

Bennett Street Manchester

Road Safety Audit Stage 1/2 Report



Contents

- 1.0 Project details
- 2.0 Introduction
- 3.0 Items raised at previous road safety audits
- 4.0 Items raised at this stage 1/2 road safety audit
- 5.0 Audit team statement
- 6.0 List of documents presented for road safety audit
- 7.0 Problem location plan

1.0 Project details

Report title:	Bennett Street – Manchester Road Safety Audit Stage 1/2 Report
Date:	2 nd August 2023
Document reference and revision:	BSMS38S278/KH/1-2/0
Prepared by:	Network Road Safety Limited
On behalf of:	Kellen Homes

2.0 Introduction

Site location:

Bennett Street, Manchester

Scheme purpose:

The proposed works are the highway elements to a scheme to develop land adjacent to Bennett Street, Manchester. The proposals comprise a priority junction on Bennett Street and internal road network for a residential housing development.

The RSA was instructed by Lucy Crawford, Kellen Homes.

The RSA team membership consisted:

D Ramsden DipASM CertAI FIHIE FARRM
Network Road Safety Limited
HE Certificate of Competency

Neil Jones DipTEDM MSoRSA FCIHT
Network Road Safety Ltd
HE Certificate of Competency

The site was visited on 31st July 2023, during which the weather was dry. The road surface was dry. Traffic conditions were considered light and free flowing.

The terms of reference of this report are as described within GG119. The road safety audit team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria.

No departures from standard have been brought to the attention of the road safety audit team regarding the scheme as presented.

3.0 Items raised at previous road safety audits

No previous road safety audits have been carried out on the scheme as presented.

4.0 Items raised at this stage 1/2 road safety audit

PROBLEM – 1

Location: Road 2 / Road 6 junction

Summary: Lack of waiting restrictions could encourage obstructive parking

Waiting restrictions are proposed on the eastern side of the junction between Road 2 and Road 6. However, waiting restrictions aren't proposed for the western side of the junction. Providing restrictions on one side of the junction could increase the likelihood of vehicles, parking on the unrestricted side of the junction. This could restrict visibility for vehicles emerging from the junction and pedestrians crossing the junction increasing the risk of collisions.

RECOMMENDATION

Waiting restrictions should be provided on the eastern side of the junction on both Road 2 and Road 6 with similar extents to those proposed for the eastern side of the junction.

PROBLEM – 2

Location: Various junctions within the development

Summary: Lack of pedestrian crossing points

Most of the priority junctions within the development incorporate raised tables. None of the junctions appear to incorporate pedestrian crossing points. There is a risk that pedestrians, particularly those with pushchairs or wheelchairs could have difficulty negotiating kerbs that aren't flush which increases exposure to passing traffic and likelihood of collisions.

RECOMMENDATION

Pedestrian crossing points should be provided at all junctions including dropped kerbs and appropriate tactile paving.

PROBLEM – 3

Location: Various

Summary: Flush kerb could be a hazard to visually impaired pedestrians

The kerbing drawing identifies sections of kerb as: 125 x 150 Bullnose kerb 25mm face, it also identifies the same sections of kerb as pedestrian and vehicle crossings with 0-6mm



125 X 150 BN KERB
25mm FACE
0-6mm FACE AT PEDESTRIAN AND
VEHICLE CROSSING

face. There is a risk that by combining both pedestrian and vehicle crossings as the same identifier vehicle crossings could be installed with a 0-6mm kerb upstand but without tactile paving to warn visually impaired pedestrians increasing the risk of them unknowing stepping into the carriageway into the path of passing vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION

There should be clarity on the design drawing to indicate that vehicle crossover kerb should be installed with a 25mm kerb face and separately identify pedestrian crossing points with a 0-6mm kerb face.

PROBLEM – 4

Location: Bennett Street / Emergency Access

Summary: Dropped kerb could be a hazard to visually impaired pedestrians

There is a footway that runs parallel to the emergency access. The development footway links with the footway on Bennett Street at a point where the kerb, on Bennett Street is dropped. There is a risk that visually impaired pedestrians walking along the development footway could unknowingly step out into the carriageway on Bennett Street due to the low kerb height, increasing the likelihood of collisions with passing traffic.

RECOMMENDATION

The kerb on Bennett St directly opposite the end of the footway should be raised. As the access is for emergency use only there could be benefit in installing a battered kerb rather than a dropped kerb across the access.

5.0 Audit team statement

We certify that this road safety audit has been carried out in accordance with GG 119	
Road Safety Audit Team Leader	
Name:	David Ramsden
Signed:	
Position:	Director
Organisation:	Network Road Safety Limited
Date:	1 st August 2023
Road Safety Audit Team Member(s)	
Name:	Neil Jones
Signed:	
Position:	Consultant Road Safety Engineer
Organisation:	Network Road Safety Limited
Date:	2 nd August 2023

6.0 List of documents presented for road safety audit

22122/100/1	F	Road & Main Drainage Layout 1
22122/100/2	F	Road & Main Drainage Layout 2
22122/100/3	F	Longitudinal Sections 1
22122/100/4	E	Longitudinal Sections 2
22122/100/5	E	Longitudinal Sections 3
2122/100/6	C	Longitudinal Sections 4
22122/100/7	A	Longitudinal Sections 5
22122/101/1	E	Road Levels & Contours
22122/112/1	C	S38 Agreement Plan
22122/113/1	-	Typical Highway Details
22122/113/2	-	Raised Table Detail
22122/116/1	-	Kerbing Plan DRG 1
22122/116/2	-	Surfacing Plan DRG 2
A-506	-	HS2 Access Plan
3683	V1	Highways Note
3683		Transport Assessment

7.0 Problem location plan (problem no.3 not shown)

