

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL
ROAD SAFETY AUDIT STANDARD
2018**

Date: March 2019
Prepared by: Ashley Carnall
Position: Road Safety Audit Coordinator

Summary

This Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2018 has been prepared and formally approved by Sheffield City Council, and supersedes the previous Sheffield City Council Road Safety Audit Standard 2005, which is hereby withdrawn.

Following the publication of the Highways Agency Road Safety Audit Standard HD 19/15, which came into effect in March 2015, it was decided to update the Council's Standard to reflect this new guidance and also procedural changes following the commencement of the Sheffield PFI Highways Maintenance Contract. HD 19/15 was developed and is mandatory for audits on motorways and trunk roads only but was commended for use on roads within a local highway network as "Best Practice". It supersedes HD19/03 and IAN 152/11, IAN 152/11(W), DEM 136/11 and TS Interim Amendment 40/11. This new Sheffield Standard is closely based on HD19/15, but is adapted to suit the structure and resources of a Local Authority

Superseded Documents

This Standard supersedes the Sheffield City Council Road Safety Audit Standard 2005, which is hereby withdrawn.

Implementation

This Standard shall be used forthwith for all Road Safety Audits on all Highway Improvement Schemes on the Sheffield network with the exception of those that are done strictly to HD 19/15 (typically Section 278 schemes audited by private companies).

Departures from Standard HD 19/15

The Highways Agency's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges includes publication HD 19/15. This HA Standard makes it a mandatory requirement for the road safety auditing of all trunk road schemes [including motorways]. It therefore only applies to highway projects carried out on the roads for which Sheffield is not responsible. It does, however, contain relevant information that is good practice, and the majority of which has been incorporated into this Sheffield Standard 2018. The requirements in HD 19/15 have not been incorporated in their entirety, as their extent is unnecessarily complex and excessively consuming of staff resources for dealing with the types of schemes in Sheffield. For information, the Sheffield Standard main departures from HD 19/15 are shown below, along with the relevant paragraphs that apply in both HD19/15 and the Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2018 (SRSAS 2018)

Requirement from HD 19/15	Sheffield Road Safety Standard 2018 (SRSAS18) Departure
All highway improvement schemes to be audited (Para 1.12 HD19/15)	Schemes over £20,000 in value shall be audited. Whether to audit schemes with a value below £20,000 is at the discretion of the Project Sponsor. (Paras 1.10 & 1.11 SRSAS18)
The Road Safety Audit team must comprise of an Audit Team Leader and at least one Audit team member (Paras 1.32 & 2.72 HD19/15)	At the discretion of the Audit Team Leader the requirement to have 2 team members on the audit team can be removed. This will be commensurate with the size of the scheme being audited. This does not preclude the inclusion of a specialist advisor to be part of the team. (Paras 1.34, 2.73 and 2,74 SRSAS18)
Project sponsor to inform the audit team and design team leader of any delegations in Directors and Project Sponsors responsibilities (Para 2.8 HD19/15)	Not applicable to a local authority structure so requirement removed.
Combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audits may only be carried out where the scheme is of such a scale that no preliminary design has been necessary and the scheme has progressed directly to detailed design (Para 2.27 HD19/15)	In some cases it may be appropriate to undertake combined audits on smaller scale and simple schemes where any road safety issues are likely to be minor in nature and can be dealt with at the RSA 2 Stage. Audits combined for this reason should be discussed with the relevant Overseeing Organisation Specialist(s) (under the structure as at September 2018 the Road Safety Audit Coordinator) at an early stage and agreement obtained. (Para 2.27 SRSAS18)
All Road Safety Audit Team Members must visit together the sites of Improvement Schemes (Paras 2.31, 2.35 and 2.39 HD19/15)	Due to the pressures of workload and the fact that the audit team is often a combination of agency and Overseeing Organisation members it is not always practicable for all Team Members to visit the site together, although this should be done where possible. In the event of it not being possible the site may be visited separately and notes compared afterwards. It is mandatory for all Audit Team Members to attend the site (Paras 2.30, 2.34 and 2.38 SRSAS18)

Full audit team to undertake a night time site visit at Stage 3 Road Safety Audit (Para 2.39 HD19/15)	Night time site visit to be undertaken at the discretion of the audit team, usually on larger schemes, unless specifically requested by the Design Team/Client. No requirement for the full team to be present (Para 2.38 SRSAS18)
Stage 4 Road Safety Audits should be carried out once 12 months and 36 months collision data is available (Paras 2.43 to 2.53 HD19/15)	Stage 4 Road Safety Audits should be carried out once 12 months collision data is available, reflecting changes in subsequent DfT guidance published in GG119 (January 2019) removing the requirement to undertake a further RSA 4 with 36 months data (Paras 2.42 to 2.52 SRSAS18).
A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (or combined 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit where there has been no preliminary design) must be undertaken before planning consent is applied for (Para 2.58 HD19/15)	In local authorities preliminary design is usually completed as part of the Section 278 agreement only once planning approval has been given, meaning that often this cannot be done (Para 2.57 SRSAS18)
Road Safety Audit Team to satisfy the project sponsor of their competence to undertake Road Safety Audit (Paras 2.73 to 2.75 HD19/15)	Accepted that local authority staff and teams led by local authority staff are suitable for the task. The HD19/15 requirement still applies to Road Safety Audits carried out by consultants working for developers, third party organisations or the local authority (Paras 2.69 to 2.71 SRSAS18)
Appointment of Specialist Advisors is subject to the approval of the Project Sponsor who would separately instruct them on their role (Para 2.85 HD19/15)	The appointment of Specialist Advisors is at the discretion of the Audit Team Leader (Para 2.82 SRSAS18)
The Design Team may prepare the Road Safety Audit Brief on behalf of the Project Sponsor but this requires formal approval. The Project Sponsor must issue the Road Safety Audit Brief (Para 2.87 HD19/15)	The Project Sponsor has overall responsibility for the Road Safety Audit Brief. However, the Design Team may prepare <u>and issue</u> the Road Safety Audit Brief on their behalf. (Para 2.83 SRSAS18)
The Design Brief should include 36 months personal collision data in the form of “stock plots” and interpreted listings. (Para 2.89i HD19/15)	Not necessary to provide collision data as part of the brief as this information is more readily available to the Audit Team via the AccsMap system than it is to the Design Team and Project Sponsor (Para 2.85i SRSAS18)
Audit team leader to invite a representative from the maintaining agent on the stage 3 Road Safety Audit site visit (Para 2.93 HD19/15)	Not considered necessary to always invite a representative from the maintaining agent due to the typical size and nature of schemes. This will be at the discretion of the Audit Team Leader. It is still mandatory to invite a representative from the police on all RSA 3s. (Para 2.89 SRSAS18)
Representatives of the Police and the Maintaining Agent may advise on Stage 1,2 and 4 Audits subject to the approval of the Project Sponsor	This is at the discretion of the Audit Team Leader and does not require Project Sponsor approval (Para 2.90 SRSAS18)

(Para 2.94 HD 19/15)	
<p>The report should contain a statement signed by all the Road Safety Audit Team. (Para 2.97i HD 19/15)</p>	<p>If is only necessary for the statement to be signed by the Road Safety Audit Team Leader. (Para 2.93i SRSAS18)</p>
<p>Send final/draft Road Safety Audit report directly to the Project Sponsor, who will then consult the Design Team as necessary. (Paras 2.102 & 2.103 HD19/15)</p>	<p>A more direct route is to be employed whereby the report is sent direct to the design team. The design team will liaise with the project sponsor where necessary. It is not considered necessary to issue a draft report for the majority of schemes being audited. (Para 2.98 SRSAS18)</p>
<p>Exception Report Process (Paras 3.1 to 3.14 HD19/15)</p>	<p>In order to minimise the need for Exception Reports, make the document trail easier and to improve the dialogue between the Design Team and Road Safety Audit Team in the interests of getting a better and safer agreed outcome, a “Sheffield Procedure for Documenting Road Safety Audit Responses and Comments in Road Safety Audit Reports” was developed for the Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2005, whereby dialogue between the Design Team and the Audit Team is documented in the report. This process has been a considerable success and is continued in this standard with some minor variations (Paras 3.1 to 3.23 SRSAS18)</p>

Contents

Chapter

- 1 Introduction
2. Road Safety Audit
3. Road Safety Audit – Subsequent Actions

Appendices

- A - Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Checklists – Completion of Preliminary Design
- B - Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Checklists – Completion of Detailed Design
- C - Stage 3 Road Safety Audit Checklists – Completion of Construction
- D - Illustrative Road Safety Audit Brief
- E - Illustrative Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Report (including Responses)
- F - Illustrative Stage 4A Road Safety Audit Report (12 months post construction)
- G - Illustrative Exception Report
- H - Illustrative Arbitration Report
- I – Roles and Responsibilities Flowcharts

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

- 1.1 The objective of this Standard is to ensure that the road safety implications of all Highway Improvement Schemes are fully considered for all users of the Sheffield road network. The application of the Standard to those working on the highway is covered in paragraph 2.16.
- 1.2 Sheffield City Council (the Overseeing Organisation) attaches great importance to the improvement of road safety. The use of Standards that are based on road safety considerations help to ensure that this objective is met.
- 1.3 Many elements of a Highway Improvement Scheme design are based on the use of Design Standards and Advice Notes. Whilst these Standards and Advice Notes provide a basis for safe design, care has to be taken when combining elements from them to avoid the creation of potential hazards. However, it is important to note that a Road Safety Audit is not exclusively concerned with those aspects that are associated with the interaction of Design Standards. The objective of Road Safety Audit is to identify aspects of a Highway Improvement Scheme that could give rise to road safety problems and to suggest modifications that would improve the road safety of the resultant scheme.
- 1.4 Although road safety has always been considered during scheme preparation, there have been instances where details of the design have contributed to collisions and/or incidents on newly opened schemes. Design Teams do not necessarily contain staff with Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering experience and consequently they may not foresee potential factors pertaining to collision causation.
- 1.5 The Road Safety Audit procedure has been developed to ensure that operational road safety experience is applied during the design and construction process in order that the number and severity of collisions is kept to a minimum. Road Safety Auditors identify and address problem areas using the experience gained from highway design, road safety engineering, collision analysis and road safety related research. The Overseeing Organisation's aim is that the monitoring of Road Safety Audited schemes will result in more informed designs, leading to schemes that rarely require road safety related changes after opening.
- 1.6 It is recommended that Design Teams include staff with Road Safety Engineering experience to ensure that road safety issues are considered during the design process. However, Road Safety Engineers included within the Design Team cannot be permitted to be part of the appointed Road Safety Audit Teams. This is because of a potential lack of independence from the scheme design as their views may be influenced by familiarity and a natural "pride of authorship". The involvement of a Road Safety Engineer within the Design Team is not considered to be an acceptable substitute for undertaking Road Safety Audit.

