



Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit Report

**A474 Neath Abbey Road, Neath
Proposed new Aldi Foodstore
S278 & 38 Highway works**

**Produced for:
Entran**

Date: 18th February 2021



trafficmanagementconsultants@hotmail.co.uk



07771 557382

DOCUMENT REGISTER

Project Name: Aldi A474 Neath Abbey Road, Neath S278 & 38 highway works

Report Title: Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit

Date: 18th February 2021

Client: Entran

Audit Team	Name	Position	Date
Audit Team Leader:	Peter Ronald	Director	18/02/2021
Audit Team Member:	Wing Lee	Road Safety Auditor	18/02/2021
Approved By:	Peter Ronald	Director	18/02/2021

Revision History					
Revision	Date	Description	Audit Team Leader	Audit Team Member	Approved
-	18/02/2021	Draft	PR	WL	PR
A	18/02/2021	Final	PR	WL	PR

Prepared By: **Traffic Management Consultants Ltd**

Unit 2
71A Hamilton Road
READING
RG1 5RA

☎ 07771 557382

✉ trafficmanagementconsultants@hotmail.co.uk

14 Aintree Lane
Liverpool
L10 2JL

Disclaimer

“No part of this report may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Traffic Management Consultants. If you have received this report in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Traffic Management Consultants.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Traffic Management Consultants, no other party may use, make use of, or rely on the contents of the report. If others choose to rely upon this report they do so entirely at their own risk. No liability is accepted by Traffic Management Consultants for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided.

Opinions and information provided in the report are based on Traffic Management Consultants using due skill, care, and diligence in the preparation of the same and no explicit warranty is provided as to their accuracy. It should be noted, and it is expressly stated, that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Traffic Management Consultants has been made.”

1. Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	5
2. Introduction.....	5
3. Risk Assessment.....	7
4. Historical Summary	7
5. Existing Environment.....	7
6. Collision Data.....	7
7. Survey Information.....	8
8. Audit Assessment	8
9. Nil Response/Comments	14
10. Non-Motorised User Report (NMU's)	14
11. Audit Team Statement	15
12. Appendix A - List of Documents	16
13. Appendix B - Identified Road Safety Audit Matters Location Plans.....	16
14. Appendix C - Designer's and Auditor Response to Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit	17

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 This scheme is promoted by Aldi Foodstores. This Road Safety Audit is supplied under the provisions of the Safety Audit request dated 1st December 2020.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 This report results from a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit request for a proposal to construct a new Aldi Foodstore with access onto the A474 Neath Abbey Road, Neath on land in front of CSN Precision Engineering.

The works include:

- New improved side road T-junction , and access road
- Localised widening with ghost right turn lane

2.2 Audit Team Membership

The Audit Team comprised the following individuals:

Peter Ronald I.Eng, AMICE, MCIHT, MSoRSA, (HE - RSA Cert of Comp).
(Audit Team Leader)

Wing Lee BEng(hons), PGCert, MCIHT, MIHE, (HE - RSA Cert of Comp).
(Audit Team Member)

2.3 Audit Site Visit

A site visit was carried out on Tuesday 8th December 2020 by the Audit Team, between 1.30pm and 2.30pm. The weather conditions were cloudy and dry. Traffic Flows were low and limited pedestrian/cycle movements were observed. The road surface was wet. Vehicle speeds were perceived to be within the posted 30mph speed limit along Neath Abbey Road

The Audit also comprised an examination of the drawing provided by Craddys and any additional support documents completed by the Audit Team as listed in **Appendix A**. All safety issues are with reference to the outline design details shown on the drawing.

2.4 Strategic Decisions

The Audit Team has not been advised of any Strategic Decisions made by the Local Highway Authority or by the Local Planning Authority.

2.5 Audit Brief

The Audit Team were not provided with an Audit Brief by the Local Authority.

2.6 Terms of Reference

The terms of reference of the audit are based on "Guidelines For the Safety Audit of Highway Schemes" published by the Institution of Highways and Transportation, other guidance references are the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016, and GG119 Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

The Audit Team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme and has not 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 or other guidance documents.

2.7 **Audit Recommendations**

Recommendations included within this report should not be regarded as being prescriptive design solutions to the problems identified. They are only to indicate a proportionate and viable means of eliminating or mitigating the identified road safety audit matters, and in no way imply that a formal design process has been undertaken.

There may be alternative measures of addressing a problem which would be equally acceptable or superior in achieving the desired degree of mitigation and these should be considered by the designer when responding to this report.

