FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST – 1466/17

Dear Sir/Madam

Your request for information has now been considered and the information requested is provided below.

Request:

The FOI refers to the proposed regeneration scheme (Option A introduction of one way scheme and associated works) of Oakham Town Centre.

Request & Response:

1. Has a road safety audit been undertaken for the proposed works?

Answer:
A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was undertaken on the Preliminary Design for Options A & B. A Stage 2 Road Safety Audit is scheduled to be undertaken on the revised detailed design of the scheme.

2. If so, please provide an electronic copy of the audit?

Answer: Please see attached document – Oakham Town Centre DRAFT RSA1

3. What is the proposed speed limit down the High Street?

Answer:
A 20mph zone is proposed for the High Street within the extents of the proposed scheme.

4. In developing scheme A, what different road junctions were devised and then evaluated for High Street and Burley Road?

Answer:
Several different junction layouts were considered as part of design development for the High Street junction with Burley Road. These included different options for access/egress for cyclists and full signalisation of the junction.

5. What were the quantitative risk evaluation requiring the modifications to Bull Lane and the Library?

Answer:
Modifications to the Bull Lane access were necessary to enable the provision of zebra crossing facilities to improve pedestrian access to the town centre.
and library area.

You are free to use any documents supplied for your own use, including for non-commercial research purposes. The documents may also be used for news reporting. However, any other type of re-use, for example by publishing the documents or issuing copies to the public will require the permission of the copyright owner, where copyright exists. Such a request would be considered separately in accordance with the relevant Re-use of Public Sector Information Regulations 2005 and is not automatic. Therefore, no permission is implied in the re-use of this information, until such a request to re-use it has been made and agreed, subject to any appropriate conditions. Any request to re-use the information should be made to me at the address below.

If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request please contact the Head of Corporate Governance, Rutland County Council, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP. You can also complain to the Information Commissioner at:

The Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House, Water lane
Wilmslow, Cheshire
SK9 5AF
Tel: 01625 545700

Yours faithfully

FOI Administrator
Corporate Support Team, Rutland County Council
Freedom of Information Request to Rutland County Council

Please provide receipt of FOI with date and time when received by Rutland County Council
13 December 2017
Mr and Mrs C Rowsell

The FOI refers to the proposed regeneration scheme (Option A introduction of one way scheme and associated works) of Oakham Town Centre.

1. Has a road safety audit been undertaken for the proposed works?
2. If so please provide an electronic copy of the audit?
3. What is the proposed speed limit down the High Street
4. In developing scheme A, what different road junctions were devised and then evaluated for High Street and Burley Road?
5. What were the quantitative risk evaluation requiring the modifications to Bull Lane and the Library.

I look forward to receiving your response to the above.

Mr and Mrs C Rowsell
Oakham Town Centre
Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
Limitations

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited ("AECOM") has prepared this report for the sole use of Rutland County Council ("Client") in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by AECOM. This report is confidential and may not be disclosed by the Client nor relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in the report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by AECOM in providing its services are outlined in this report. The work described in this report was undertaken during May and June 2017 and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

AECOM disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the report, which may come or be brought to AECOM’s attention after the date of the report.

Certain statements made in the report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. AECOM specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this report.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.
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Figure 1: Scheme Location Plan
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Audit Details

1.1.1 This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on the proposed Oakham Town Centre scheme – Options A and B. The Audit was carried out at the request of Andrew Sherwood of AECOM’s Nottingham office on behalf of Rutland County Council.

1.1.2 The Road Safety Audit Team membership approved by Andrew Sherwood on behalf of the Overseeing Organisation Project Sponsor was as follows:

1. Jamie Stone  
Audit Team Leader  
BEng (Hons) EngTech MCIHT MSoRSA  
AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited

2. Pete Denton  
Audit Team Member  
BSc (Hons) DipASM MCIHT MSoRSA  
AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited

1.1.3 The Road Safety Audit was undertaken in accordance with the instruction received via Email from Andrew Sherwood on 29th March 2017. The Audit comprised of an examination of the documents provided by the Design Team, which are listed in Appendix A. The documents consisted of a complete set of the preliminary design drawings for Option A and Option B.

