

YGG RHOSAFAN, MARINE DRIVE, PORT TALBOT

PROPOSED SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

June 2025

RW-DC-25-4624-RSA1

Report title:	YGG Rhosafan, Marine Drive, Port Talbot. RSA 1
Date:	16/06/25
Document reference and revision:	RW-DC-25-4624-RSA1
Prepared by:	The Safety Forum
On behalf of:	Asbri Transport Ltd / Neath Port Talbot Council

Revision Status	Prepared by: (Name)	Checked by: (Name)	Approved by: (Signature)	Date Approved:
Original	R Westhead	D Crawford		16/06/25
Designer's Response				
Authority's Response				
Audit Response				

--	--	--	--	--

Client:	
Asbri Transport Ltd	The Safety Forum Ltd
Suite D, 1st Floor, 220 High Street, Swansea, SA1 1NW	PO Box 831 Godalming Surrey GU7 9HT
	Date: 16/06/25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	ITEMS CONSIDERED	5
3.0	MATTERS ARISING FROM THIS STAGE 1 AUDIT.	6
4.0	AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT	8

APPENDIX A Location Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) carried out on the proposed access arrangements and off-site highway works associated with a school development on the site of the existing Ysgol Gynradd Gymraeg Rhosafan Primary school.

1.2 The RSA brief states: *Construction of proposed replacement school access works to the new Ysgol Rhosafan, Marine Drive, Port Talbot and a relocated informal pedestrian crossing including two points of vehicular access with the easternmost being designated an entrance and the westernmost for exit only.*

The informal pedestrian crossing to be re-located approximately 20m north-west of its exiting location.

1.3 The RSA Team are not aware of any previous RSAs for these proposals.

1.4 The Stage 1 RSA was carried out at the request of the Design organisation, Asbri Transport Limited.

1.5 The Road Safety Audit Brief was supplied by Asbri Transport Limited. The overseeing organisation is Neath Port Talbot Council. The RSA Brief was accepted by the Audit Team as adequate to complete the RSA.

1.6 The Audit was carried out between 10th and 16th June 2025 by consultants working on behalf of The Safety Forum Limited. The Audit Team, which is established from The Safety Forum Ltd and independent of the project design team, has had no involvement with the project.

The Auditors were:

R Westhead – Team Leader (MSoRSA, RSA Cert Comp)

D Crawford – Team Member BSc IEng MICE MIHT (Cert of Comp)

1.7 The report has been prepared in accordance with General Principles and Scheme Governance General Information, GG 119, Road Safety Audit (Formerly HD 19/15).

1.8 The Audit consisted of a desktop study and a site visit. The site visit was carried out on 11th June 2025, between 19:15 and 19:45 hours by all members of the Audit Team together. The weather was dry and sunny and the road surface was dry. Traffic conditions were very quiet and free flowing.

- 1.9 Issues relating to the health & safety of operatives constructing, operating or maintaining the highway are not covered by Road Safety Audit. Only issues relating to the design and construction of facilities for highway maintenance that may potentially contribute to a Road Safety Matter are considered by the Road Safety Audit process.

Road Safety Audit is not a technical check that the design conforms to Standards and/or best practice guidance. Design Organisations are responsible for ensuring that their designs have been subjected to the appropriate design reviews (including, where applicable, Walking, Cycling & Horse Riding Assessment & Review) prior to Road Safety Audit.

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

Whilst reference is made to certain design standards, where safety may be compromised by a reduction in standard, this report is not intended to provide a design check. The Auditors have only reported on matters that might have an adverse effect on road safety in the context of the chosen design. No attempt has been made to comment on the justification of the scheme or the appropriateness of the design. Consequently, the Auditors accept no responsibility for the design or construction of the scheme.

