

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 Date Audit Completed: 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
3.1.1	Y	Y	Statutory Signage in the form of RUS009, RUS058 and Speed Limit signs are included in the current design. Please refer to drawings 1201-TSRM-001 through 1201-TSRM-004.	
3.1.2	Y	Y	Cyclist yield road markings, M115C, are provided at locations where the designated cycle track terminates or transitions into a shared space. In addition, a different surface colour and texture is provided within chared areas. Please refer to drawings 1201-TSRM-001 through 1201-TSRM-004.	
3.1.3	Y	Y	A level difference of between 50mm and 90mm has been provided between all adjacent cycle tracks and footpaths, with the exception of the section of cycle track south of Bull Road where a low stub wall separates cyclists and pedestrians.	
3.1.4	Y	Y	All new walls were designed for accidental collision loading in accordance with IS EN 1991 Eurocode 1: Actions on Structures – Part 2: Traffic Loads on Bridges as amended by the relevant Irish National Annexes (NA.2.30-2.31 Sub clause 4.7.3.3 (1) and NA.2.32 Sub clause 4.7.3.3 (2) for determining global and local effect respectively). Upgrading of existing coastal walls was considered at design stage and deemed not to be necessary: 1. given the relatively low design speed / posted speed limit (50km/hr), the distance of the wall from road edge, the presence of full height kerbs and straight road alignment (i.e. low risk location)	

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 **Date Audit Completed:** 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
			and; 2. the traffic calming measures (i.e. reduction in road width) under the scheme will act to further reduce actual road speeds along the length of the scheme.	
3.1.5	Y	N	<p>The height of the seawall has been dictated by DCC to provide an adequate level of protection from coastal flooding while minimising the visual impact of the sea defence and not restricting the visual amenity value of the location.</p> <p>ROD where commissioned by DCC to undertake a review of the sea wall upstand requirements. The report reviewed similar situations at other locations around Dublin Bay and provided the following recommendations which should be implemented:</p> <p>a) Minimum desirable height of the parapet edge wall should be 0.5m high;</p> <p>b) A stainless steel railing should be provided at a minimum level of 0.3m above the top of the wall where the minimum desirable of height of 0.5m is not achieved;</p> <p>c) A flat coping is appropriate as a change from the original proposal for a rounded coping.</p> <p>It is intended that the above recommendations will be implemented along the scheme and address the risk of pedestrians falling or tripping over the wall. Please refer to the aforementioned report for further details.</p> <p>In relation to the inclusion of a flat coping, the original scheme design</p>	

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 **Date Audit Completed:** 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
			<p>provided for a rounded coping. Representations from the local community have sought to change the coping to a flat coping that would enable pedestrian to sit comfortably on the wall to rest or to enjoy the amenity. The above mentioned report reviewed other locations around Dublin Bay and found that a flat coping was the most common arrangement. It is acknowledged there may be an attraction for people, especially children to walk on top of the sea wall. This is quite normal and will occur regardless of the coping shape. Parental supervision will always be required in such a location, and if people choose to walk on top of the wall the hazard is sufficiently obvious that they do so at their own risk</p>	
3.1.6	Y	N	<p>With regard to the lighting column identified in the upper picture in the RSA report. The foundation of this PL column clashed with the existing wall foundation which is in a poor state of repair and not within the scope of works to replace. The location of the column, and offset from the wall, is comparable to the existing PL column in the vicinity which is being replaced.</p> <p>With regard to the PL column in the lower picture. The lighting columns in question are located adjacent to the an existing cantilevered footpath which has been retained. It was not within the scope of the works to replace this length of cantilever footpath. A structural assessment of the cantilever determined that cantilever would not be capable of adequately taking the additional loading of the lighting columns. The position of the columns provide a minimum of 1.2m clearance between the column and the</p>	