1.1.4 The Road Safety Audit took place in the AECOM Chesterfield office during May and June 2017 and the site was examined by both members of the Road Safety Audit Team together during daylight hours on 16th May 2017. The weather during the daylight site visit was overcast and dry with a damp road surface. The site visit was carried out during the off-peak period between the hours of (11:00 – 12:30). There were construction works being undertaken throughout the scheme extents. It was unclear, at the time of the site inspection, as to whether or not these works were independent of the scheme being audited.

1.1.5 The terms of reference of the Audit are as described in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) document HD 19/15 ‘Road Safety Audit’. The advice issued in the DMRB applies to trunk road and motorway highway improvement schemes; however, it has been used in this report to define the scope of this Audit.

1.1.6 An absence of any comment relating to specific road users / modes in Section 3 of this report does not imply that they have not been considered; instead the Audit Team feel that they are not adversely affected by the proposed changes.
1.1.7 Nothing in this Audit should be regarded as a direct instruction to include or remove a measure from within the scheme. Responsibility for designing the scheme lies with the Designer and as such the Audit Team accepts no design responsibility for any changes made to the scheme as a result of this Audit.

1.1.8 The scheme has been examined, and this report compiled, only with regard to the safety implications to road users of the scheme as presented. It has not been examined or verified for compliance with any other standards or criteria. However, to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem, the Audit Team may, on occasion, have referred to a design standard without touching on technical audit.

1.1.9 Unless general to the scheme, each problem has been identified with reference to key features and highlighted on the problem location plans in Appendix B.
2.0 Site Description

2.1 Existing Layout

2.1.1 Oakham is the county town of Rutland in the East Midlands situated 25 miles east of Leicester, 28 miles south-east of Nottingham, and 23 miles west of Peterborough. A scheme location plan can be found below.

2.1.2 The existing carriageway surface and road markings appeared to be in adequate condition. There are footways adjacent both sides of the carriageway and a number of on-street parking places are provided.

2.1.3 Land use within the area is predominantly retail and commercial developments.

2.1.4 Oakham High Street is subject to a 30mph speed limit and has lighting columns located sporadically throughout.

Figure 1: Scheme Location Plan

Google Earth Pro™ imagery in the form of Google Map™ and Google Streetview™ have been used, unmodified, within this document. This imagery has been used within the extents of the AECOM license agreement with Google Inc.
2.2  Proposals

2.2.1  A number of options were devised as part of a Feasibility Study for Oakham Town Centre. From these studies, two of the options; Option A and Option B have been proposed as part of this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

Option A includes:

- Modifying the existing two-way High Street to one-way between the junction of Burley Road, Mill Street, Catmos Street and High Street to the junction of New Street with High Street, including Market Street and The Market Place.
- Reducing the speed limit to 20mph throughout the High Street,
- Improvements to pedestrian and cyclist facilities throughout the High Street;
- Discourage and/or restrict vehicular use, particularly HGVs, throughout the High Street; and,
- Improvements to ‘in town’ signage for both retail and visitor sites at Car Parks, Bus and Rail Stations and the town centre.

Option B includes:

- Public realm enhancements to the area between the junction of Burley Road, Mill Street, Catmos Street and High Street to the Junction of Church Street, Gaol Street and High Street, including Market Street and The Market Place;
- Reducing the speed limit to 20mph throughout the High Street,
- Improvements to pedestrian and cyclist facilities throughout the High Street;
- Discourage and/or restrict vehicular use, particularly HGVs throughout the High Street; and,
- Improvements to ‘in town’ signage for both retail and visitor sites at Car Parks, Bus and Rail Stations and the town centre.
3.0 Items Identified During this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

The following road safety issues were identified during this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

Option A

3.1 General

3.1.1 Proposed Route

3.1.1.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Approaches to the High Street and surrounding areas.

Summary: Lack of route signage or one-way signage leading to conflicts and collisions occurring throughout the scheme extents.

Under the existing layout, High Street is a two lane, two-way carriageway. Under the proposals, High Street is to become on-way in an eastbound direction and Mill Street is to become one-way in a southbound direction. No route signage or one-way signage outlining the changes in priority at the High Street junction with Mill Street, Burley Road and B641 have been detailed. If the change in priorities at the junction are not clear there, is a risk of collisions occurring within the junction.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that advanced route direction signage, clearly outlining the change in route, are installed on all approaches to the High Street. Additionally, ‘No Entry’ back to back with ‘Two-way Traffic’ and ‘One-way’ signage should be installed at the terminal points of the proposed one-way system and ‘One-way’ signage should be installed throughout the one-way system to inform drivers leaving side roads of the direction they should travel.