- 1.10 The recommendations in this report are aimed at addressing the road safety problems; however there may be other alternative acceptable ways to overcome a specific problem, when other practical issues are considered. The recommendations contained herein do not absolve the Designer of his/her responsibilities.
- 1.11 The Overseeing Organisation response to the RSA should be formally recorded and reported to the Designer and the RSA Team so that a record of the Audit process is contained in the *As Built* design pack to be provided and retained by the Overseeing Organisation on final completion.
- 1.12 All problems identified in this Road Safety Audit Report are indicated on a location plan in Appendix A

2.0 ITEMS CONSIDERED

2.1 The Road Safety Audit was undertaken on the scheme detailed in the following documentation.

Drawing No.	Rev	Title
-	10/6/2025	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Brief
26CC04 -FRL -30 - XX -D -L -1500	P10	Proposed Site Layout / Block Plan
T24.119.CAD.D16	-	Visibility splay
T24.119.CAD.D16	-	Swept path analysis Mini Bus
T24.119.CAD.D17		Active Travel link
T24.119.TA.Final	22/4/25	Transport Assessment.

2.2 Speed survey data provided in the Transport Assessment is included below:

Site	Direction	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)	Stopping Sight Distance
Site 1	NB	26	32
	SB	25	31

Table 3.3 Observed 85th Percentile Speed and Forward Visibility

2.3 No departure from standards or other information was submitted to the Audit Team.

3.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM THIS STAGE 1 AUDIT.

3.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Proposed site accesses and proposed crossing over Marine Drive.

SUMMARY: Parking may obscure visibility splays.

It is unclear whether there will be any parking restrictions to prohibit parking on street within visibility splays of the proposed access points to the school, or the proposed crossing point over Marine Drive. If vehicles park within these visibility splays it could obscure junction visibility and lead to emerging type conflicts, or visibility to / from pedestrians using the crossing, which could lead to vehicle to pedestrian conflicts.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that parking within junction and crossing visibility splays is prohibited by either double yellow or school keep clear markings.

It is also noted that one of the provided drawings shows visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m. These splays would not be adequate for the speed of traffic indicated by the speed survey data. Visibility splays suitable for the surveyed speed of traffic should be provided clear of obstructions.

3.2 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Bus layby on Marine Drive.

SUMMARY: Capacity of bus parking area.

It is presumed that the layby area on Marine Drive is to be for school buses, similar to the existing arrangement. It is unclear whether the parking is sufficient for the required number of buses who will be using this facility. If it is not large enough to accommodate all buses, then bus parking on street may result in parking which obstructs footways or the safe passage of traffic. This could increase the risk of conflicts generally.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that adequate provision is made for bus parking.

3.3 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Exit from school site onto Marine Drive.

SUMMARY: Vehicles exiting in two streams.

The exit from the school onto Marine Drive looks like it may be wide enough for two streams of traffic to exit simultaneously (i.e. left turning and right turning streams). If vehicles do this there could be a risk of pedestrians crossing being masked by adjacent vehicles. Vehicle to pedestrian conflicts could occur.

RECOMMENDATION

Alter the junction geometry so that vehicles exit in one lane only.

3.4 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Access points to school site onto Marine Drive.

SUMMARY: Risk of congestion at access points due to onsite traffic flows.

There is a concern that due to the one-way access points and the circulation of traffic within the site car park, that drivers may circle the car park seeking a parking space. This could lead to congestion which could spread onto the public highway, preventing the safe passage of traffic, and lead to unsafe movements such as overrunning footways. This could increase the risk of conflicts generally.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure that the car park access points and circulation arrangement does not lead to congestion on Marine Drive or at the access junctions.

4.0 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

4.1 We certify that this audit has been carried out in accordance with GG 119.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER

Name: R Westhead
Position: Director
The Safety Forum Ltd
PO Box 831
Godalming
Surrey
GU7 9HT

Signed:

Date: 16/06/25

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER

Name: D Crawford
Position: Road Safety Consultant
The Safety Forum Ltd
PO Box 831
Godalming
Surrey
GU7 9HT

Signed:

Date: 16/06/25

APPENDIX A: LOCATION PLAN