Scope of this Standard

- 1.7 This Standard sets out the procedures required to implement Road Safety Audit on Highway Improvement Schemes located within the Sheffield Boundary. It defines the relevant schemes and stages in the design and construction process at which Road Safety Audit shall be undertaken and sets out the requirements for post-implementation collision monitoring.
- 1.8 This document includes several significant changes from the previous Sheffield City Council Road Safety Audit Standard 2005 to bring it more into line with the latest DfT

guidance **HD19/15** which has superseded **HD 19/03 (upon which the previous Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard was based)**. In line with **HD19/15** this document also incorporates the requirements and advice in the withdrawn **IAN 152/11, IAN 152/11(W), DEM 136/11** and **TS Interim Amendment 40/11**, which relates to **EC Directive 2008/96/EC** in respect to Road Safety Audit. The main changes in this Standard include:

- additional guidance on schemes to be Road Safety Audited;
- clarification of the process for the collision monitoring of completed Highway Improvement Schemes in the form of Stage 4 Road Safety Audit;
- further information on the application of Road Safety Audit for developer-led schemes;
- inclusion of the Road Safety Auditor Certificate of Competency requirements;
- additional guidance on the preparation of the Road Safety Audit Exception Report and the Arbitration Procedure

Superseded Documents

- 1.9 This Standard supersedes the **Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2005**, which is hereby withdrawn.

Implementation

- 1.10 This Standard shall be used forthwith for all Road Safety Audits on all Highway Improvement Schemes where the estimated cost, including fees, is above £20,000.
- 1.11 Most highway schemes of a value less than £20,000 are likely to be small and uncomplicated and thereby unlikely to give rise to significant safety concerns. However, some highway schemes of a lesser value than £20,000 may be subjected to a road safety audit, if for example the project will result in substantial changes for road users. This is at the discretion of the Project Sponsor. It is the responsibility of the Design Team to ensure that all highway schemes are designed to the latest Safety Standards and also to check with Road Safety Engineering professionals if there are any concerns relating to the proposals.
- 1.12 This Standard does not apply to trunk roads or motorways as these are the responsibility of Highways England. Any audits for these category roads should be carried out by auditors appointed by Highways England and the audit should be in accordance with the latest HE Road Safety Audit Standard, currently HD19/15.
- 1.13 Where a Road Safety Audit Brief in accordance with the **Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2005** has been issued before the publication date of the **Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2018** those Road Safety Audits may be completed in accordance with the **Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2005**.

Definitions

- 1.14 **Arbiter:** The person or persons called upon to make authoritative decisions in the event of any unresolved issues, or disputes between the Design Team, Scheme Sponsor and the Road Safety Audit Team.
- 1.15 **Arbitration:** The procedure for times when it is not possible to produce a signed off Exception Report in accordance with the Sheffield City Council Exception Report Procedure (typically due to disagreement within the Exception Report Team). See Chapter 3 and Appendix H.

- 1.16 **Collision Investigation:** The collection and examination of historical collision data over a period of time in order to identify common trends and factors which may have contributed to the collisions. This could also include the detailed forensic investigation of single collisions.
- 1.17 **Design Organisation:** The organisation(s) commissioned to undertake the various phases of scheme preparation.
- 1.18 **Design Team:** The group within the Design Organisation undertaking the various phases of scheme preparation.
- 1.19 **Design Team Leader:** A person within the Design Team responsible for managing the scheme design and co-ordinating the input of the various design disciplines.
- 1.20 **Director:** The Director in the Overseeing Organisation with overall responsibility for the Highway Improvement Scheme. The Director will make the final decision in respect of the acceptance of any Arbitration Decisions (see Chapter 3 and Appendix H). Under the current Sheffield City Council Structure (as at September 2018) this is the Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure.
- 1.21 **Exception Report:** A report from the Project Sponsor on each recommendation in the Road Safety Audit Report that the Project Sponsor proposes should not be implemented (see Chapter 3 and Appendix G).
- 1.22 **Highway Improvement Schemes:** All works that involve construction of new highway or permanent change to the existing highway layout or features. This includes changes to road layout, kerbs, signs and road markings, lighting, signalling, drainage, landscaping, communications cabinets and the installation of roadside equipment. The term “Highway Improvement Scheme” is considered to include the **EC Directive 2008/96/EC** term “Infrastructure Project”.
- 1.23 **Interim Road Safety Audit:** The application of Road Safety Audit to the whole or part of a Highway Improvement Scheme at any time during its design and construction. Interim Road Safety Audit is neither mandatory nor a substitute for the Stage 1, 2 and 3 Road Safety Audits.
- 1.24 **Like-for-like Maintenance Scheme:** A scheme or highway feature proposed as maintenance works, that solely involves the replacement or refurbishment of a highway feature with a corresponding feature, which as a minimum, will appear the same, be located in the same position, perform the same and be constructed of comparable materials as the feature it replaces. Maintenance schemes undertaken under the Sheffield PFI contract would not normally be classed as “like-for-like” as they usually involve some form of upgrade (e.g. upgrading of signal controlled crossings, provision of tactiles across junctions etc). The expectation therefore is that these schemes will usually be audited.
- 1.25 **Non-Motorised Users (NMUs):** NMUs are considered to be pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. The term NMU also includes disabled people and wheelchair users.
- 1.26 **Overseeing Organisation:** The highway or road authority responsible for the Highway Improvement Scheme to be Road Safety Audited, or in the case of developer-led or third party organisation promoted schemes, the highway or road authority responsible for the road affected by the proposed Highway Improvement Scheme. On all schemes within the Sheffield highway boundary this is Sheffield City Council.
- 1.27 **Overseeing Organisation Specialist:** A person from the Overseeing Organisation that has the appropriate training, skills and experience in the Road Safety discipline.

- 1.28 **Project Sponsor/Project Manager:** A person from the Overseeing Organisation responsible for ensuring the progression of a scheme in accordance with the policy and procedures of the Overseeing Organisation (i.e. the Client function), and ensuring compliance with the requirements of this Standard. It should be noted that the Project Sponsor may not always be from the same organisation as those promoting the scheme, as the scheme may be proposed by a third party organisation (see paragraph 1.42).
- 1.29 **Road Safety Audit:** The evaluation of Highway Improvement Schemes during design and at the end of construction. The aim is to identify potential road safety problems that may affect any users of the highway and to suggest measures to eliminate or mitigate those problems. The Road Safety Audit process includes the collision monitoring of Highway Improvement Schemes to identify any road safety problems that may occur after opening. The Stage 4 Road Safety Audit will include the analysis and reporting of 12 and 36 months of personal injury collision data from when the scheme became operational.
- 1.30 **Road Safety Audit Brief:** The instructions to the Road Safety Audit Team defining the scope and details of the Highway Improvement Scheme to be Road Safety Audited, including sufficient information for the Road Safety Audit to be undertaken (see Appendix D).
- 1.31 **Road Safety Audit Report:** The report produced by the Road Safety Audit Team describing the road safety related problems identified by the Road Safety Audit Team and the recommended solutions to those problems.
- 1.32 **Road Safety Audit Response Report:** A report produced by the Design Team following Road Safety Audit Stages 1, 2 and 3 in which the Design Team responds to the problems and recommendations raised in the Road Safety Audit Report.
- 1.33 **Road Safety Audit Site Visit:** a visit to the location of a proposed or completed Highway Improvement Scheme.
- 1.34 **Road Safety Audit Team:** A team that works together on all aspects of the Road Safety Audit, independent of the Design Team. The Road Safety Audit Team shall usually comprise a minimum of two persons (a Team Leader and Team Member) but occasionally just a Team Leader may be acceptable for small schemes (see para 2.76 and list of Departures from Standard above). The individuals within the Road Safety Audit Team may be drawn from the Design Organisation or other organisations. Having at least one member of the team drawn from the Overseeing Organisation is recommended.
- 1.35 **Road Safety Audit Team Leader:** A person with the appropriate training, skills and experience who is approved for a particular Road Safety Audit by the Project Sponsor on behalf of the Overseeing Organisation. The Road Safety Audit Team Leader has overall responsibility for carrying out the Road Safety Audit and managing the Road Safety Audit Team.
- 1.36 **Road Safety Audit Team Member:** A member of the Road Safety Audit Team with the appropriate training, skills and experience necessary for the Road Safety Audit of a specific scheme, reporting to the Road Safety Audit Team Leader.
- 1.37 **Road Safety Audit Team Observer:** A person with the appropriate training, skills and experience accompanying the Road Safety Audit Team to observe and gain experience of the Road Safety Audit process. The Road Safety Audit Team Observer is encouraged to contribute actively to the Road Safety Audit process.

- 1.38 **Road Safety Engineering:** The design and implementation of Highway Improvement Schemes intended to reduce the number and severity of collisions involving road users, drawing on the results of Collision Investigations.
- 1.39 **Road Safety Matters:** Any element of the road environment that could potentially contribute to a Road Traffic Collision or incident. The definition of Road Safety Matters also includes features that could present an unacceptable risk of trips, slips or falls to road users.
- 1.40 **Road Traffic Collision:** A collision between road users or between a road user and a feature on or adjacent to the highway.
- 1.41 **Specialist Advisor:** A person approved by the Project Sponsor to provide specialist independent advice to the Road Safety Audit Team, should the scheme include complex features outside the experience of the Road Safety Audit Team Members, e.g. a complex traffic signal controlled junction.
- 1.42 **Third Party Organisations:** Organisations such as a developer, a developer's consultant, a local authority, Statutory Undertaker or other private organisation that could be promoting a Highway Improvement Scheme on the Overseeing Organisation's road network.

2. ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

Schemes to be Road Safety Audited

- 2.1 This Standard shall apply to all Highway Improvement Schemes (see paragraph 1.22) on the Sheffield road network, with the exception of those audits carried out under HD19/15, regardless of procurement method. This includes work carried out under agreement with the Overseeing Organisation resulting from developments alongside or affecting the road network or Highway Improvement Schemes being promoted by third party organisations.
- 2.2 Highway Improvement Schemes that will not impact on road user behaviour or adversely change the outcome of an incident involving an errant vehicle, due to the nature of the works and/or the distance of the improvement from the operational highway may, in certain circumstances be excluded from the Road Safety Audit process (see paragraph 2.9). In such situations, Project Sponsors must formally consult with an Overseeing Organisation Specialist(s) (under the structure as at September 2018 the Road Safety Audit Coordinator) at an early stage and gain agreement from the Specialist that the Road Safety Audit process does not need to be applied to the Highway Improvement Scheme.
- 2.3 The Project Sponsor must formally record on their scheme file (or equivalent) any decision not to apply Road Safety Audit to a scheme that they consider will not impact on road safety. If the Overseeing Organisation Specialist does not formally agree that the scheme may be excluded from the Road Safety Audit process and the Project Sponsor still considers the Road Safety Audit unnecessary, then the Departure from Standard process must be applied in accordance with paragraph 2.9 of this Standard.
- 2.4 Like-for-like maintenance schemes are excluded from Road Safety Audit (see paragraph 1.24). However, Project Sponsor's and Designer's attention is drawn to paragraphs 2.5 and 2.6 of this Standard. This Standard does apply to Highway Improvement Schemes that are constructed as part of the same procurement package as maintenance works.
- 2.5 When considering whether a scheme is a like-for-like maintenance scheme, the Project Sponsor must consider if the works may change road user behaviour or adversely change the outcome of an incident involving an errant vehicle. If the feature could potentially change road user behaviour or its presence could exacerbate the severity of a collision then the Road Safety Audit process detailed in this Standard must be applied. If a Project Sponsor is unsure if the scheme under consideration could impact on road user behaviour or change the outcome of an incident involving an errant vehicle, they must formally consult with an appropriate Specialist from the Overseeing Organisation.
- 2.6 Project Sponsors and Designers should ensure that any like-for-like replacement or refurbishment scheme does not reinstate a feature that is known by the Overseeing Organisation or Design Organisation to adversely affect road user safety (e.g. the replacement of a non-passively safe traffic sign in the same location where it has been previously struck by errant road users on numerous occasions).

Delegation

- 2.7 The Overseeing Organisation will decide on the extent of delegation of the Director's and Project Sponsor's responsibilities, duties and tasks, with respect to this Standard. Project Sponsors may delegate to an assistant within the Overseeing Organisation. The Project Sponsor is responsible for ensuring that the assistant is

competent to carry out the responsibilities, duties and tasks delegated. Project Sponsors may also delegate to a supplier employed as a “Department’s Representative” provided they are independent from the design, construction and Road Safety Auditor organisations and the individuals appointed are competent to undertake the role. If a Project Sponsor or Director is unsure if the individual they are intending to delegate to is competent and independent, they should formally consult with an appropriate Specialist from the Overseeing Organisation.

Application to Temporary Traffic Management Schemes

- 2.8 This Standard is not generally required for application to temporary traffic management schemes. The Department for Transport publication “Safety at Street Works and Road Works A Code of Practice” and Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual contain the necessary guidance to facilitate the safe planning and implementation of temporary traffic management activities. However, Road Safety Audit should be applied to exceptional temporary traffic management schemes that involve temporary changes to the layout and operation of junctions or realignment of roads that will affect the network for a considerable period. Examples of such schemes include installation of a temporary roundabout junction, a diversion using a length of temporary carriageway to allow major excavation on a main carriageway or temporary arrangements that are programmed to remain unaltered for a period of six months or more. If a Project Sponsor is unsure if the scheme under consideration should be subjected to Road Safety Audit, they should formally consult with an appropriate Specialist from the Overseeing Organisation.

Exemption

- 2.9 Where the Project Sponsor considers it unnecessary for a Road Safety Audit to be applied to a particular Highway Improvement Scheme and the scheme in question has not been excluded from Road Safety Audit in accordance with paragraph 2.2 or paragraph 2.48 of this Standard, approval for a Departure from Standard must be obtained from the Overseeing Organisation. The Departure application must clearly state why a Road Safety Audit is not considered necessary.
- 2.10 A Departure from Standard allowing exemption from Road Safety Audit will only be approved when, in the opinion of the Overseeing Organisation, the effect of the Highway Improvement Scheme on the highway would be negligible and the costs and safety risks of undertaking the Road Safety Audit would outweigh its benefits.

The Relationship between Road Safety Audit and Health & Safety Legislation

- 2.11 Road Safety Audit does not cover health & safety legislation issues concerning the construction, maintenance and use of the road.
- 2.12 Although the Road Safety Audit Team’s contribution to design is limited, in making recommendations they may be considered to have undertaken design work under health & safety legislation. It is therefore recommended that Road Safety Audit Teams make themselves aware of current health & safety legislation and consider the implications of their recommendations for the health & safety of others.
- 2.13 Overseeing Organisation Project Sponsors and Directors should make themselves aware of current health & safety legislation and consider the implications of their instructions to Design Teams and Road Safety Audit Teams in terms of health & safety.
- 2.14 When incorporating Road Safety Audit recommendations into scheme designs (see paragraph 3.24), the Design Team shall be responsible for reviewing and amending any design risk assessments required by health & safety legislation. The Design

Team must also consider the impact that incorporating Road Safety Audit recommendations could have on other design elements.

Scope of Road Safety Audit

- 2.15 Road Safety Audit shall only consider Road Safety Matters (see paragraph 1.39).
- 2.16 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 (see paragraph 1.39) should be considered by the Road Safety Audit process.
- 2.17 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, Non-Motorised User (NMU) or Cycle Audits prior to Road Safety Audit). If there are any Departures from the Design Standards, then the Road Safety Audit Team should be informed of these in the Road Safety Audit Brief so that any safety implications can be assessed
- 2.18 Road Safety Audit is not a check that the scheme has been constructed in accordance with the design.
- 2.19 Road Safety Audit does not consider structural safety.

Road Safety Audit

- 2.20 When making recommendations for dealing with identified problems, Road Safety Audit Teams must make allowance for the fact that strategic decisions on matters such as route choice, junction type, standard of provision and approved Departures from Standards already reflect an appropriate balance of a number of factors including road safety. Recommendations requiring major changes in these areas are unlikely to be acceptable when balanced with other aspects of the scheme and the Road Safety Audit Team must not make such proposals. In the unlikely situation where the road safety implications of the strategic decisions have not been fully considered previously, the Project Sponsor may extend the scope of the Road Safety Audit to include consideration of these items. The Project Sponsor must clearly identify within the Road Safety Audit Brief where the scope of the Road Safety Audit has been extended to cover strategic decisions.
- 2.21 Where the Project Sponsor has extended the scope of the Road Safety Audit to include strategic decisions in the Road Safety Audit Brief, it should be noted that the Road Safety Audit Team's recommended changes to the strategic elements of the design may not be accepted by the Project Sponsor and the Designer's original scheme layout as detailed in the Road Safety Audit Brief may be progressed. Therefore, when Road Safety Auditors are permitted to consider strategic elements of a Highway Improvement Scheme and they make recommendations for changes to the strategic decisions, the Road Safety Audit Team must also ensure that they fully assess the original layout as proposed by the Design Team so that any road safety problems are identified and addressed.
- 2.22 Advice is given on the general aspects that should be addressed at Road Safety Audit Stages 1, 2 and 3 in the lists in Appendices A to C of this Standard. An Illustrative Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Report is shown in Appendix E and an illustrative Stage 4 Road Safety Audit Report (12 months) is contained in Appendix F.

- 2.23 The lists in Appendices A, B and C are not intended to be exhaustive. They provide a prompt for optional supplementary checks that Road Safety Audit Teams could make following their less prescriptive and more wide-ranging Road Safety Audit.
- 2.24 Road Safety Auditors must examine the overall layout of the Highway Improvement Scheme. All users of the highway shall be considered including motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and facilities for those working on the highway (see paragraph 2.16). Particular attention should be given to vulnerable road users such as the very young, older users and the mobility and visually impaired.
- 2.25 The potential for road safety problems is often greatest at junctions, tie-ins and immediately beyond tie-ins. Where a Highway Improvement Scheme joins an existing road or junction, inconsistency in the standard of provision may potentially lead to collisions, so particular attention should be paid to these areas to ensure the safest possible transition is achieved. This applies particularly to on-line improvements where variations in the standard of provision between new and existing sections may not be obvious to the road user.

Stages of Road Safety Audit

- 2.26 Highway Improvement Schemes shall be Road Safety Audited at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4. If, for any reason, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has not been carried out (for example, where a scheme is of such a scale that no preliminary design has been necessary and the scheme has progressed directly to detailed design with the agreement of the Project Sponsor), Road Safety Audit Stages 1 and 2 shall be combined at Stage 2 and shall be referred to as a Combined Stage 1 & 2 Audit. The information provided as part of the Road Safety Audit Brief for a Combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit must be of sufficient detail to undertake a detailed design Road Safety Audit (see paragraph 2.32).
- 2.27 Stage 1 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audits must not be combined as purely a cost and/or programme saving measure. However, in some cases it may be appropriate to undertake combined audits on smaller scale and simple schemes where any road safety issues are likely to be minor in nature and can be dealt with at the RSA 2 Stage. Audits combined for this reason should be discussed with the relevant Overseeing Organisation Specialist(s) (under the structure as at September 2018 the Road Safety Audit Coordinator) at an early stage and agreement obtained.

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit: Completion of Preliminary Design

- 2.28 Stage 1 Road Safety Audits will be undertaken at the completion of preliminary design.
- 2.29 The end of the preliminary design stage is often the last occasion at which land requirements may be changed. It is therefore essential that Stage 1 Road Safety Audits considers any road safety issues which may have a bearing upon land take, licence or easement before the draft Orders are published or planning consent is applied for.
- 2.30 At Road Safety Audit Stage 1 all Road Safety Audit Team members must visit the sites of Highway Improvement Schemes:
- that involve permanent change to the existing highway layout or features; and
 - where new offline proposals tie-in to the existing highway.
- 2.31 The need to consider the site during specific traffic conditions at the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be identified in the Road Safety Audit Brief.

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit: Completion of Detailed Design

- 2.32 Stage 2 Road Safety Audits will be undertaken at the completion of the detailed design stage. At this stage, the Road Safety Audit Team is concerned with the more detailed aspects of the Highway Improvement Scheme. The Road Safety Audit Team will be able to consider geometry (such as the layout of junctions and highway cross sections), street furniture (such as the position of traffic signs and road restraint systems), carriageway markings, street lighting provision and other issues (see Appendix B).
- 2.33 The Stage 2 Road Safety Audit should include a review of the issues raised in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Report. Any issues that have not been satisfactorily resolved from the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit either by the element of the scheme being redesigned, as a result of clarification given by the provision of further information or by an approved Exception Report, should be reiterated in the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Report.
- 2.34 At Road Safety Audit Stage 2 all team members must visit the sites of Highway Improvement Schemes:
- that involve permanent change to the existing highway layout or features; and
 - where new offline proposals tie-in to the existing highway.
- 2.35 The need to consider the site during specific traffic conditions at the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit should be identified in the Road Safety Audit Brief.

