



# PARAGON HIGHWAYS

---

## Proposed Petrol Filling Station

Mitchells Way, Barnsley

Designers Response to Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out by AC Road Safety Audits

---

### ITEMS RAISED IN STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

#### 3.1.1 Problem 1

**Summary** – Risk of flooding/ standing water resulting in vehicles losing control.

**Recommendation:** Ensure adequate drainage especially at the junction of the new access and Barnsley Road.

**Designers Response:** Accepted – suitable drainage will be provided and identified at detailed design stage.

#### 3.1.2 Problem 2

**Summary** – Risk of carriageway failure at new vehicular dropped crossing.

**Recommendation:** Ensure the services and all statutory undertaker's equipment is lowered and protected to an adequate standard.

**Designers Response:** Accepted – statutory undertaker's equipment will be lowered if necessary, and suitable cover provided, which will be agreed with the Highway Authority.

#### 3.1.3 Problem 3

**Summary** – Risk of vehicle collisions due to inadequate turning area from pumps 1 & 2.

**Recommendation:** Swept path analysis should be shown to demonstrate that vehicles especially larger vehicles can safely manoeuvre within the space and exit without having to reverse.

**Designers Response:** Vehicle tracking for a 3.5t panel van has been provided demonstrating that these vehicles can make the turn from pump 1 towards the exit. Larger vehicles such as 7.5t and above would use pump 7.

#### 3.1.4 Problem 4

**Summary** – Risk of vehicle collisions due to inadequate space for disabled parking.

**Recommendation:** Swept path analysis should be shown to demonstrate that vehicles using the disabled space can reverse safely without conflict with other vehicles using the petrol pumps.

**Designers Response:** Vehicle tracking has been provided demonstrating that private cars can enter and exit the disabled bay safely.

#### 3.1.5 Problem 5

**Summary** – Risk of vehicle strike with forecourt canopy

**Recommendation:** Ensure canopy is of suitable height for vehicles to clear it and provide signs to warn over-height vehicles of its presence.

**Designers Response:** Accepted – the canopy will be provided at a suitable height with adequate signage provided as appropriate, which will be identified at detailed design stage.

#### 3.1.6 Problem 6

**Summary** – Risk of vehicle collisions/ collisions with surrounding infrastructure

**Recommendation:** Ensure that all types of vehicle expected to use the forecourt can turn and manoeuvre safely within the area without conflict with other vehicles or physical feature within the site.

**Designers Response:** Vehicle tracking has been provided demonstrating that a large oil tanker can enter and exit the site in a forward gear. The swept path analysis identifies that suitable clearance is provided between the vehicle swept path and adjacent object/ feature. The size of tanker at the site could be conditioned if necessary. It should also be noted that during delivery times the petrol filling station would be closed to customers.

#### 3.1.7 Problem 7

**Summary** – Risk of movement of land/private access due to inadequate containment.

**Recommendation:** Ensure the land is retained sufficiently and security of the building is not compromised.

**Designers Response:** Accepted – the adjacent land will be sufficiently retained where necessary along with suitable security provided for the building. If measures are necessary, these will be identified as part of the detailed design.

### 3.1.8 Problem 8

**Summary** – Risk of collisions due to inadequate sightlines

**Recommendation:** Ensure the sightlines are adequate and comply with local standards.

**Designers Response:** Visibility splays have been provided on the drawing, which are considered to be suitable.

### 3.1.9 Problem 9

**Summary** – Risk of collisions due to parked vehicles & congestion.

**Recommendation:** Monitor the parking and review the restrictions in the vicinity of the proposed access.

**Designers Response:** On street parking along the east side of the road may encroach into the latter section of the visibility splay on occasion. However, this is not within the critical direction. Visibility of motorists travelling from the south is generally not impeded by on-street parking.

### 3.1.10 Problem 10

**Summary** – There is a risk of collisions due to location of existing bus stop and shelter.

**Recommendation:** Relocate the bus stop & shelter to a more suitable location.

**Designers Response:** Whilst a stationary bus would not impede manoeuvres to and from the access it is proposed to relocate the bus stop to a position to be agreed with LPA and SYPT.

### 3.1.11 Problem 11

**Summary** – Risk of collisions between vehicles and pedestrians.

**Recommendation:** Ensure there is adequate provision for pedestrians at this location.

**Designers Response:** Suitable pedestrian provision will be provided and identified at detailed design stage.

### 3.1.12 Problem 12

**Summary** – Risk of pedestrian trips and falls due to uneven ground.

**Recommendation:** The route for pedestrians outside the site boundary should be improved and consideration given to removing the trees if it is thought they may affect the ground or infrastructure within the site.

**Designers Response:** This area forms part of the public highway with suitable footway provision. The trees are not located within the application site and are out of the control of the applicant. Detailed design will identify any remedial works required to the ground within the site if necessary.

### 3.1.13 Problem 13

**Summary** – Risk of collisions between pedestrians & cyclists.

**Recommendation:** Ensure the shared use footway is properly signed and it is clear where it starts and ends.

**Designers Response:** The signs relate to a shared facility across Barnsley Road terminating at the splitter island. Therefore, the shared facility does not travel toward the proposed access point and no additional works are required to the signage as a result of the proposed development.

### 3.1.14 Problem 14

**Summary** – Risk of vehicle collisions due to inadequate signing.

**Recommendation:** Include signs to indicate the preferred direction of travel around the petrol forecourt.

**Designers Response:** Accepted – suitable signage will be provided to direct traffic accordingly and will be identified as part of the detailed design.

### 3.1.15 Problem 15

**Summary** – Risk of collisions between pedestrians & vehicles due to inadequate lighting.

**Recommendation:** Provide adequate street lighting for the proposed development and at the junction.

**Designers Response:** Street lighting to an appropriate standard is provided along Barnsley Road. Suitable lighting will also be provided internally within the site, which will be identified at detailed design stage.

**Designers Response by L J Ogden MCIHT MIHE**

**Company: Paragon Highways**

**Date 08<sup>th</sup> October 2018.**