

**Expanded Schedule August 2017**

	<b>PBA’s Road Safety Audit Stage 1:Problems Location Map, May 2017</b>	<b>RSA, first seen by the Wincheap Society August 2017</b>	<b>Wincheap Society’s Queries.</b>
	<b>PBA’s Problems A-K</b>	<b>PBA’s recommendation and KCC’s Design Team’s responses</b>	<b>Queries re the RSA August 2017</b>
A.	<p>Hard shoulder on proposed slip road. Summary: Risk of rear shunt collisions due to lorries parking on the hard shoulder restricting forward visibility.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> The hatched markings within the hard shoulder on the slip road should be extended to the north west along the slip road back to a point adjacent to the back edge of the nosing. In addition, another lay-by should be provided at a suitable location elsewhere to reduce the risk of lorries parking on the extended nearside hatched markings.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted to extend hatching through the hard shoulder ...there is not a suitable location for a new layby in the vicinity of the slip road to meet current standards ....</p>	<p>What do KCC and CCC propose to do to prevent/discourage lorries displaced from the existing lay-by from parking in the Wincheap area, including the retail and industrial parks and Homersham. Some lorries already park in Homersham for long periods, including overnight.</p>
B	<p>Left turn from the A28 into Ten Perch Road. Summary: Risk of an errant vehicle leaving the road and overturning down the steep embankment, with possible collisions with slip road traffic. An errant vehicle leaving the A28 at the left turn onto Ten Perch Road could lose control and overturn down the embankment, encroaching onto the slip road and risking collisions with slip road traffic.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Adjacent to the left turn from the A28 road restraint barrier should be installed from the wing wall to the end of the slip road bend.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted ....</p>	<p>Just how sturdy will such a barrier need to be?</p> <p>Are extra long or articulated HGVs more or less likely to be classified as “errant vehicles”?</p> <p>Why has this issue not been raised before?: Such vehicles can be observed daily having trouble negotiating this turning, particularly those that approach it from the north-bound A2 off-slip.</p>

C	<p>Along the slip road Summary: Non-passively safe street furniture increasing the risk of higher severity injuries to errant motorists</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION The detailed design should include a passively safe terminal to the road restraint barrier. The speed limit/bend warning sign poles should be passively safe, or the offside pole located behind the working width of the road restraint barrier. The lamp columns should be passively safe or located further away from the edge of the carriageway.</p> <p>RESPONSE Recommendation accepted ....</p>	<p>How many poles and light columns will this add to the scores already in place for the A2/A28/Ten Perch Road junctions?</p>
D	<p>Left hand bend at the end of the slip road straight. Summary: Risk of loss of control collisions due to the tight radius of the bend.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION The design of the bend should be modified so that it resembles a loop road by extending the chevron signage further around the bend to so that approaching drivers can appreciate the full extent of the bend and its relatively tight radius. In addition, with drivers seeing the full extent of the bend from chainage 290m the high friction surface should be extended back along the slip road to this point so that drivers can decelerate in greater safety before entering the bend</p> <p>RESPONSE Recommendation accepted ...</p>	<p><i>See our comments on the 45-degree left turn INTO the north-bound A2 off-slip from the A28 proposed for access to Thanington Park, at <a href="http://wincheapcampaigns.wordpress.com">wincheapcampaigns.wordpress.com</a>.</i></p> <p><i>(At least vehicles coming from the Ten Perch Road off-slip won't plunge on to the A2 below - if that's any consolation.)</i></p>
E	<p>Left hand bend at the end of the slip road straight. Summary: Risk of loss of control collisions due to the tight radius of the bend.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATION The high friction surface on the bend should be extended to chainage 413m</p> <p>RESPONSE Recommendation accepted ...</p>	<p><i>See comment at D, above.</i></p>