Stage 3 Road Safety Audit: Completion of Construction

- 2.36 The Stage 3 Road Safety Audit should be undertaken when the Highway Improvement Scheme is substantially complete and, in the case of new roads, preferably before the works are opened to road users. This is to minimise potential risk to road users and the difficulty that could be experienced by Road Safety Audit Teams in traversing the site when open to traffic. Where this is not feasible, alternative arrangements should be agreed with the Project Sponsor. This may result in the Road Safety Audit being carried out a short time after opening or in phases where a scheme is subject to phased completion and opening. However, all Highway Improvement Schemes should be subjected to a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit within 1 month of completion. If there is an accessibility issue that restricts the Road Safety Audit Team from fully traversing areas of the site (e.g. an area of live carriageway that cannot be accessed on foot), reference to this should be included in the introduction of the Road Safety Audit Report for consideration by the Project Sponsor.
- 2.37 Road Safety Auditors are required to examine the Highway Improvement Scheme from all users' viewpoints and may decide to drive, walk and/or cycle through the scheme as well as consider motorcycle and equestrian use to assist their evaluation and ensure they have a comprehensive understanding. Issues raised in the Stage 2 or Combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit Report should also be reviewed at the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit and reiterated if not satisfactorily resolved, either by the element of the scheme being redesigned, as a result of clarification given by the provision of further information or by an approved Exception Report.
- 2.38 All Road Safety Audit Team Members must examine the scheme site during daylight. They may also, at their discretion, examine the site during the hours of darkness at Stage 3 so that hazards particular to night operation can be identified.

- 2.39 The Road Safety Audit Team should also consider the potential impact on road safety of different traffic conditions which may be specific to the Highway Improvement Scheme location. For example at peak periods, the beginning or end of the school day or during frequent events. The need to consider the site during specific traffic conditions should be identified in the Road Safety Audit Brief (see paragraph 2.84h).
- 2.40 Road Safety Auditors should also consider the potential impacts on road safety of various weather conditions that may not be present at the time of inspection.
- 2.41 In the case of new roads the Road Safety Audit Team Leader should discuss any alterations recommended at the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit with the Project Sponsor as soon as possible to give the opportunity for modifications to be undertaken before opening. This will provide a safer working environment for the workforce and delays to road users will be minimised.

Stage 4 Road Safety Audit: Monitoring

- 2.42 The Overseeing Organisation will arrange for evidence led collision monitoring of Road Safety Audited Highway Improvement Schemes. Stage 4 Road Safety Audits should be undertaken by individuals with the appropriate training, skills and experience as identified in paragraphs 2.75 to 2.80 of this Standard.
- 2.43 When a Highway Improvement Scheme is opened to road users, monitoring in the form of Stage 4 Road Safety Audits must be carried out on the number of personal injury collisions that occur, so that any road safety problems can be identified and remedial action taken as soon as possible.
- 2.44 Stage 4 Road Safety Audit collision monitoring reports shall be prepared using 12 months of personal injury collision data from the time the Highway Improvement Scheme became operational and shall be submitted to the Overseeing Organisation. The Stage 4 Road Safety Audit process is an evidence led review of personal injury collisions that have occurred in the vicinity of the Highway Improvement scheme. The collision records shall be analysed in detail to identify:
- locations at which personal injury collisions have occurred; and
 - personal injury collisions that appear to arise from similar causes or show common factors.
- 2.45 When considering the timing of the Stage 4 Road Safety Audit, allowance should be made for any significant changes that may have been implemented as a result of the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit. In the case where there have been significant changes following the period the scheme first became operational, then the Stage 4 report should make reference to these changes and their potential impact on the personal injury collision history.
- 2.46 The analysis of personal injury collision data should include identification of changes in the collision population in terms of number, rate (taking account of any traffic flow changes), types and other collision variables, comparisons should be made with control data. Where the Highway Improvement Scheme is an on-line improvement then the collision record before the scheme was built should be compared with the situation after opening. The collision data should be analysed to identify the influence of problems and recommendations identified at previous Road Safety Audit stages, and any Exception Reports.
- 2.47 If collision records are not sufficiently comprehensive for detailed analysis, the Police should be contacted to ascertain the availability of statements and report forms, which could aid the data analysis.

- 2.48 Where no personal injury collisions have been recorded in the vicinity of the Highway Improvement Scheme over the 12 month period, a formal Stage 4 Road Safety Audit collision monitoring report is not required. In this event a note should be made to this effect on the Road Safety Audit Log.
- 2.49 At Road Safety Audit Stage 4 all Road Safety Audit Team members should visit the sites of Highway Improvement Schemes:
- where higher than expected numbers of personal injury collisions have occurred since the scheme became operational (when compared to control data); or
 - where the personal injury collision rate or severity has increased since the scheme became operational; or
 - where characteristics within the personal injury collision data post-opening show unexpected common trends (e.g. a high frequency of personal injury collisions during the hours of darkness or on a wet road surface).
- 2.50 When a site visit is undertaken (for the reasons identified in paragraph 2.49), the Road Safety Audit Team should consider if the personal injury collision analysis justifies an inspection during a particular time period (e.g. the hours of darkness or peak hour).
- 2.51 The Stage 4 Road Safety Audit collision monitoring report should identify any road safety problems indicated by the collision data analysis and any related observations during any site visits undertaken. The report should make recommendations for remedial action as appropriate.
- 2.52 An illustrative Stage 4 Road Safety Audit Report is contained in Appendix F.

Developer-led and Third Party Organisation-led Schemes

- 2.53 The design and Road Safety Audit process for developer-led and third party organisation-led Highway Improvement Schemes can vary from the process for Sheffield City Council promoted Highway Improvement Schemes. Most significantly, the scheme may be designed by an independent organisation working for the developer or third party organisation rather than the Council or an organisation working on its behalf. The developer-led scheme will be submitted for planning approval to the local planning authority and, where there are highway implications, the highway authority (i.e. Sheffield City Council) will be consulted. The following paragraphs provide additional requirements and guidance for all organisations involved in the Road Safety Audit of developer-led and third party organisation led Highway Improvement Schemes.
- 2.54 On all developer-led schemes or third party organisation-led schemes that will result in Highway Improvements Schemes (as defined in paragraph 1.22) on the Sheffield highway network, the contents of this Standard (or alternatively HD19/15) must be followed for all Stages of Road Safety Audit.
- 2.55 The Road Safety Audit Team approval and appointment must follow the process set out in the relevant standard being used (i.e. paragraphs 2.70 to 2.75 of HD19/15, or paragraphs 2.69 to 2.75 of this Standard). As the Highway Authority, Sheffield City Council is responsible for ensuring that the developer-led or third party scheme complies with the Road Safety Audit procedure as detailed in these Standards.
- 2.56 A Road Safety Audit Brief must be prepared and issued in accordance with paragraphs 2.82 to 2.85 of this Standard for all Road Safety Audit Stages (see Appendix D).

- 2.57 A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (or combined Stage 1 & 2 Road Safety Audit where there has been no preliminary design) should ideally be undertaken before planning consent is applied for in line with the guidance in HD19/15. However, it is recognised that preliminary design is often completed as part of the Section 278 agreement only once Planning Approval has been given, meaning that this cannot be done.
- 2.58 The process of issuing and considering the Road Safety Audit Report identified in paragraphs 2.98 to 2.100 of this Standard must be followed for both developer-led and third party led schemes for all Road Safety Audit Stages. The Scheme Designer is responsible for producing a Road Safety Audit Response Report in accordance with paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 of this Standard.
- 2.59 At all Road Safety Audit Stages, recommendations made in the Road Safety Audit Report that impact on the Sheffield highway network must be either incorporated into the design, included within the constructed scheme, resolved via the Response Report process or dealt with by means of Exception Report(s) to the satisfaction of the Overseeing Organisation Project Sponsor and Director (or his/her nominee). See Section 3 of this Standard for details.
- 2.60 At all stages the Project Sponsor (i.e. Sheffield City Council Highway Development Management representing the Highway Authority) is responsible for the production of any Exception Reports. Typically the Project Sponsor will request that the design team produces the Exception Report(s) on their behalf due to their better familiarity with the scheme. The Exception Report(s) must be produced to the satisfaction of the Overseeing Organisation's Project Sponsor and Director (or his/her nominee), for elements of the scheme on the road network. The Exception Report(s) must be agreed with the Overseeing Organisation's Project Sponsor and Director (or his/her nominee), and signed accordingly, prior to the scheme progressing to the next stage. See Section 3 for more details on the Exception Report process.

Design Changes and Road Safety Audit Shelf Life

- 2.61 Stage 1, Combined Stage 1 & 2 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audits must be repeated if the scheme design materially changes, if there are many minor changes which could together impact on road user safety, or if the previous finalised Road Safety Audit for the relevant stage is more than 5 years old. In the case of minor changes to a Highway Improvement Scheme then the repeated Road Safety Audit should only be concerned with the elements of the scheme that have been changed. If the changes are more significant or if there are many minor changes then the whole Road Safety Audit stage should be repeated.
- 2.62 Throughout the period following the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit, the Design Organisation and/or Contractor must keep the Project Sponsor informed of all design changes that occur so that any requirement for an additional Stage 2 Road Safety Audit can be identified. The Project Sponsor must then initiate any additional Road Safety Audits required.

Interim Road Safety Audit

- 2.63 The requirement for independence need not prevent contact between the Design Team and the Road Safety Audit Team throughout the design and construction process, provided certain conditions are met (see paragraph 2.67). The Interim Road Safety Audit process can provide the benefit of early identification of potential road safety problems leading to savings in both programme and design costs. This could be particularly beneficial to larger projects with accelerated programmes, such as Highway Improvement Schemes involving early contractor involvement.