It is also recommended that road markings are installed to clearly outline to drivers the change in priority at the junction.
3.1.2 Basic Design Principles

3.1.2.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Echelon parking areas within the scheme extents.

Summary: Vehicles may have to manoeuvre over the contra-flow cycle lane while entering and exiting the echelon parking bays leading to collisions with oncoming cyclists.

Echelon parking bays have been provided within the northern footway on High Street. However, no swept path analysis has been provided to the Audit Team outlining how vehicles enter and exit the echelon parking bays. There is a risk that vehicles may have to enter the contra-flow cycle lane heightening the risk of collisions with oncoming cyclists.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that swept path analysis is undertaken to ensure vehicles can enter and exit the echelon parking bays efficiently without having to manoeuvre within the cycle lane.

3.1.2.2 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0006

Location: Market Street.

Summary: Bus entering the proposed bus stop, adjacent to Market Street, may do so into the path of an oncoming vehicle leading to a collision.

A proposed bus stop is detailed adjacent to Market Street. The location of the bus stop is such that buses may enter it by crossing Market Street. There is a risk that a bus may manoeuvre into Market Street into the path of an oncoming vehicle leading to a collision.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that a kerbed build out is provided to separate Market Street and the proposed bus stop.
3.1.2.3 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0006

Location: Market Place.

Summary: Vehicles may not be able to enter the proposed lay-by adjacent to Market Place efficiently leading to overrun or loss of control collisions.

A proposed lay-by is detailed adjacent to Market Place. The angle of the lay-by is such that vehicles appear to have to enter Market Place before manoeuvring into the lay-by. There is a risk that vehicles may not be able to make this manoeuvre efficiently and safely leading to them overrunning the footway or adjacent High Street or losing control as they attempt the manoeuvre leading to collisions.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that swept path analysis is undertaken to ensure vehicles can enter the lay-by efficiently and safely.

3.2 Non-Motorised User Provision

3.2.1 Pedestrians/Cyclists

3.2.1.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Side roads and vehicular access’s throughout the scheme extents.

Summary: Lack of uncontrolled tactile crossing points leading to pedestrians entering the carriageway, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision.

Uncontrolled tactile crossing points have been detailed at a number of crossing points throughout the High Street. However, a number of crossing points have not been detailed with tactile paving, for example Church Street. If tactile paving is omitted at uncontrolled crossing points, pedestrians may not stop at the crossing point and enter the carriageway, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision. This issue will be exacerbated for visually impaired users who may not be aware that they have come to a crossing point.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that all uncontrolled crossing points are furnished with tactile paving.
3.2.1.2 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0001

Location: Proposed signalised crossing facilities.

Summary: Incorrect tactile paving layout leading to a visually impaired user unintentionally missing the crossing point and entering the carriageway at an unsafe location, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, and injury occurring.

The tactile paving provision at the signalised crossing facilities appears to be incorrect. No tail has been detailed to guide visually impaired users to the crossing points. There is a risk that a visually impaired may unintentionally miss the cross point and enter the carriageway at an unsafe location, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to injury occurring.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that a L-shaped tactile paving layout is provided at the signalised crossing point. The L-shaped tail should guide visually impaired users to the right hand-side of the crossing point.

3.2.1.3 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0002

Location: New Street, western footway.

Summary: Lack of footway width leading to pedestrians potentially walking within the carriageway and conflicts and collisions occurring with oncoming vehicles.

The approximate width of the western footway on New Street appears to be below 1.0m. There is a risk that due to the narrow footway, pedestrians may not have adequate space to pass efficiently potentially leading to them entering the adjacent carriageway. If pedestrians walk within the carriageway, the risk of conflicts and collisions occurring with vehicular traffic will be increased.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the western footway is widened to a minimum width of 2000mm to facilitate two people in wheelchairs to pass each other comfortably.
3.2.1.4 **Problem**

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Throughout the extents of the scheme.

Summary: Proposed surfacing throughout the cycle lane may lead to cyclists losing control and injuries occurring.