2.8 **Scope of Road Safety Audits**

Road Safety Audit shall only be concerned with Road Safety Matters, i.e. *an element of the existing road environment or proposed road environment that could potentially contribute to a road traffic collision or features that could present a risk of injuries to road users.*

Road Safety Audit is not a technical check that the design conforms to standards and/or best practice guidance.

Road Safety Audit is not a check that the scheme has been constructed in accordance with the design.

Road Safety Audit does not consider structural safety.

Road Safety Audit does not cover health and safety issues concerning road workers during the construction phase but may cover the future maintenance and operation of the road.

Road safety matters resulting from the operation of facilities for highway maintenance that affect road users shall be included in the scope of Road Safety Audit.

The needs of all road users shall be assessed when undertaking Road Safety Audits.

3. Risk Assessment

- 3.1 Each of the Auditors' responses is classified as either a 'Problem' or a 'Nil Response / Comment'. Items classified as a 'Problem' denote matters likely to result in significant road safety hazards. Items marked as 'Nil Response / Comment' are less serious but worthy of consideration by the Designer and/or by the Overseeing Organisation.
- 3.2 Although all the problems identified are of sufficient importance to require action, the table below shows their relative urgency based on the risk perceived by the Safety Auditors. The level of risk assigned to each problem is largely subjective and is only intended as a guide to assist the client in determining the priority of the road safety matters raised.

Severity / Risk Level	Probability				
	Frequent	Probable	Occasional	Remote	Improbable
Catastrophic	****Problem**** (Urgent)				
Critical		***Problem*** (High Risk)			
Major			**Problem** (Medium Risk)		
Minor				*Problem* (Low Risk)	
Negligible					Comment

4. Historical Summary

- 4.1 The site is currently open space in front of CSN Precision Engineering .

5. Existing Environment

- 5.1 The A474 Neath Abbey Road is a single carriageway classified road that links north from the large roundabout junction with the A4230 to Cadoxton Road to Cadoxton and Rhyddings.
- It has a footway only along its southern side in the vicinity of the new store and has a system of street lighting that introduces a 30mph speed limit.
- The speed limit reduces to 20mph to the east of the proposed store access then continues to the east. The site is located off the south western side of Shipton Road, Woodstock east of Woodstock.

6. Collision Data

- 6.1 The Audit Team have not been provided with any recorded injury collision data as part of this road safety audit.

7. Survey Information

7.1 None provided.

8. Audit Assessment

8.1 The table below summarises the findings from this audit which are described in detail within the following pages.

Identified locations of Road Safety Audit Matters are indicated on drawings within **Appendix B** to the rear of this report.

No.	Item	Comments	Notes
B1	General		
B1.1	Departures from Standards		
B1.2	Drainage		
B1.3	Climatic Conditions		
B1.4	Landscaping	Problem	(8.1) Vegetation overhanging carriageway on northern side of road along reduced width running lane
B1.5	Public Utilities/ Services Apparatus	Problems Comment	(8.2) Existing manhole in middle of new junction will need to be strengthened and have non-slip cover or relocated (8.3) Existing utilities inline with proposed pedestrian crossing point (9.1) Existing manhole sunk needs to be reset
B1.6	Lay-bys		
B1.7	Access		
B1.8	Skid Resistance		
B1.9	Agriculture		
B1.10	Fences and Road Restraint Systems		
B1.11	Adjacent Developments and Roads		
B1.12	Road alignment		
B1.13	General layout		
B2	Local Alignment		
B2.1	Visibility		
B2.2	New/Existing Road Interface		
B3	Junctions		
B3.1	Layout		
B3.2	Visibility		
B3.3	Signing		
B3.4	Road Markings		
B3.5	T, X and Y junctions		
B3.6	All roundabouts		
B3.7	Mini Roundabouts		
B3.8	Traffic Signals		

B4	Non-Motorised User Provision		
B4.1	Adjacent Land		
B4.2	Pedestrians	Problem	(8.4) Bus shelter being relocated , ensure adequate footway width adjacent to new location
B4.3	Cyclists		
B4.4	Equestrians		
B5	Road Signs, Carriageway Markings and Lighting		
B5.1	ADS and Local Traffic Signs		
B5.2	Variable Message Signs		
B5.3	Lighting		
B5.4	Road Markings	Comment	(9.2) Ensure TRO progressed for double yellow lines
B5.5	Poles and Columns		

8.1 *Problem* (Item B1.4)	
Location:	Neath Abbey Road
Summary:	Vegetation overhanging northern side of carriageway
 There is vegetation that overhangs the northern side of the carriageway that will cause an obstruction for vehicles travelling along the reduced width traffic lane on the northern side of road. This vegetation needs to be cut back	
TYPE OF CONFLICT/COLLISION	
Vehicle collisions with vegetation	
RECOMMENDATION	
Cut back vegetation	