- 2.64 The Project Sponsor will decide whether to employ Interim Road Safety Audit. Design Teams must not contact Road Safety Audit Teams without the Project Sponsor's prior authorisation.
- 2.65 Subject to the Project Sponsor's prior agreement, at any time during the preliminary and detailed design stages, Designers may submit or be instructed to submit designs of the whole or parts of schemes to the Road Safety Audit Team for completion of an Interim Road Safety Audit. The Road Safety Audit Team and Design Team are permitted to meet if considered necessary, to enable the Design Team to explain their designs and the Road Safety Audit Team to explain any identified problems and recommendations.
- 2.66 In addition, Interim Road Safety Audit may be employed during the construction process with the agreement of the Project Sponsor. Elements of the constructed scheme may be subjected to Interim Road Safety Audit, when works are partially complete or when individual elements or sections of the scheme are complete and opened to road users in stages.
- 2.67 Interim Road Safety Audit is subject to the following conditions:
- Road Safety Audit Teams must report in the format illustrated in the Road Safety Audit Report in Appendix E, namely the "problem/recommendation" format, unless instructed differently by the Project Sponsor in writing.
 - Road Safety Audit Teams must limit their reports to matters within the scope of this Standard.
 - Interim Road Safety Audit supplements the Road Safety Audits at Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4, therefore these Stage 1, 2, 3 and 4 Road Safety Audits must also be carried out and reported.
- 2.68 The Road Safety Audit Team will require a Road Safety Audit Brief for an Interim Road Safety Audit. This should contain as many of the items given in paragraph 2.85 as are available.

Road Safety Audit Team Approval and Appointment

- 2.69 For all audits where the audit team is led by an Audit Team Leader working for the Council, the appointment of the Road Safety Audit Team at all stages is the responsibility of the Audit Team Leader. It is the Audit Team Leader's responsibility to ensure that all members of the audit team meet the necessary criteria laid out in this Standard. The HD19/15 requirement (paragraph 2.73 of that Standard) still applies to Road Safety Audits carried out by consultants working for developers or third party organisations.
- 2.70 In order to be able to demonstrate their competence to undertake Road Safety Audits, the Road Safety Audit Team must be able to produce a road safety specific curriculum vitae upon request. The information provided in the curriculum vitae must concisely set out how the proposed Road Safety Audit Team member's training, skills and experience (including Continuing Professional Development) align with the guidance and requirements of this Standard. The curriculum vitae can then be passed to the Client for approval if requested.
- 2.71 Experience must be relevant to the type of scheme being Road Safety Audited and this relevant experience must be identified in the proposed Road Safety Audit Team members' curriculum vitae.
- 2.72 It is a fundamental principle of the Road Safety Auditing process that the Road Safety Audit Team is independent from the Design Team (see paragraph 1.6). If a Road

Safety Audit Team's independence from the Design Team is in doubt it must not be accepted. In such cases, an alternative Road Safety Audit Team must be selected.

- 2.73 At Road Safety Audit Stages 1, 2, 3 and 4 the Road Safety Audit Team should normally comprise the Audit Team Leader and at least one Audit Team Member. This enables discussion between the Road Safety Auditors of the problems and recommendations and maximises the potential to identify problems. Road Safety Audit Team Observers may also join the Road Safety Audit Team to gain experience in carrying out Road Safety Audit. However, the number of Road Safety Audit Team Observers shall be limited to a maximum of two.
- 2.74 In some cases one member may be adequate and acceptable, depending upon the complexity of the project and the audit stage. Employing two or more members for every audit may better ensure that all potential dangers are identified, but is not always practicable, considering the level of workload and resources. A Police representative may assist at any stage of the audit as a Specialist Advisor.
- 2.75 It is not necessary for the same Road Safety Audit Team to undertake all Road Safety Audit stages of a scheme.

Road Safety Audit Team Training, Skills and Experience

- 2.76 Paragraphs 2.79 to 2.81 include guidance on the general levels of training, skills and experience that are expected of Road Safety Auditors. Most are not mandatory requirements but are intended to assist when considering Road Safety Audit Teams and also to assist potential auditors to prepare themselves as candidates for Road Safety Audit Teams. The guidance is intended to be flexible, recognising that the experienced road safety professionals that are needed to carry out Road Safety Audits may have developed their careers from a range of backgrounds.
- 2.77 The Audit Team Leader and Audit Team Members should be individuals whose recent experience involves Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering on a regular basis. This should ensure that Road Safety Auditors are well versed in the most recent practices and developments in the field. Those candidates who have the recommended experience in Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering experience, but who have not undertaken such work on a regular basis in the previous 2 years, are unlikely to be acceptable, due to their lack of current relevant experience.
- 2.78 Road Safety Auditors should also have an understanding of how best practice highway design principles may benefit road safety. It is not intended that Road Safety Auditors have extensive detailed design knowledge. However, they should have a reasonable understanding of design Standards and best practice design principles, and how the application of these can minimise collision risk.
- 2.79 Road Safety Audit Teams comprised of highway design engineers with little or no experience of road safety work are not acceptable.
- 2.80 The following list gives guidelines on acceptable training, skills and experience for Road Safety Audit Team Members:
- **Road Safety Audit Team Leader:** A minimum of 4 years Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering experience. Completion of at least 5 Road Safety Audits in the past 12 months as a Road Safety Audit Team Leader or Member. In order to become an Audit Team Leader the auditor will already have achieved the necessary training to become an Audit Team Member. However, they should also demonstrate a minimum 2 days CPD in the field of Road Safety Audit, Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering in the past 12 months.

- **Road Safety Audit Team Member:** A minimum of 2 years Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering experience. Completion of at least 5 Road Safety Audits as Road Safety Audit Team Leader, Member or Observer in the past 24 months. The Road Safety Audit Team Member should have attended at least 10 days of formal Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering training to form a solid theoretical foundation on which to base practical experience. They should also demonstrate a minimum of 2 days CPD in the field of Road Safety Audit, Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering in the past 12 months.
- **Road Safety Audit Team Observer:** A minimum of 1 year Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering experience. The Road Safety Audit Team Observer should have attended at least 10 days of formal Collision Investigation or Road Safety Engineering training.

Road Safety Auditor Certificate of Competency

- 2.81 At least one individual within the Road Safety Audit Team undertaking Road Safety Audit on the motorway and/or trunk road network must hold a Certificate of Competency in Road Safety Audit, acquired in accordance with Annex J of HD 19/15.

Specialist Advisors

- 2.82 The Road Safety Audit Team should consider if there are any particular features of the project, such as complex signal controlled junctions, temporary traffic management or maintenance issues that warrant the appointment of Specialist Advisors to advise the Road Safety Audit Team. A Specialist Advisor is not a member of the Road Safety Audit Team but advises the team on matters relating to their specialism.

Road Safety Audit Brief

- 2.83 The Road Safety Audit Brief defines the scope of the Road Safety Audit to be undertaken. The Project Sponsor has overall responsibility for the Road Safety Audit Brief. However, the Design Team may prepare and submit the Road Safety Audit Brief on their behalf.
- 2.84 To maximise the benefit from the Road Safety Audit process, the Road Safety Audit Brief needs careful preparation and must include sufficient information to enable an efficient and effective Road Safety Audit to be undertaken.
- 2.85 An illustrative Road Safety Audit Brief is shown in Appendix D of this Standard. A Road Safety Audit Brief should contain the following:
- a) A description of the proposed Highway Improvement Scheme clearly identifying its objectives.
 - b) Scheme drawings showing the full geographical extent of the scheme and including the areas beyond the tie-in points.
 - c) Details of determined and pending Departures and Relaxations from Standards.
 - d) Clear identification of the elements of the scheme proposals included within the scope of the Road Safety Audit to be undertaken and also those elements of the scheme that fall outside of the scope, including strategic decisions. The Road Safety Audit Brief should clearly identify where the scope of the Road Safety Audit has been extended to allow consideration of strategic decisions.
 - e) General scheme details, to help give an understanding of the purpose of the scheme and how the layout will operate, including design speeds, speed limits,

traffic flows, forecast flows, queue lengths, NMU flows and desire lines (including NMU Context and Audit reports where applicable). Also details of any environmental constraints on the design and how these may have affected any strategic decisions made.

- f) Details of any safety risk assessments undertaken as part of the design process
 - g) Any other relevant factors which may affect road safety such as adjacent developments (existing or proposed), proximity of schools or retirement/care homes and access for emergency vehicles.
 - h) The Road Safety Audit Brief should identify if the location of the Highway Improvement Scheme should be visited at a particular time of the day (e.g. peak traffic periods or beginning or end of the school day).
 - i) As the Road Safety Audit Team has access to the Collision Investigation Database (AccsMAP) for all roads in Sheffield it is not necessary to provide personal injury collision data, although such information should be provided if readily to hand (for example for accident reduction schemes). Any personal injury collision data provided should cover both the extent of the scheme and the adjoining sections of highway.
 - j) At Road Safety Audit Stages 2 and 3, details of any changes introduced since the previous Road Safety Audit stage.
 - k) Any changes in the Highway Improvement Scheme that are not shown on the design or As-Built drawings.
 - l) Plans using an appropriate scale for the Road Safety Audit Team to mark up for inclusion in the Road Safety Audit Report.
 - m) Details of any site access arrangements including any specific health & safety requirements such as inductions, Personal Protective Equipment and vehicle livery requirements.
- 2.86 If the Road Safety Audit Team considers the Road Safety Audit Brief to be insufficient for their purpose, requests for further information shall be made to the Design Team Leader and copied to the Project Sponsor. Any information requested but not supplied to the Road Safety Audit Team must be identified in the introduction to the Road Safety Audit Report.

Road Safety Audit Management

- 2.87 The Project Sponsor and Design Team should liaise and ensure that the Road Safety Audit process is initiated at the appropriate stages, allowing sufficient programme time to complete the full Road Safety Audit procedure. This should include an allowance for the incorporation of design changes.
- 2.88 The Design Team should ensure that the Road Safety Audit Team is given sufficient notice of when the scheme will be ready for Road Safety Audit and the date by which the report will be required.
- 2.89 The Road Safety Audit Team Leader must invite representatives of the Police to accompany the Road Safety Audit Team to offer their views for the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit.
- 2.90 The Road Safety Audit Team Leader may also, at his/her discretion, invite representatives of the Police to advise on Road Safety Audits at Stages 1, 2 and 4

where the Road Safety Audit Team Leader considers that their participation will benefit the Road Safety Audit.