The proposed cycle lane throughout the extents of the scheme has been detailed with a granite sett and porphyry paving sett surfacing. No specification details have been provided to the Audit Team outlining whether or not these sett’s are cycle friendly. If they are not cycle friendly, there is a risk that cyclists may lose control as they ride over the surfacing, should the setts become uneven or dislodged. If a cyclist loses control, they may fall from their cycle, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision. Additionally, the changes in surface type may heighten the risk of cyclists losing control due to the potential change in surface friction.

The change in surface type may also give the wrong impression to drivers that they can drive within the cycle lane, or wait within the cycle lane as they exit the side roads, increasing the risk of cycle and vehicular collisions.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the cycle lane is furnished with a cycle friendly paving sett’s.

3.2.1.5 **Problem**

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0004

Location: Area in front of the Knights of Oakham local business.

Summary: Proposed tree may create a pinch point in front of the Knights of Oakham local business leading to pedestrian conflicts and collisions occurring.

As part of the proposals, trees are detailed in the area in front of the Knights of Oakham. A pinch point appears to have been created between the Knights of Oakham and the eastern most proposed tree. If this tree is installed as detailed, it will reduce the available width of the footway leading to potential pedestrian conflicts and collisions as they pass in close proximity to one another. There is also a risk of a pedestrian striking the tree as they pass leading to potential injuries occurring.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that adequate footway width is provided between the local businesses and proposed tress to reduce the likelihood of pedestrian conflicts and collisions occurring.
3.2.1.6 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0008

Location: Burley Road junction with High Street.

Summary: Right turning cyclists enter the High Street into the path of oncoming vehicles leading to an increased risk of collisions occurring.

As part of the proposals, a contra-flow cycle lane is to be created on High Street. Cyclists wishing to enter the contra-flow cycle lane on High Street, from Burley Road, have to turn right into the path of oncoming vehicles. There is a risk that vehicles wishing to carry straight ahead from High Street on to Catmos Street will position themselves towards the right, of the running line, at a point where the contra-flow cycle lane begins in advance of the right turn lane on to Mill Street. If this occurs there is an increased risk of cyclists turning right, into High Street, into the path of an oncoming vehicle leading to a collision.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that adequate provision is provided at the junction to allow right turning cyclists to enter the contra-flow cycle lane without cycling into the path of oncoming vehicles at the junction.

3.2.1.7 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0008

Location: Uncontrolled crossing point at Mill Street.

Summary: Lack of tactile paving depth increasing the risk of a visually impaired user unintentionally entering the carriageway when it is not safe, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to injury.

The tactile paving depth within the western footway adjacent to Mill Street is only 400mm at its narrowest point. There is a risk that a visually impaired user may unintentionally miss the crossing point and enter the carriageway at an unsafe location, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to injury occurring.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the tactile paving depth is increased to a minimum 800mm at its narrowest point.
3.3 Road Signs, Carriageway Markings & Lighting

3.3.1 Signs

3.3.1.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0008

Location: High Street junction with Mill Street.

Summary: Lack of no entry signs and keep left bollards leading to vehicles approaching High Street from Catmos Street potentially manoeuvring around the central island and colliding with oncoming vehicles.

The existing roundabout junction of High Street with Burley Road, Catmos Street and Mill Street is to be removed and modified; the movement from Burley Road to Catmos Street will now be a through route with no access provided to High Street for vehicles. As no signage has been detailed, there is a risk that due to the alignment of the proposed right turn lane from High Street to Mill Street, vehicles approaching from Catmos Street may attempt to access High Street and collide head-on with an oncoming vehicle.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that no entry signs and a keep left sign are installed to ensure that vehicles exiting Catmos Street proceed onto Mill Street.

3.3.2 Lighting

3.3.2.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Various

Summary: Lighting provision may lead to dark patches within the footways and carriageway, heightening the risk of collisions occurring during darkness hours.

It was noted during the site inspection that there are a low number of existing lighting columns throughout the High Street. No information has been detailed as to what is to happen to these lighting columns once the scheme has been implemented. There is a risk that if the lighting provision is insufficient for the High Street, dark patches may form on the footways and carriageway heightening the risk of collisions during darkness hours.
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that additional lighting columns are incorporated into the design to ensure that the High Street is efficiently lit during darkness hours.

3.3.3 Poles/Columns

3.3.3.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0002

Location: New Street, eastern footway.