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 **Date Audit Completed:** 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
			face of the wall to allow wheelchair users or buggies to pass while maintaining 0.5m clearance from the cycle track to reduce the hazard of cyclist handle bars impacting the columns. Where possible, lighting columns have been positioned to the back of the footpaths.	
3.2.1	Y	N	<p>Residential properties on Doyle's Lane are located immediately adjacent to Dollymount Avenue. It is envisaged that cyclists from Doyle's Lane will utilise the facilities provided at Dollymount Avenue to access footpaths and cycle tracks.</p> <p>The Oaks is located 88m from signalised toucan crossing provided at the junction with Mount Prospect Avenue. The final designed outbound lane from the Oaks to the Mount Prospect Avenue junction tapers from 3.4m to 3.0m. It is envisaged that cyclists which are not confident and children will utilise the existing footpath to access the Toucan crossing. It is envisaged that confident cyclists will join traffic on the carriageway to access the Toucan crossing. It is deemed that the proposed layout is sufficient for the likely demand from the Oaks.</p>	
3.2.2	N	N	<p>The proposed design provides for build outs at unsignalised side roads adjacent to parking bays. The provision of build outs allows motorist to edge out to improve visibility without entering the carriageway traffic lanes. This provides improved visibility to that which was provided in the existing layout. In addition, The UK Manual for Streets, section 7.8.5, states the following:</p> <p>"7.8.5 Parking in visibility splays in built-</p>	

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 **Date Audit Completed:** 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
			up areas is quite common, yet it does not appear to create significant problems in practice. Ideally, defined parking bays should be provided outside the visibility splay. However, in some circumstances, where speeds are low, some encroachment may be acceptable."	
3.2.3	Y	Y	The footpath between Ch.0+350 and Ch.0+550 drains to surface water channels which outfall to pedestrian gullies at low points. Refer to Drawing 501-SWD-001 through 501-SWD-005.	
3.2.4	Y	N	A retractable flood barrier is to be constructed at the crown of the proposed ramp on Bull Road. For the flood barrier to operate effectively the road and footpath are required to be at grade. If an upstand was provided it would result in a gap in the upstand to facilitate the flood barrier. This would create a trip hazard. The footpath is straight and well defined by a kerb to the south and wall to the north. The length of footpath that does not have a kerb is approximately 3m. The risk of a visually impaired pedestrian deviating from the line of the footpath over this short distance is unlikely. The risk of that occurring is less than the risk of a pedestrian tripping over gap in the upstand. In addition, the ramp will have a coloured surfacing and a different texture which will indicate a different environment to visually impaired pedestrians.	
3.2.5			The current design does not include a build out at Ch.1+650. The kerb line transition as recommended.	

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Sutton to Sandycove Cycleway- Dollymount Improvement Works

Route No.: R807

Audit Stage: 2 **Date Audit Completed:** 15th January 2017

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
3.2.6	Y	Y	The current design has provision for a pedestrian crossing at Ch.1+650. A gap has been provide in the low wall adjacent to Ch.1+650 to provided direct pedestrian access to St. Anne's Park.	
3.2.7	Y	Y	ROD, in consultation with the client, will review road markings on approach to Causeway Road signalised junction.	
3.2.8	Y	Y	ROD to revise lane direction road markings on Causeways Road west bound to provide right turn only on northern Lane and Left turn and straight ahead on southern lane.	
3.2.9	N	N	Alterations to the signalised junction at Causeway Road are not within the scope of works for the current scheme.	
3.2.10	N	N	The proposed cycle track road crossing at Causeway Road is a cyclists only crossing at which a dropped crossing is provided. It is not intended to cater for pedestrians. Ladder tactiles are provided on the footpath on approach to the shared area where cyclist will cross the footpath. In addition, there is a change in colour and texture of the surfaces which will highlight a different environment to visually impaired pedestrians. Refer to drawing 1101-KFP-001 through 1101-KFP-005.	
3.2.11	Y	Y	Sufficient forward visibility on approach to the flood ramp on Causeway Road is provided.	

Signed:  **Designer** **Date** 22/02/17

Signed: _____ **Audit Team Leader** **Date** _____

Signed: _____ **Employer** **Date** _____