8.2 *Problem* (Item B1.5)	
Location:	Neath Abbey Road at new junction
Summary:	Existing manhole in middle of new junction inline with turning vehicles
 There is an existing BT manhole that is detailed to be diverted or lowered that will be in the middle of the new junction carriageway inline with turning vehicles. This will need a non slip cover if its remains within the carriageway as it will cause a stability problem for turning two wheeled vehicles	
TYPE OF CONFLICT/COLLISION	
Turning vehicle loss of control collisions	
RECOMMENDATION	
Provide non slip manhole cover on manhole if it remains within carriageway	

8.3 *Problem* (Item B1.5)	
Location:	Neath Abbey Road at new junction
Summary:	Existing manhole inline with proposed pedestrian crossing point
	
There is an existing BT manhole that is detailed to be diverted or lowered that will be inline with the proposed pedestrian crossing point. This will cause an obstruction for pedestrians when essential maintenance works are being carried out. Relocate manhole away from line of pedestrian crossing point.	
TYPE OF CONFLICT/COLLISION	
Obstruction in line with pedestrian crossing point when essential maintenance being carried out	
RECOMMENDATION	
Relocate manhole away from inline with pedestrian crossing point	

8.4 *Problem* (Item B4.2)	
Location:	Neath Abbey Road
Summary:	Bus shelter being relocated within new 2m footway ensure minimum width is maintained
There is a bus shelter that is being relocated within the proposed footway. Ensure that adequate footway width is maintained adjacent to the shelter	
TYPE OF CONFLICT/COLLISION	
Inadequate width of footway adjacent to shelter	
RECOMMENDATION	
Ensure adequate width of footway is maintained adjacent to new shelter location	

9. Nil Response/Comments

- 9.1 Neath Abbey Road. Existing manhole sunk near new junction. Inform Council for them to rectify



- 9.2 New double yellow lines proposed these need to be backed by TRO

10. Non-Motorised User Report (NMU's)

- 10.1 This report has identified several road safety problems affecting NMU's that need to be resolved

11. Audit Team Statement

I certify that we have examined the drawing listed within **Appendix A** and that the site has been inspected. The examination has been carried out with the sole purpose of identifying road safety matters that can be addressed to improve the safety of the scheme.

The problems identified have been noted in the report together with associated safety improvement suggestions that we recommend should be studied for implementation.

I can confirm that we have not been involved with the scheme design.



Peter Ronald
(Audit Team Leader)

18th February 2021



Wing Lee
(Audit Team Member)

18th February 2021

14. Appendix C - Designer's and Auditor Response to Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit

Stage 1/2 (Road Safety Audit) DESIGNER'S ROAD SAFETY AUDIT RESPONSE Scheme Name: Aldi Neath Abbey Road		
The issues categorised in this road safety audit as 'Problem' matters are those causing serious concern and are summarised below. The purpose of this form is for the scheme Designer or Overseeing Organisation to respond to the 'Problem' matters. Responses should be returned to Traffic Management Consultants. 'Comments' in this report are made for the benefit of the Designer and are not referred to below.		
RSA Matter	Summary of RSA Problem	Designer's Response
8.1	Vegetation overhanging northern side of carriageway	Agree – All overhanging vegetation to be cut back and identified as an ongoing maintenance requirement, refer to drawing 79-E1379-CDY-XX-XX-DR-D-En_80_35_74-0010 - S278-38 Engineering Layout.
8.2	Existing manhole in middle of new junction inline with turning vehicles	Agree – Existing services chamber to receive a non-slip surface treatment or shall be relocated into adjacent footway, refer to drawing 79-E1379-CDY-XX-XX-DR-D-En_80_35_74-0010 - S278-38 Engineering Layout.
8.3	Existing manhole inline with proposed pedestrian crossing point	Agree – Relocation of the chamber into the new/revised footway is the preference and is currently being progressed by the Developer's team, refer to plan SX/20/NM/833909 Openreach Proposal A. Only if chamber relocation is cost or technically prohibitive will the chamber remain in its current position.
8.4	Bus shelter being relocated within new 2m footway ensure minimum width is maintained	Agree – Minimum footway width shall be maintained. Further information is being sought from Clear Channel on the spatial requirements for bus shelter to determine necessity for localised footway widening.

AUDIT TEAM RESPONSE

8.1

8.2

8.3

8.4