- 2.91 During any Road Safety Audit site visit the total number of Road Safety Audit Team Members and its advisors should not exceed 6 individuals. This is because traversing sites in large groups can make the Road Safety Audit process more complex and could increase the potential for health & safety issues.
- 2.92 Site visit risk assessments should be produced prior to visiting site and reviewed during the site visit should conditions change. Risk assessment should be undertaken in accordance with the latest health and safety guidance/legislation and the Road Safety Audit organisation's Health & Safety policy. Any control measures identified during the site visit risk assessment process should be adhered to.
- 2.93 At all Stages, the Road Safety Audit Team must prepare a written report. For stage 1,2 and 3 reports the report should be submitted within a timescale of approximately 4 weeks from receipt of the Audit Brief, although this may not always be practicable for large scale schemes. Road Safety Audit Reports shall include:
- a) Identification of the Road Safety Audit stage including a unique document reference number and the status of the Road Safety Audit Report.
 - b) A brief description of the proposed Highway Improvement Scheme including details of its location and its objectives.
 - c) Details of who supplied the Road Safety Audit Brief. Not applicable for RSA 4s.
 - d) Identification of the Road Safety Audit Team membership as well as the names of others contributing such as the Police, Maintaining Agent and Specialist Advisors.
 - e) Details of who was present at the site visit, the date and time period(s) when it was undertaken and what the site conditions were on the day of the visit (weather, traffic congestion, etc.). May not be applicable for RSA 4s.
 - f) The specific road safety problems identified, supported with the background reasoning.
 - g) Recommendations for action to mitigate or remove the road safety problems.
 - h) A location map based on the scheme plan(s), marked up and referenced to problems and if available, photographs of the problems identified.
 - i) A statement, signed by the Road Safety Audit Team Leader in the format given in Appendix E.
 - j) A list of documents and drawings reviewed for the Road Safety Audit.
- 2.94 The Road Safety Audit Report must contain a separate statement for each identified problem describing the location and nature of the problem and the type of collisions or incident considered likely to occur as a result of the problem. When deciding whether to include a potential problem, a Road Safety Auditor must consider who may be involved in a collision and how it might happen. If a collision type cannot be associated with the problem being considered, then it may not be appropriate to include the problem in the Road Safety Audit Report.
- 2.95 Each problem must be followed by an associated recommendation. The Road Safety Audit Team must aim to provide proportionate and viable recommendations to eliminate or mitigate the identified problems. Recommendations to "consider" should be avoided. Recommendations to "monitor" must only be made where a need to

supplement the scheduled Stage 4 Road Safety Audit monitoring is specifically identified in terms of frequency and incidence of particular vehicle manoeuvres or collision contributory factors and the monitoring task can be specifically allocated. The use of the word “must” shall also be avoided in Road Safety Audit recommendations, as this may be misinterpreted as an instruction from the Road Safety Audit Team.

- 2.96 Items such as correspondence with the Overseeing Organisation or copies of marked up checklists must not be included in the Road Safety Audit Report.
- 2.97 An illustrative Stage 2 Road Safety Audit Report is shown in Appendix E. The Road Safety Audit Report format shown is recommended for use for Road Safety Audit Stage 1, 2 and 3 Audits.
- 2.98 The Road Safety Audit Team must send the Road Safety Audit Report directly to the audit requestor (usually a member of the Design Team). The design team will liaise with the project sponsor where necessary. It is not usually considered necessary to issue a draft report for the majority of schemes being audited.
- 2.99 The Road Safety Audit Team Leader must not include as problems in the Road Safety Audit Report, technical matters that have no implications on road safety or any other matters not covered by the Road Safety Audit Brief, such as maintenance defects observed during site visits and health and safety issues. They may include such items as Additional Comments in the report so that they can be considered by the Project Sponsor and Design Team at their discretion, but any such comments do not require a Road Safety Audit Response Report.
- 2.100 On receipt of the Road Safety Audit Report, the Design Team should prepare, on behalf of the Client, a Road Safety Audit Response Report in accordance with this Standard (see below).

3. ROAD SAFETY AUDIT – SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS

- 3.1 In order to minimise the need for Exception Reports, make the document trail easier and to improve the dialogue between the Design Team and Road Safety Audit Team in the interests of getting a better and safer agreed outcome, a “Sheffield Procedure for Documenting Road Safety Audit Responses and Comments in Road Safety Audit Reports” was developed for the Sheffield Road Safety Audit Standard 2005, whereby dialogue between the Design Team and the Audit Team is documented in the report. Whilst this increases the size of the final report it has the significant advantage of documenting the ongoing progress of discussions between the Audit Team and the Design Team and demonstrates clearly to anyone reading the report, including any third parties (especially those involved in potential litigation), how the final solution was reached, all in one document. This Procedure has been tried and tested both in-house and with external clients over the last few years and has also attracted national interest, particularly from the Professional Highway Institutions. Some of the procedure (combining the report and the response reports in one document) has subsequently been incorporated into HD 19/15.
- 3.2 This procedure outlined below (paragraphs 3.2 to 3.25) applies to Stage 1, Combined 1 & 2, Stage 2 and Stage 3 Road Safety Audits. There is a separate procedure for Stage 4 Road Safety Audits, details for which are given in paragraph 3.26.

Road Safety Audit Design Team Response Reports

- 3.3 It is the Project Sponsor’s responsibility to ensure that all problems raised by the Road Safety Audit Team are given due consideration. To assist with this, the Design Team must prepare, on behalf of and after liaising with the Project Sponsor, a Road Safety Audit Response Report to the Road Safety Audit Report at the Stage 1, Combined 1 & 2, Stage 2 and Stage 3 Road Safety Audit stages. This should then be sent to the Road Safety Audit Team for their consideration
- 3.4 The Road Safety Audit Response Report should include the following:
- a) Full consideration of each problem and recommendation raised in the Road Safety Audit Report.
 - b) The Road Safety Audit Response Report should, for each problem and recommendation, do one of the following:
 - accept the problem and recommendation made by the Road Safety Audit Team;
 - accept the problem raised, but suggest an alternative recommendation, giving reasoning for the alternative recommendation or;
 - disagree with the problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both the problem and recommendation.
 - c) Details of the representatives from the Design Team who prepared the Road Safety Audit Response Report.

Road Safety Audit Team Responses and Audit Closure

- 3.5 Upon receipt of the Design Team Response the Road Safety Audit Team should decide whether to accept the response and close the audit point, make further suggestions in order to reach a mutually acceptable compromise or reject the response. This may result in further responses or the production of an Exception Report by the Design Team.

- 3.6 In the case of rejection then the Design Team/Project Sponsor may choose to provide an Exception Report at any stage. Likewise, the Audit Team may request an Exception Report at any stage if an accommodation cannot be reached.
- 3.7 An illustrative Road Safety Audit Report incorporating both Design Team and Road Safety Audit Team Responses is shown in Appendix F.

Exception Report(s)

- 3.8 The Road Safety Audit Response Report will initiate the requirement for an Exception Report(s) where:
- the problem and/or recommendation has not been accepted in the Road Safety Audit Response(s) and the Project Sponsor agrees with the response(s); or
 - the Road Safety Audit Response(s) accepts a problem and/or recommendation, but the Project Sponsor does not agree with the Road Safety Audit Response(s).
- 3.9 If there is more than one exception in respect of a Road Safety Audit then each exception must be considered separately at the Exception Report meeting (see paragraphs 3.13 to 3.16 below).
- 3.10 When producing Exception Reports, Project Sponsors may contact the Overseeing Organisation Specialists for advice.
- 3.11 The Project Sponsor/Design Team shall provide copies of each approved Exception Report to the Road Safety Audit Team Leader for information and so that the audit can be closed.
- 3.12 If and when all the road safety concerns have been addressed, by whatever method, then the Audit Team should write to the Design Team stating that the particular Stage of the Audit is “closed”.
- 3.13 Exception Reports have a standard format and a copy is attached in Appendix G. The Exception Report details the item number and the reason for not complying with the Audit Advice. It is important to reference the Exception Report to the audit document. It is the Design Team’s responsibility to draft the Exception Report.
- 3.14 Once the Exception Report has been drafted the Design Team Leader must then organise an Exception Report meeting with a minimum of two other staff. Neither staff member should have had any previous direct involvement with the design process. At least one of the additional staff should be at least a Senior Engineer. At least one of the staff must also be at an equal, or higher, level in the organisation than the Design Team Leader. In the event that these criteria cannot be met then the Exception Report should be signed off by a more senior member of staff via the Arbitration Procedure.
- 3.15 The Meeting will examine the draft Exception Report and decide collectively to agree or amend the draft report.
- 3.16 The agreed report must then be signed by all parties attending the meeting. This should then be sent to the Audit Team. Upon receipt of the report containing all the items where actions have been agreed and accepted and an Exception Report detailed the stated action those items not agreed, the Auditor will close the audit and place a copy of the both reports on file. The Auditor will then reply to the Design Team confirming closure of the audit.
- 3.17 Road safety issues contained in the Exception Report should not be raised again at later audit stages unless circumstances relating to the respective highway scheme

have changed, as this will merely lead to the production of further identical Exception Reports and cause unnecessary scheme delays. The Audit Team may however, wish to refer to such issues in the introduction to the report to demonstrate to any third party reading the report that the issues have been raised at a previous audit stage.

- 3.18 In the event that an Exception Report cannot be produced, typically due to disagreement during the Exception Report Meeting or between the Design Team and the Client, then the Arbitration Procedure should be followed.
- 3.19 The Arbitration Procedure may also be used at any time that the Design Team and/or the Client wishes to seek approval for a decision from a more Senior Officer, for example if the issue is particularly contentious. In some circumstances the Audit Team may recommend this approach, although the final decision as to whether to invoke the arbitration process in this instance rests with the Client and the Design Team

Arbitration

- 3.20 It is the responsibility of the Design Team to invoke Arbitration by writing to the Arbiter. The Design Team is to provide the Arbiter with copies of all documentation associated with the disputed matters, including the unsigned Exception Report with copies to the Auditor.
- 3.21 The Arbiter is to be the Director or his/her nominees. In reaching his/her decision he/she may consult appropriate Overseeing Organisation Specialists. In exceptional circumstances, the Arbiter may wish to consult the Director of Development Services and/or the Executive Director of Place.
- 3.22 The Arbiter will consider all the facts, including a detailed risk assessment, and may convene meetings with the parties involved. The Arbiter will confirm the outcome, including the reasons behind any decision, in writing to the Design Team and the Audit Team. The Design Team is to implement the decision and record it on file.
- 3.23 A typical signed off Arbitration is shown in Appendix H.

Subsequent Actions

- 3.24 The Project Sponsor must instruct the Design Team in respect of any changes required during the preparation, design and construction of the scheme resulting from Road Safety Audit.
- 3.25 If the changes are substantial, the Project Sponsor should resubmit the Highway Improvement Scheme or element of the scheme that has materially changed for a further Road Safety Audit (see paragraphs 2.61 and 2.62). If a Project Sponsor is unsure if the Highway Improvement Scheme or element of the scheme needs to be resubmitted for Road Safety Audit they should formally consult with an appropriate Specialist from the Overseeing Organisation (i.e. the Road Safety Audit Coordinator in the structure as at September 2018).
- 3.26 The Project Sponsor is responsible for initiating prompt action on all recommendations in the Road Safety Audit Report and on all Exception and Arbitration Reports. The Project Sponsor must notify the Director of the reasons if works to implement Stage 3 Road Safety recommendations or alternative measures proposed in Exception Reports, are not completed within 6 months of acceptance of the Stage 3 Road Safety Audit recommendations and/or approval of Exception/Arbitration Reports.

Subsequent actions for Stage 4 Road Safety Audits

- 3.27 The Stage 4 Road Safety Audit Reports (see paragraphs 2.42 to 2.52) must be submitted to the Overseeing Organisation who will consider the reports and decide on appropriate action. Decisions made by the Project Sponsor in respect of the Stage 4 Road Safety Audit recommendations must be recorded by the Project Sponsor on the Overseeing Organisation's scheme file (or equivalent).

APPENDIX A: STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT CHECKLISTS – COMPLETION OF PRELIMINARY DESIGN

List A1 – General

Item	Possible Issues
• Departures from Standards	What are the road safety implications of any approved Departures from Standards or Relaxations? (Are these strategic decisions within the scope of the Road Safety Audit?)
• Cross-sections	How safely do the cross-sections accommodate drainage, ducting, signing, fencing, lighting and pedestrian and cycle routes? Could the scheme result in the provision of adverse camber?
• Cross-sectional Variation	What are the road safety implications if the standard of the proposed scheme differs from adjacent lengths of highway?
• Drainage	Will the new road drain adequately, or could areas of excess surface water result? Could excess surface water turn to ice during freezing conditions? Could excessive water drain across the highway from adjacent land?
• Landscaping	Could areas of landscaping conflict with sight lines (including during windy conditions)?
• Public Utilities/Services Apparatus	Could utility apparatus be struck by an errant vehicle? Could utility apparatus obscure sight lines?
• Lay-bys	Has adequate provision been made for vehicles to stop off the carriageway including picnic areas? How will parked vehicles affect sight lines? Could lay-bys be confused with junctions? Is the lay-by located in a safe location (e.g., away from vertical crests or tight horizontal alignments with limited visibility)?
• Access	Can all accesses be used safely? Can multiple accesses be linked into one service road?

- Emergency Vehicles
Are there any conflicts between turning and parked vehicles?
- Future Widening
Has provision been made for safe access and egress by emergency vehicles?
Where a single carriageway scheme is to form part of a future dual carriageway, is it clear to road users that the road is for two-way traffic?
- Adjacent Development
Does adjacent development cause interference/confusion? (e.g. lighting or traffic signals on adjacent roads may affect a road user's perception of the road ahead)
- Basic Design Principles
Are the overall design principles appropriate for the predicted level of use for all road users?

List A2 – Local Alignment

- | Item | Possible Issues |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Visibility | <p>Are horizontal and vertical alignments consistent with required visibility?</p> <p>Will sight lines be obstructed by permanent or temporary features e.g. bridge abutments and parked vehicles?</p> |
| • New/Existing Road Interface | <p>Will the proposed scheme be consistent with the standard of provision on adjacent lengths of road and if not, is this made obvious to the road user?</p> <p>Does interface occur near any potential hazard, i.e. crest, bend after steep gradient?</p> |
| • Vertical Alignment | <p>Are climbing lanes to be provided?</p> <p>Will the vertical alignment cause any “hidden dips”?</p> |

List A3 – Junctions

- | Item | Possible Issues |
|-------------|--|
| • Layout | <p>Is provision for right turning vehicles required?</p> <p>Are acceleration/deceleration lanes required?</p> <p>Are splitter islands required on minor arms to assist pedestrians or formalise road users movements to/from the junction?</p> <p>Are there any unusual features that affect road safety?</p> <p>Are widths and swept paths adequate for all road users? Will large vehicles overrun pedestrian or cycle facilities?</p> |

Are there any conflicts between turning and parked vehicles?

Are any junctions sited on a crest?

Is the junction type appropriate for the traffic flows and likely vehicle speeds?

- Visibility

Are sight lines adequate on and through junction approaches and from the minor arm?

Are visibility splays adequate and clear of obstructions such as street furniture and landscaping?

Will the use of deceleration or acceleration lanes obscure junction visibility?

List A4 – Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision

Item	Possible Issues
• Adjacent Land	Will the scheme have an adverse effect on safe use of adjacent land?
• Pedestrian/Cyclists	Have pedestrian and cycle routes been provided where required? Do shared facilities take account of the needs of all user groups? Can verge strips dividing footways/cycleways and carriageways be provided? Where footpaths have been diverted, will the new alignment permit the same users free access? Are footbridges/subways sited to attract maximum use? Is specific provision required for special and vulnerable groups? (i.e. the young, older users, mobility and visually impaired?) Are tactile paving, flush kerbs and guard railing proposed? Is it specified correctly and in the best location? Have all NMU needs been considered, especially at junctions? Are these routes clear of obstructions such as signposts, lamp columns etc.? • Equestrians
	Have equestrian needs been considered? Does the scheme involve the diversion of bridleways?

List A5 – Road Signs, Carriageway Markings and Lighting

Item	Possible Issues
• Signs	Is there likely to be sufficient highway land to provide the traffic signs required? Are sign gantries needed? Have traffic signs been located away from locations where there is a high strike risk?
• Lighting	Is the scheme to be street lit? Has lighting been considered at new junctions and where adjoining existing roads? Are lighting columns located in the best positions? (e.g. behind safety fences)
• Poles/Columns	Will poles/columns be appropriately located and protected?
• Road Markings	Are any road markings proposed at this stage appropriate?

APPENDIX B: STAGE 2 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT CHECKLISTS – COMPLETION OF DETAILED DESIGN

The Road Safety Audit Team should satisfy itself that all issues raised at Stage 1 Road Safety Audit have been resolved. Items may require further consideration where significant design changes have occurred.

If a Highway Improvement Scheme has not been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, the items listed in Lists A1 to A5 should be considered together with the items listed below.

List B1: General

Item	Possible Issues
• Departures from Standards	Consider road safety aspects of any Departures granted since the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.
• Drainage	<p>Do drainage facilities (e.g. gully spacing, gully locations, flat spots, crossfall, ditches) appear to be adequate?</p> <p>Do features such as gullies obstruct cycle routes, footpaths or equestrian routes or are they located on NMU desire lines?</p> <p>Do the locations of features such as manhole covers give concern for motorcycle/cyclist stability?</p> <p>Is surface water likely to drain across a carriageway and increase the risk of aquaplaning under storm conditions?</p>
• Climatic Conditions	Is there a need for specific provision to mitigate effects of fog, wind, sun glare, snow, and ice?
• Landscaping	<p>Could planting (new or when mature) encroach onto the carriageway or obscure signs or sight lines (including during windy conditions)?</p> <p>Could earth bunds obscure signs or visibility?</p> <p>Could trees (new or when mature) be a hazard to an errant vehicle?</p> <p>Could planting affect lighting or shed leaves on to the carriageway?</p>
• Public Utilities/Services Apparatus	<p>Can maintenance vehicles stop clear of traffic lanes? If so, could they obscure signs or sight lines?</p> <p>Are boxes, pillars, posts and cabinets located in safe positions away from locations that may have a high potential of errant vehicle strikes? Do they interfere with visibility?</p>

Has sufficient clearance to overhead cables been provided?

Have any special accesses/parking areas been provided and are they safe?

Are there any utility inspection chambers in live traffic lanes and/or wheel tracks?

- Lay-bys

Have lay-bys been positioned safely?

Could parked vehicles obscure sight lines?

Are lay-bys adequately signed?

Are picnic areas properly segregated from vehicular traffic?

- Access

Is the visibility to/from accesses adequate?

Are the accesses of adequate length to ensure all vehicles clear the main carriageway?

Do all accesses appear safe for their intended use?

- Skid Resistance

Are there locations where high skid resistance surfacing (such as on approaches to junctions and crossings) would be beneficial?

Do surface changes occur at locations where they could adversely affect motorcycle stability?

Is the colour of any high friction surfacing appropriate?

- Agriculture

Have the needs of agricultural vehicles and plant been taken into consideration (e.g. room to stop between carriageway and gate, facilities for turning on dual carriageways)? Are such facilities safe to use and are they adequately signed?

- Fences and Road Restraint Systems

Is there a need for road restraint systems to protect road users from signs, gantries, parapets, abutments, steep embankments or water hazards?

Do the road restraint systems provided give adequate protection?

Are the road restraint systems long enough?

Are specific restraint facilities required for motorcyclists?

In the case of wooden post and rail boundary fences, are the rails placed on the non-traffic side of the posts?

If there are roads on both sides of the fence is an interlocking-design necessary to prevent impalement on impact?

• Adjacent Developments and Roads

Has screening been provided to avoid headlamp glare between opposing carriageways, or any distraction to road users?

Are there any safety issues relating to the provision of environmental barriers or screens?

List B2: Local Alignment

Item

Possible Issues

• Visibility

Obstruction of sight lines by:

- i. safety fences
- ii. boundary fences
- iii. street furniture
- iv. parking facilities
- v. signs
- vi. landscaping
- vii. structures
- viii. environmental barriers
- ix. crests
- x. features such as buildings, plant or materials outside the highway boundary

Is the forward visibility of at-grade crossings sufficient to ensure they are conspicuous?

• New/Existing Road Interface

Where a new road scheme joins an existing road, or where an on-line improvement is to be constructed, will the transition give rise to potential hazards?

Where the road environment changes (e.g. urban to rural, restricted to unrestricted) is the transition made obvious by appropriate signing and carriageway markings?

List B3: Junctions

Item

Possible Issues

• Layout

Are the junctions and accesses adequate for all vehicular movements?

Are there any unusual features, which may have an adverse effect on road safety?

Have guard rails/safety fences been provided where appropriate?

Do any roadside features (e.g. guard rails, safety fences, traffic bollards, signs and traffic signals) intrude into drivers' line of sight?

Are splitter islands and bollards required on minor arms to assist pedestrians or formalise road users' movements to/from the junction?

Are parking or stopping zones for buses, taxis and public utilities vehicles situated within the junction area? Are they located outside visibility splays?

- Visibility

Are the sight lines adequate at and through the junctions and from minor roads?