Summary: Existing lighting column reducing the available width of the footway at the uncontrolled crossing point, potentially leading to pedestrian conflicts.

There is an existing lighting column on New Street, eastern footway, located at the proposed uncontrolled tactile crossing. No information has been provided to the Audit Team with regards as to what is to happen to this lighting column as part of the works. If this lighting column is to remain in its existing location it will reduce the available width of the footway at the uncontrolled crossing point leading to potential pedestrian conflicts and collisions as they pass in close proximity to one another. There is also a risk of a pedestrian striking the lighting column as they pass leading to potential injuries occurring.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the existing lighting column is relocated away from the uncontrolled crossing point. Careful consideration should be given to the relocated position of the lighting column to ensure that luminance levels remain adequate at the junction.

3.3.3.2 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0003

Location: High Street southern footway, adjacent to Gaol Street.

Summary: Proposed bollards, opposite the uncontrolled crossing point at Gaol Street, leading to pedestrian conflicts.

Proposed bollards are detailed to be installed within the southern footway on High street, adjacent to Gaol Street, in line with the proposed uncontrolled crossing. The bollards are installed such that they may reduce the available width of the footway area and heighten the risk of a pedestrian striking the bollards as they pass or being forced into the path of other pedestrians leading to conflicts and collisions occurring resulting in injuries. Additionally, during darkness hours or periods of inclement
weather, the proposed bollards may not be conspicuous, heightening the risk of pedestrians striking them as they pass.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the proposed bollards are removed. If they are to remain, reflective bands should be installed on the proposed bollards.

3.3.4 Road Markings

3.3.4.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various
Location: Various
Summary: Lack of carriageway markings at junctions leading to potential overshoot collisions.

Give way junction markings have not been detailed at any of the side road junctions within the scheme extents. There is a risk that if give way markings are not installed, vehicles may overshoot into the High Street and potentially collide with oncoming vehicles or cyclists leading to injury.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that give way carriageway markings are detailed at all side road junctions throughout the scheme extents.
Option B

3.4 Non-Motorised User Provision

3.4.1 Pedestrians/Cyclists

3.4.1.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Side roads and vehicular access’s throughout the scheme extents.

Summary: Lack of uncontrolled tactile crossing points leading to pedestrians entering the carriageway, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision.

Uncontrolled tactile crossing points have been detailed at a number of crossing points throughout the High Street. However, a number of crossing points have not been detailed with tactile paving, for example Market Street. If tactile paving is omitted at uncontrolled crossing points, pedestrians may not stop at the crossing point and enter the carriageway, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision. This issue will be exacerbated for visually impaired users who may not be aware that they have come to a crossing point.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that all uncontrolled crossing points are furnished with tactile paving.

3.4.1.2 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Throughout the scheme extents.

Summary: Lack of tactile crossing points leading to pedestrians entering the carriageway, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision.

A signalised tactile crossing point has been provided at the High Street junction with New Street and an uncontrolled crossing point provided on High Street, east of Market Place, to enable pedestrians to cross High Street in a north to south direction and vice versa. However, no other tactile crossing points have been provided throughout the High Street. If no tactile crossing points are provided, pedestrians may cross in unsafe locations, potentially into the path of oncoming vehicles, leading to a collision.
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that tactile crossing points are provided throughout the High Street and that tactile paving is provided either side of the proposed crossing point, east of Market Place.

3.4.1.3 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0001

Location: New Street, western footway.

Summary: Lack of footway width leading to pedestrians potentially walking within the carriageway and conflicts and collisions occurring with oncoming vehicles.

The approximate width of the western footway on New Street appears to be below 1.0m. There is a risk that due to the narrow footway, pedestrians may not have adequate space to pass efficiently potentially leading to them entering the adjacent carriageway. If pedestrians walk within the carriageway, the risk of conflicts and collisions occurring with vehicular traffic will be increased.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the western footway is widened to a minimum width of 1.6m.

3.4.1.4 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0003

Location: Church Street, uncontrolled crossing point.

Summary: Excessive width of uncontrolled crossing point, heightening the risk of pedestrians colliding with vehicular traffic, leading to injury.

