Nicholson Sloan Consultancy

Pell Frischmann

Residential Development, Hinchley Road, Blackley
Site Access Junctions and Internal Highway Works



Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

Report No. NS25/1112/RSA1

October 2025

Nicholson Sloan Consultancy

REPORT CONTROL	
Document	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
Project	Residential Development, Hinchley Road, Blackley Site Access Junctions and Internal Highway Works
Client	Pell Frischmann
Report Number	NS25/1112/RSA1
Primary Author	Kevin Nicholson [redacted]
Reviewer	Nancy Sloan

REVISION HISTORY			
Issue	**Date**	**Status**	**Checked for Issue**
1	02/10/25	Issued to the Client	[redacted]

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS 3

3. ITEMS RAISED BY THIS STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT 4

4. AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT 6

5. DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED 7

6. LOCATION PLAN OF ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT 8

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out on the site access junctions and internal highway works associated with a residential development of 106 dwelling units on land to the northwest of Hinchley Road, Blackley, Manchester.

1.2. The Road Safety Audit was requested by Andrew Hall of Pell Frischmann and was carried out during September and October 2025. The Audit Team membership was as follows: -

Kevin Nicholson Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited (Audit Team Leader);

Nancy Sloan Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited (Audit Team Member).

1.3. The Audit Team visited the site together on the afternoon of Tuesday 30 September, during which the weather was overcast, and the road surfaces were dry. Traffic was steady and free-flowing, and a number of pedestrians and cyclists were observed as the visit coincided with the finishing time at the Co-op Academy.

1.4. An investigation of the Crashmap database has revealed that no collisions occurred in the vicinity of the proposals in the 5-year period ending December 2023 (the latest available data).

1.5. The terms of reference for this audit are as described in GG 119 (Revision 2) in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The Team has reported only on the road safety implications of the proposals and has not examined or verified the compliance of the design to any other criteria. However, and without being prescriptive, the Audit Team might refer to a design standard or technical guidance where this would help to clarify a safety problem or recommendation. In addition, there may be alternative methods of addressing a problem that would be equally acceptable in achieving the elimination or mitigation of a problem, and these should be considered in the light of the recommendations in this report.

1.6. The detail provided for the audit is shown in Section 5. All comments and recommendations are referenced to the design drawings and related documents and the locations of the items raised by the audit are shown on the plan in Section 6.

1.7. Where relevant within this report, traffic signs will be described either by their reference numbers on the drawings or by their diagram number within the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 (TSRGD).

1.8. Within this report the generic term "pedestrians" can include walking pedestrians, wheelchair users, mobility scooter users, dismounted cyclists, the blind, partially sighted and mobility impaired. Reference may be made to specific groups where appropriate.

1.9. Some items in Section 3 might refer to issues that would usually be evaluated as part of a Stage 2 (detailed design) Road Safety Audit. However, notwithstanding that this is a Stage 1 Audit, those issues are raised in order that they can be given due consideration as the detailed design progresses.

2. ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS

2.1 The Audit Team has not been advised of any previous Road Safety Audits carried out on the proposals.

3. ITEMS RAISED BY THIS STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

3.1. PROBLEM

Location: The junctions of the site access roads with Hinchley Road.

Summary: The absence of appropriate visibility at the junctions could increase the risk of a number of collision types.

At this stage, visibility splays are not specified on the drawings for the junction. Although visibility should be achievable given the road alignments, it should nevertheless be specified on the drawings in order to ensure that no permanent barriers to visibility are located within the splays during construction and that mutual visibility can be achieved between motorists turning out of the development access road and those on Hinchley Road.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that appropriate visibility splays are specified for the junctions.

3.2. PROBLEM

Location: The junctions of the site access roads with Hinchley Road, and the internal junctions.

Summary: The absence of priority road markings could increase the risk of collisions.

There are no road markings shown to indicate priority at the junctions. This could increase the risk of overshoot or restart type collisions. The Audit Team have noted that at other similar junctions within developments in the area, give way or edge of carriageway markings are present.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that transverse and warning markings to Diagrams 1003A and 1004 are specified for the site access junctions, and that give way or edge of carriageway markings are specified for the internal junctions.

3.3. PROBLEM

Location: Throughout the development.

Summary: Providing adequate visibility on the internal roads could reduce the risk of collisions.

There are a trees and landscaping shown along the roads throughout the development. At junctions and bends these could potentially restrict side and forward visibility.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that, taking into account the landscaping proposals, adequate forward visibility is provided at all junctions and bends throughout the development.

3.4. PROBLEM

Location: Throughout the development.

Summary: The absence of dropped kerbs and tactile paving could present a hazard for physically and visually impaired pedestrians.

Pedestrians will require to cross the roads at various points, for example at side roads or to access properties. Practically, in the absence of fully dropped kerbs, physically impaired pedestrians and wheelchair users are likely to attempt to cross the carriageway via the lowest available kerbs, usually at the driveways, which are typically 25mm in height. An upstand of this size can be difficult for physically impaired pedestrians and wheelchair users to negotiate in the upwards direction and could result in trips or overturns. In addition, and particularly if tactile paving is not provided (should the LHA have a policy in this regard), visually impaired pedestrians could be confused as to where to cross or may not be able to align themselves correctly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that fully dropped kerbs (within tolerances) are provided at appropriate points and desire lines throughout the development. If this recommendation is accepted, and the dropped sections of kerbs are opposite each other, it is also recommended that tactile paving is provided (taking into account that the LHA may have a policy to provide tactile paving only in areas of heavy pedestrian use).

4. AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

We certify that this Road Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with GG 119.

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT TEAM LEADER

Kevin Nicholson BSc, CMaths, MCIHT, FSoRSA,
HE Certificate of Competency
Director, Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited
Cherry Tree Cottage
Hayton, Brampton, Cumbria, CA8 9HT

Signe [redacted]
Date: 02/10/25

ROAD SAFETY AUDIT TEAM MEMBER

Nancy Sloan MCIHT, MSoRSA
Director, Nicholson Sloan Consultancy Limited
Cherry Tree Cottage
Hayton, Brampton, Cumbria, CA8 9HT

Signed: [redacted]
Date: 02/10/25

5. DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

DRAWING OR DOCUMENT NUMBER	PROJECT AND TITLE	DATE
HR-SL-01 REVISION C	HINCHLEY ROAD,CHARLESTOWN SITE LAYOUT PLAN	21.02.25

6. LOCATION PLAN OF ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT

