

Stage 3 Road Safety Audit Risk Assessment

19th July 2018

Project Manager	Clement Agyei-Frempong	Project Title and Reference	Quietway 7 – Dulwich Village Junction (60493383-C0443)
Assessor	Clement Agyei-Frempong	Decision Maker	Richard Wells

Guidance

The proposed non-adoption of a RSA report recommendation must be approved by the Business Unit Manager, for this to be fully considered a risk assessment is required using the table and matrix below.

Using collision data (Collision Levels in Greater London 2011-13, latest as of Aug 2015) the probability and severity of a collision can be considered. If there are other similar control sites that can be used it is acceptable to use this more meaningful data from that control site.

“As an example the annual occurrence of a pedestrian casualty on a zebra crossing is 0.16. Therefor a pedestrian casualty can be expected on average every 75 months, which give us a probability of likely scoring 3. One in seven collisions involves Fatal or Serious injury and it is reasonable to expect this to be greater for pedestrians, the severity is most likely to be 2. Thus give this recommendation a low rating.

Notwithstanding this adjustment will need to be made whilst carrying out the assessment taking into account site conditions on site such as vehicle and pedestrian flows, speed of vehicles and other site conditions such as visibility, class of road etc.

Therefor as our recommendation is concerned about high approach speeds and elderly pedestrians we increase the severity to 3, now giving us a score of 9.”

There are three classification of risk, Low, Medium and High, risks in the Low classification are generally acceptable but may require, monitoring or small scale interventions. Medium Classification will almost certainly need further review and measures to mitigate to reduce the risk to Low. High risks are not acceptable and will require measures to ensure this risk is reduced to a tolerable level.

Link to Collision Levels in Greater London 2011-13 <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/road-safety>

RSA Ref	Hazard Description	Probability (P)	Severity (S)	Risk Classification (R)	Response/Control Measure	P	S	R	Details
3.1.1	A raised delineator strip has been installed at the edge of two staggered pedestrian islands within the scheme extents, designed to act as a tapping rail for visually impaired pedestrians. Recent similarly designed islands have led to a number of pedestrians failing to appreciate this layout and tripping when traversing the staggered island incorrectly. Therefore there may be an increased risk for personal injury for pedestrians that trip when negotiating the islands. This is of particular concern in areas of high pedestrian footfall, when pedestrian volumes may mask the raised strip.	3	2	6	<p>Using 125mm upstand standard kerbs would not mitigate the trip hazard raised by the auditors. In addition, there is not sufficient width to install pedestrian guardrail and leave a reasonable capacity on the island for pedestrians, especially taking into account the high footfall in the area during school peak times. However, it is not an unusual layout, and it is expected that pedestrians would be familiar with this type of arrangement.</p> <p>No changes to the kerbs used on the two staggered islands at the junction are proposed.</p> <p>Potential measures to further highlight the presence of these kerbs could be to paint them or to install information signs to warn pedestrians.</p>	3	2	6	The use of the bespoke kerbs is in accordance with the Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) and was based on recommendation of the LB Southwark Design Quality Manager.

3.1.2	Two reverse staggered islands were installed at the Dulwich Village junction guiding pedestrians to walk away from approaching traffic. The lack of pedestrian guardrail on the islands could potentially encourage pedestrians to cross away from the defined crossing points increasing the potential for conflict among pedestrians and vehicles.	3	3	9	<p>Pedestrians crossing Calton Avenue (southbound) will be deterred from crossing at any point other than the controlled crossing due to the presence of the grass verge and the timber bollards with chain arrangement at the opposite side.</p> <p>Pedestrians crossing Turney Road (northbound) will be encouraged to use the controlled crossing due to the presence of the pedestrian guardrail on the south western footway.</p> <p>Taking into account the two aforementioned observations, it is considered unlikely that pedestrians will attempt to cross away from the designated crossing areas on the traffic islands.</p> <p>So no changes to the layout are proposed.</p>	3	3	9	As per the LB Southwark policy for street furniture de-cluttering and Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM) the use of guardrail is not recommended.
-------	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

3.2.2	<p>Following the footway buildout and the installation of a new traffic island on the western side of the junction (i.e. Dulwich Village junction with Turney Road), the new kerb alignment may force northbound drivers to deviate around the kerb. This may lead to an increased risk of conflicts with adjacent vehicles as well as creating a pinch point between the kerb and guardrail for cyclists.</p>	3	2	6	<p>The new kerblines and traffic island provide a clear alignment for vehicles on the northbound on Dulwich Village which narrows down gradually allowing for a smooth merge for motorists and cyclists. Following resurfacing two additional cycle logo markings were installed at the merge point to further draw motorists' attention to cyclists in the area.</p> <p>No further changes to the layout are proposed.</p>	3	2	6	N/A
-------	--	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	-----

Probability (P)	Severity (S)					Risk Classification (R)
	Minor harm (Minor damage or loss no injury)	Moderate harm (Slight injury or illness, moderate damage or loss)	Serious harm (Serious injury or illness, substantial damage or loss)	Major harm (Fatal injury, major damage or loss)	Catastrophic harm (Multiple fatalities, catastrophic loss or damage)	
Extremely unlikely (Highly improbable, never known to occur)	1	2	3	4	5	Low (1–9) Ensure assumed control measures are maintained and reviewed as necessary
Unlikely (Less than 1 per 10 years)	2	4	6	8	10	Medium (10–19) Additional control measures needed to reduce risk rating to a level which is equivalent to a test of 'reasonably required' for the population concerned
Likely (Once every 5–10 years)	3	6	9	12	15	
Extremely Likely (Once every 1–4 years)	4	8	12	16	20	High (20–25) Activity not permitted. Hazard to be avoided or risk to be reduced to tolerable
Almost Certain (Once a year)	5	10	15	20	25	