As part of the proposals, an uncontrolled crossing point is to be constructed across the junction mouth of Church Street. The width of this crossing point appears to be excessive, heightening the risk of pedestrians colliding with vehicular traffic as they attempt to cross the junction, leading to injuries occurring.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that a pedestrian refuge island is constructed as part of the uncontrolled crossing to enable pedestrians to cross in two phases.
3.4.1.5 Problem

Drawing No(s): 60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0008

Location: Catmos Street, existing uncontrolled crossing point.

Summary: Unclear what is to happen to the existing crossing point, leading to pedestrians crossing at unsafe locations and potentially colliding with vehicular traffic, resulting in injury.

It is unclear from the preliminary design drawings as to what is to happen to the existing uncontrolled crossing point across Catmos Street. If the existing crossing point is removed, there is a heightened risk that pedestrians may cross the carriageway at unsafe locations, potentially into the path of an oncoming vehicle, leading to a collision, resulting in injury.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that an uncontrolled tactile crossing is installed across Catmos Street, utilising the existing pedestrian refuge to enable pedestrians to cross in 2 phases.

3.5 Road Signs, Carriageway Markings & Lighting

3.5.1 Lighting

3.5.1.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Various

Summary: Lighting provision may lead to dark patches within the footways and carriageway, heightening the risk of collisions occurring during darkness hours.

It was noted during the site inspection that there are a low number of existing lighting columns throughout the High Street. No information has been detailed as to what is to happen to these lighting columns once the scheme has been implemented. There is a risk that if the lighting provision is insufficient for the High Street, dark patches may form on the footways and carriageway heightening the risk of collisions during darkness hours.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that additional lighting columns are incorporated into the design to ensure that the High Street is efficiently lit during darkness hours.
3.5.2 Road Markings

3.5.2.1 Problem

Drawing No(s): Various

Location: Various

Summary: Lack of carriageway markings at junctions leading to potential overshoot collisions.

Give way junction markings have not been detailed at any of the side road junctions within the scheme extents. There is a risk that if give way markings are not installed, vehicles may overshoot into the High Street and potentially collide with oncoming vehicles or cyclists leading to injury.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that give way carriageway markings are detailed at all side road junctions throughout the scheme extents.
4.0 Audit Team Statement

We certify that this Audit has been carried out in accordance with Road Safety Audit Standard (HD 19/15).

AUDIT TEAM LEADER

Jamie Stone  BEng (Hons) EngTech MCIHT MSoRSA

AECOM
Royal Court
Basil Close
Chesterfield
Derbyshire
S41 7SL
United Kingdom

Signed:  
Date: 30th June 2017

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER

Pete Denton  BSc (Hons) DipASM MCIHT MSoRSA

AECOM
Royal Court
Basil Close
Chesterfield
Derbyshire
S41 7SL
United Kingdom

Signed:  
Date: 30th June 2017

AUDIT TEAM OBSERVERS

There were no Audit Team Observers present during the site visit.

OTHERS INVOLVED

There were no other persons involved in this audit than previously stated above.
## Appendix A – Documents Submitted to the Audit Team

The following documents were submitted as part of the Road Safety Audit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTC-ACM-XX-XX-SK-CE-00101</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Phase 1 Location Plan</td>
<td>28/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Public Realm Improvements – Option 2 – One-way System / Echelon Parking</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-A-LH-0008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Public Realm Improvements – Option 3 – Shared Surface</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document No.</td>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP-B-LH-0008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Preliminary Design Option B</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP02-CD-0001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Typical Construction Details (Sheet 1 Of 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP02-CD-0002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Typical Construction Details (Sheet 2 Of 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60494381-SHT-20-OP02-CD-0003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oakham Town Centre Typical Construction Details (Sheet 3 Of 3)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Location of Problems Drawing(s)
VARIOUS:
PROBLEM 3.1.1.1,
PROBLEM 3.1.2.1,
PROBLEM 3.2.1.1,
PROBLEM 3.2.1.4,
PROBLEM 3.3.2.1,
PROBLEM 3.3.4.1,
PROBLEM 3.4.1.1,
PROBLEM 3.4.1.2,
PROBLEM 3.5.1.1 and
PROBLEM 3.5.1.2

PROBLEM 3.2.1.2
PROBLEM 3.2.1.5
PROBLEM 3.3.3.2
PROBLEM 3.4.1.3
PROBLEM 3.4.1.4
PROBLEM 3.4.1.5
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