### 1.Project Details

Report Title:	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Response Report – Coventry City Council, London
	Road North
Date of Report:	16/07/2024
Document Ref &	LONDON ROAD CYCLEWAY NORTH
Revision:	STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT
Prepared by:	Joel Logue & Martin Wilkinson
On behalf of:	Coventry City Council

#### **Authorisation Sheet**

Project:	Coventry South Cycleway – London Road North
Report Title:	LONDON ROAD CYCLEWAY NORTH
-	STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT
	DESIGNER RESPONSE
Prepared by:	
Name:	Scott Mills
Position:	Designer
Signed:	The
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	August 2024

Approved by:	
Name:	Hakan Bikim
Position:	Project Manager
Signed:	Alexander of the second of the
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	03/10/2025

## 2. Introduction and Summary of Scheme

The scheme proposes to install cycle facilities along the eastern side of London Road between Abbey Road and the ASDA Roundabout. The proposed cycle facilities consist of two-way segregated cycleways and shared use paths. A new signalised crossings is also to be provided along the route.

# 3. Key Personnel

Overseeing Organisations:	CCC
RSA Team:	CCC (Independent Team)
Design organisation:	CCC
Developer:	N/A

# **GG119 Road Safety Audit Decision Log**

- Columns 1 & 2 to be extracted directly from RSA Report
- Column 3 to be filled out by Design Organisation

- Column 4 to then be filled out by CCC
- Design Org/CCC to then agree action.

RSA PROBLEM	RSA Recommendation	Design Organisation Response (Choose one of for each response)  1) accept the RSA problem and recommendation made by the RSA team; 2) accept the RSA problem raised, but suggest an alternative solution, giving appropriate reasoning; or 3) disagree with the RSA problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both.	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed RSA Action
Problem 2.1 – Build-out at pedestrian crossing  A build-out is proposed immediately before the pedestrian crossing. This may encourage pedestrians and cyclists to drift out into the carriageway and / or wait in the carriageway where they cannot see the pedestrian / cycle signals. This increases the risk of vehicle to pedestrian / cycle type collisions.	Amend the proposed layout to ensure that the kerb of the build-out and the dropped kerb are aligned.	Accepted, the kerb alignment has been amended. It will require repositioning of the existing signals.	Update the scheme proposals to reflect the change.	No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome issues raised and accepted
Problem 2.2 – Lack of cycle connectivity and safe cycle access to and egress from cycleway  There is a lack of safe cycle access to and egress from the short section of cycleway on the western side of London Road, between Tonbridge Road and vehicular access to shopping parade. Furthermore, there are no cycle facilities to the south of the	Amend the proposed highway layout to provide clear, safe cycle access to and egress from the cycleway on the western side of London Road	Accepted, we have consulted with the ATE team and discussed better arrangements and provided a turning point on Tonbridge Road. On the southern section, we have maintained the corduroy arrangement to demark a shared space. This is the extent of the scheme scope.	Update the layout as required to resolve the problem raised.	No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome

shopping parade access. This is likely to result in confusion and increases the risk of conflict and	RSA Recommendation	Design Organisation Response (Choose one of for each response)  1) accept the RSA problem and recommendation made by the RSA team; 2) accept the RSA problem raised, but suggest an alternative solution, giving appropriate reasoning; or 3) disagree with the RSA problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both.	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed RSA Action
collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians on Tonbridge Road and the shopping parade access.				and accepted
Problem 2.3 – Give way markings at uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point  Give way markings are proposed at the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point on Tonbridge Road. This is not a standard layout for an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing and, as a result, may confuse road users. This increases the risk of vehicle to pedestrian / cyclist type collisions.	Amend the proposed highway layout to minimise the risk of confusion to road users. If cyclists are expected to join, leave and / or cross the carriageway at this location, clear, safe and continuous designated cycle facilities should be provided to facilitate such movements.	Accepted, this has been amended following discussions with the ATE manager at CCC	Update the scheme as necessary to reflect solution.	No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome issues raised and accepted
Problem 2.4 – Incorrect tactile paving colour and configuration  The colour and configuration of the tactile paving at the zebra crossings is incorrect. This may result in visually-impaired pedestrians failing to locate the crossing or failing to identify that it is a controlled crossing. As a result, they may attempt to cross at unsafe locations. This increases the risk of vulnerable footway user personal injury.	The correct tactile paving colour (red) and configuration (L-shape) for a controlled crossing should be provided.	Disagree, there has been an internal project team discussion on this, and they are aware of the issues associated with red tactiles and zebras, i.e. users failing to give way to each other. Therefore, the decision has been made to incorporate buff uncontrolled crossings and remove the zebra crossing.	Buff tactiles and uncontrolled crossings have been incorporated, as internal team meeting discussions.	No action required, however at the time of the detailed design being completed a review of the most current position being taken by the Council on