Are visibility splays clear of obstruction?

- Signing

Is the junction signing adequate, consistent with adjacent signing and easily understood?

Have the appropriate warning signs been provided?

Are signs appropriately located and of the appropriate size for approach speeds?

Are sign posts passively safe or protected by safety barriers where appropriate?

Are traffic signs illuminated where required?

Are traffic signs located in positions that minimise potential strike risk?

Is the mounting height of sign faces appropriate?

Are traffic signs orientated correctly to ensure correct visibility and reflectivity?

- Road Markings

Do the carriageway markings clearly define routes and priorities?

Are the dimensions of the road markings appropriate for the speed limit/design speed of the road?

Have old road markings and road studs been adequately removed?

- T, X, Y-Junctions

Have ghost island right turn lanes and refuges been provided where required?

Do junctions have adequate stacking space for turning movements?

Can staggered crossroads accommodate all vehicle types and movements?

- All Roundabouts

Are the deflection angles of approach roads adequate for the likely approach speed?

Are splitter islands necessary?

Is visibility on approach adequate to ensure drivers can perceive the correct path through the junction?

Where chevron signs are required, have they been correctly sited?

Are dedicated approach lanes required? If provided, will the road markings and signs be clear to all users?

- Mini Roundabouts

Are the approach speeds for each arm likely to be appropriate for a mini roundabout?

Is the mini roundabout appropriate for the likely traffic volumes?

Is the centre island visible from all approaches?

- Traffic Signals

Will speed discrimination equipment be required?

Is the advance signing adequate?

Are signals clearly visible in relation to the likely approach speeds?

Is "see through" likely to be a problem?

Would lantern filters assist?

Is the visibility of signals likely to be affected by sunrise/sunset?

Would high intensity signals and/or backing boards improve visibility?

Would high-level signal units be of value?

Is the stopline in the correct location?

Are any pedestrian crossings excessively long?

Are the proposed tactile paving layouts correct?

Are the markings for right turning vehicles adequate?

Is there a need for box junction markings?

Is the phasing appropriate?

Will pedestrian/cyclist phases be needed?

Does the number of exit lanes equal the number of approach lanes?

If not is the taper length adequate?

Is the required junction intervisibility provided?

List B4: Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision

Item	Possible Issues
• Adjacent Land	<p>Are accesses to and from adjacent land/properties safe to use?</p> <p>Has adjacent land been suitably fenced?</p>
• Pedestrians	<p>Are facilities required for NMUs at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) junctions;b) pelican/puffin/zebra crossings;c) refuges or;d) other locations? <p>Are crossing facilities placed and designed to attract maximum use?</p> <p>Are guardrails/fencing present/required to deter pedestrians from crossing the road at unsafe locations?</p> <p>Is tactile paving and flush kerbs proposed? Is it specified correctly and in the best location?</p> <p>For each type of crossing (bridges, subways, at grade) have the following been fully considered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) visibility both by and of pedestrians;b) use by cyclists;c) use by mobility and visually impaired;d) use by older users;e) use by children/schools;f) need for guardrails in verges/central reserve;g) signs;h) width and gradient;

- i) surfacing;
- j) provision of dropped kerbs;
- k) avoidance of channels and gullies;
- l) need for deterrent kerbing;
- m) need for lighting;

- Cyclists

Have the needs of cyclists been considered especially at junctions and roundabouts?

Are cycle lanes or segregated cycle tracks required?

Does the signing make clear the intended use of such facilities?

Are cycle crossings adequately signed?

Do guardrails need to be provided to increase cyclist's awareness of potential hazards such as a road crossing?

Has lighting been provided on cycle routes?

Are any proposed drop kerbs flush with the adjacent highway?

Are any parapet heights sufficient?

Is tactile paving proposed? Is it specified correctly and in the best location?

- Equestrians

Should bridleways or shared facilities be provided?

Does the signing make clear the intended use of such paths and is sufficient local signing provided to attract users?

Have suitable parapets/rails been provided where necessary?

List B5: Road Signs, Carriageway Markings and Lighting

Item

Possible Issues

- Traffic Signs

Do destinations shown accord with signing policy?

Are signs easy to understand?

Are sign structures passively safe?

Are the signs located behind safety fencing and out of the way of pedestrians and cyclists?

Is there a need for overhead signs?

Where overhead signs are necessary is there sufficient headroom to enable designated NMU usage?

Is the sign reflectivity provided correct?

Has sign clutter been considered?

- Variable Message Signs

Are the legends relevant and easily understood?

Are signs passively safe or located behind safety fencing?

- Lighting

Has lighting been considered at new junctions and where adjoining existing roads?

Is there a need for lighting, including lighting of signs and bollards?

Are lighting columns passively safe?

Are lighting columns located in the best positions e.g. behind safety fences and not obstructing NMU routes?

- Road Markings

Are road markings appropriate to the location?

a) centre lines;

b) edge lines;

c) hatching;

d) road studs;

e) text/destinations;

f) approved and/or conform to the Regulations.

- Poles and Columns

Are poles and columns passively safe?

Are poles and columns protected by safety fencing where appropriate?

APPENDIX C: STAGE 3 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT CHECKLISTS – COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION

The Road Safety Audit Team should consider whether the design has been properly translated into the scheme as constructed and that no inherent road safety defect has been incorporated into the works.

Particular attention should be paid to design changes, which have occurred during construction.

List C1: General

Possible Issues

- Departures from Standards
 - Are there any adverse road safety implications of any Departures from Standard granted since the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit?

- Drainage
 - Does drainage of roads, cycle routes and footpaths appear adequate?

 - Do drainage features such as gullies obstruct footpaths, cycle routes or equestrian routes?

- Climatic Conditions
 - Are any extraordinary measures required?

- Landscaping
 - Could planting obscure signs or sight lines (including during periods of windy weather)?

 - Do earth bunds obscure signs or visibility?

 - Could trees (new or when mature) be a potential hazard to an errant vehicle?

 - Could planting affect lighting or shed leaves onto the carriageway?

- Public Utilities
 - Can maintenance vehicles stop clear of traffic lanes? If so, could they obscure signs or sight lines?

 - Are boxes, pillars, posts and cabinets located in safe positions away from locations that may have a high potential for errant vehicle strikes? Do they interfere with visibility?

 - Are any special accesses/parking areas provided safe?

 - Are there any utility inspection chambers in live traffic lanes and/or wheel tracks?

 - Are utility service covers and gullies located in the verge level with the surrounding ground so as not to present a potential hazard to an errant vehicle?

- Access
 - Is the visibility to/from accesses adequate?
 - Are the accesses of adequate length to ensure all vehicles clear the main carriageway?
- Skid Resistance
 - Do any joints in the surfacing appear to have excessive bleeding or low skid resistance?
 - Do surface changes occur at locations where they could adversely affect motorcycle stability?
- Fences and Road Restraint Systems
 - Is the restraint system adequate?
 - In the case of wooden post and rail boundary fences, are the rails placed on the non-traffic side of the posts?
- Adjacent Development
 - Have environmental barriers been provided and do they create a potential hazard?
- Bridge Parapets
 - Is the projection of any attachment excessive?
- Network Management
 - Have appropriate signs and/or markings been installed in respect of Traffic Regulation Orders?

List C2: Local Alignment

- | Item | Possible Issues |
|-------------------------------|--|
| • Visibility | Are the sight lines clear of obstruction? |
| • New/Existing Road Interface | Is there a need for additional signs and/or road markings? |

List C3: Junctions

- | Item | Possible Issues |
|-------------------|---|
| • Visibility | Are all visibility splays clear of obstructions? |
| • Road Markings | <p>Do the carriageway markings clearly define routes and priorities?</p> <p>Have all superseded road markings and studs been removed adequately?</p> |
| • Roundabouts | <p>Can the junction be seen from appropriate distances and is the signing adequate?</p> <p>Where chevron signs are required, have they been correctly sited?</p> |
| • Traffic Signals | <p>Can the traffic signals be seen from appropriate distances? Can drivers see traffic signal heads for opposing traffic? For the operation of signals:</p> <p>Do signal phases correspond to the design?</p> <p>Do NMU phases give adequate crossing time?</p> |

Can NMUs mistakenly view the “green man” signal for other NMU phases?

- T, X and Y Junctions

Are priorities clearly defined?

Is signing adequate?

List C4: Non-Motorised User (NMU) Provision

Item	Possible Issues
• Adjacent Land	Has suitable fencing been provided?
• Pedestrians	Are the following adequate for each type of crossing (bridges, subways, at grade)? a) visibility; b) signs; c) surfacing; d) other guardrails; e) drop kerbing or flush surfaces; f) tactile paving.
• Cyclists	Do the following provide sufficient levels of road safety for cyclists on, or crossing the road? a) visibility; b) signs; c) guardrails; d) drop kerbing or flush surfaces; e) surfacing; f) tactile paving.
• Equestrians	Do the following provide sufficient levels of road safety for equestrians? a) visibility; b) signs; c) guardrails.

List C5: Road Signs, Carriageway Markings and Lighting

Item	Possible Issues
• Signs	Are the visibility, locations and legibility of all signs (during daylight and darkness) adequate?

Are signposts protected from vehicle impact or passively safe?

Will signposts impede the safe and convenient passage of pedestrians and cyclists?

Have additional warning signs been provided where necessary?

- Variable Message Signs (VMS)

Can VMS be read and easily understood at distances appropriate for vehicle speeds?

Are they adequately protected from vehicle impact or passively safe?

- Lighting

Does the street lighting provide adequate illumination of roadside features, road markings and non-vehicular users to drivers?

Is the level of illumination adequate for the road safety of NMUs?

Is lighting obscured by vegetation or other street furniture?

- Carriageway Markings

Are all road markings/studs clear and appropriate for their location?

Have all superseded road markings and studs been removed adequately?

**APPENDIX D - ILLUSTRATIVE ROAD SAFETY
AUDIT BRIEF**

**APPENDIX E - ILLUSTRATIVE STAGE 2 ROAD
SAFETY AUDIT REPORT (INCLUDING
RESPONSES)**

**APPENDIX F - ILLUSTRATIVE STAGE 4 ROAD
SAFETY AUDIT REPORT (12 MONTHS POST
CONSTRUCTION)**

**APPENDIX G - ILLUSTRATIVE EXCEPTION
REPORT**

**APPENDIX H - ILLUSTRATIVE ARBITRATION
REPORT**

**APPENDIX I – ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
FLOWCHARTS**

These appendices will be provided once the necessary reports done to the 2018 standard have been completed.