F	<p>Left hand bend at the end of the slip road straight. Summary: Articulated vehicles overrunning the nearside hatched markings, pulling detritus onto the carriageway and increasing the risk of powered two-wheeler loss of control collisions.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> The width of the carriageway around the slip road bend should be increased, on the inside of the bend, to allow a margin for error for the drivers of articulated and other large goods vehicles.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted, the carriageway width through the bend has will be widened to provide additional space for articulated and large goods vehicles.</p>	<p>The map is not accurate, North-bound Ten Perch Road is two-laned at this point. Why will not the slip road form a third lane at this point, thereby not forcing a merging of traffic?.</p> <p><b>WHERE ARE THE CYCLE LANES ON TEN PERCH ROAD?</b></p>
G	<p>Roundabout at the northern end of Ten Perch Road. Summary: Increased risk of trips to pedestrians and loss of control collisions to powered two-wheelers due to large goods vehicles overrunning the kerbs at the northern and north-eastern exits of the roundabout.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> The width of the carriageway at the exits to the northern and north-eastern arms of the roundabout should be increased, to allow a margin for error for the drivers of articulated and other large goods vehicles.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted, the kerb lines at the northern and north-eastern arms of the roundabout will be realigned.</p>	<p>Why is no mention made of facilities for, and dangers to, cyclists and pedestrians accessing the path leading to National Cycle Route 18? Access to this path is already hazardous enough: off-A2 traffic heavy traffic will render it useless.</p>

H	<p>Slip road chainage 0 to 225m.</p> <p>Summary: Increased risk of high severity cycle/vehicle collisions due to the presence of the slip road.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Ideally cyclists should be discouraged from using this high speed dual carriageway, but as this is an all-purpose trunk road, the detailed design should include a cycle bypass to the slip road, cyclists leaving the mainline, travelling along the nearside of the slip road until they reach the back end of the nosing, then crossing the slip road at right angles to re-join the mainline. Appropriate signage on the mainline should be provided advising cyclists of the presence of this facility....</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted, cycle bypass facility will be provided at the off slip as part of the detailed design for the scheme.</p>	<p>This is not at all clear. How will signage deal with cyclists who wish to take the off-slip? Will their situation vis-a-vis vehicles be any less dangerous than that of cyclists taking the dog-leg route to remain on the A2?</p> <p>Since when, and where, have cyclists been “discouraged” from using A roads, whether single- or dual-carriageways? Is this government policy?</p> <p>Again: WHERE ARE THE CYCLE LANES ON TEN PERCH ROAD?</p>
---	---	--	--

I	<p>West side of Ten Perch Road. Summary: Risk of pedestrian/vehicle collisions as pedestrians attempt to cross the end of the slip road bend as it merges with Ten Perch Road.</p> <p>The existing footway from the northern side of the A28 into, and along, the west side of Ten Perch Road is to be removed due to the introduction of the slip road from the A2 (photo 3). Pedestrians from the A28, wishing to remain on the west side of Ten Perch, may still be tempted to walk along the current pedestrian desire line, the proposed grass verge on the west side of Ten Perch Road and cross the slip road exit, risking high severity collisions with passing traffic.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Measures should be introduced to stop pedestrians walking along the west side of Ten Perch Road from the A28.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted. Pedestrian guard railing will be provided at the end of the footway from the A28 into Ten Perch Road, and within the splitter island to limit access for pedestrians to the western side of Ten Perch Road.</p>	<p>Does this mean that, for example, people leaving the Park &amp; Ride who wish to walk to the Wincheap retail park must negotiate round the north and east sides of the roundabout?</p> <p>Where then?</p> <p>Along The Boundary to the 90-degree turn to the east of Morrisons petrol station?</p> <p>Up the east side of Ten Perch Road to the current pedestrian entrance?</p> <p>Has anyone actually taken into account pedestrians' needs? Or cyclists'?</p>
J	<p>North-eastern arm of the relocated Ten Perch Road roundabout. Summary: Increased risk of pedestrian trips due to the relocated roundabout having pedestrian facilities removed.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> The design should incorporate pedestrian facilities between the northern and southern arms of the roundabout.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted, pedestrian facilities will be provided on the eastern side of the roundabout to allow pedestrian movements between the northern and southern arms.</p>	<p>See comment at G above.</p>

K	<p>Central reservation of Ten Perch Road. Summary: Pedestrians crossing Ten Perch Road along the whole length of the central reserve at risk of collisions with passing traffic.</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b> Measures to stop pedestrians crossing Ten Perch Road should be installed along the whole length of the central reserve of Ten Perch Road to inhibit this desire line.</p> <p><b>RESPONSE</b> Recommendation accepted, guard railing will be provided along the whole length of the central reserve to prevent pedestrians crossing.</p>	<p>See queries at I above <i>mutatis mutandis</i>.</p>
---	--	--	--