RSA PROBLEM	RSA Recommendation	Design Organisation Response  (Choose one of for each response)  1) accept the RSA problem and recommendation made by the RSA team;  2) accept the RSA problem raised, but suggest an alternative solution, giving appropriate reasoning; or  3) disagree with the RSA problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both.	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed RSA Action
Problem 2.5 – Tree obscuring forward visibility of cycleway kerb protruding into carriageway  Drivers' forward visibility of the protruding kerb of the cycleway may be obstructed by the tree. This increases the risk of loss of control and head-on collisions between vehicles and cyclists.	Drivers' forward visibility of the protruding kerb of the cycleway may be obstructed by the tree. This increases the risk of loss of control and head-on collisions between vehicles and cyclists.	Accepted, a new kerbline and reflective bollards have been provided.	Update scheme to reflect this solution.	these crossings needs to be considered, should they change during the design process. No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome issues raised and accepted
Problem 2.6 – Tactile paving layout  There is no gap between the western edge of the tactile paving and the adjacent cycleway. As a result, visually-impaired pedestrians may not be able to detect the direction of the crossing point. This increases the risk of trips, falls and cycle to pedestrian type collisions.	The proposed highway layout should be amended to ensure that there is a gap between the western edge of the tactile paving and the adjacent cycleway.	Accepted, the layout has been amended.	Update layout to reflect solution proposed.	No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome issues raised

RSA PROBLEM	RSA Recommendation	Design Organisation Response (Choose one of for each response)  1) accept the RSA problem and recommendation made by the RSA team; 2) accept the RSA problem raised, but suggest an alternative solution, giving appropriate reasoning; or 3) disagree with the RSA problem and recommendation raised, giving appropriate reasoning for rejecting both.	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed RSA Action
Problem 2.7 – Acute angle of junction  The acute angle of the junction and the proximity of the adjacent zebra crossing increases the risk that cyclists turning left may lose control and / or collide with other cyclists and pedestrians.	The proposed highway layout should be amended so that the junction is perpendicular and incorporates a radius on both corners of the minor arm. The zebra crossing should be located further from the junction.	Accepted, the layout has been amended, zebra removed.	Update the layout to reflect solution proposed.	accepted  No action required, detailed design can be reviewed at Stage 2 RSA to overcome issues raised and accepted
Problem 2.8 – Inadequate illumination of footways and cycleway  Tree foliage and the location of lighting columns on the central reservation at the northern end of the proposed scheme may result in inadequate illumination of the existing footways and proposed cycleway. This increases the risk to personal safety.	A full street lighting assessment should be undertaken and the results actioned to ensure that the footways and cycleways are adequately illuminated.	Accepted, Street lighting design being undertaken. Tree foliage will be trimmed as necessary.	Street lighting design to be undertaken and design taken forwarded.	No Action required on the street lighting design, however designers should note the requirement to trim vegetation.

=	response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety a
	with the Overseeing Organisation.
Name:	Scott Mills
Signed:	The
Position:	
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	25/09/25
	anisation Coventry City Council, I certify that:
1) the RSA actions identified in re have been discussed and agreed	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and
1) the RSA actions identified in re have been discussed and agreed	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and
1) the RSA actions identified in rehave been discussed and agreed 2) the agreed RSA actions will be	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and
1) the RSA actions identified in rehave been discussed and agreed 2) the agreed RSA actions will be Name:	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and progressed.
1) the RSA actions identified in rehave been discussed and agreed 2) the agreed RSA actions will be Name: Signed:	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and progressed.    Ian Lewis
1) the RSA actions identified in re	esponse to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit with the design organisation; and progressed.    Ian Lewis   Augustian   Augustian