridge City Council \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 13<sup>th</sup> November 2019 \_\_\_\_\_

**Overseeing organisation statement**

On behalf of the overseeing organisation I certify that:

- (1) the actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the design organisation; and
- (2) the agreed actions will be progressed.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

---