



1. Project Details

Report Title:	Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Response Report – Coventry City Council, London Road South
Date of Report:	13/03/2025
Document Ref & Revision:	LONDON ROAD CYCLEWAY SOUTH 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 South
Report Title:	LONDON ROAD CYCLEWAY SOUTH STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT DESIGNER RESPONSE
Prepared by:	
Name:	Scott Mills
Position:	Designer
Signed:	
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	April 2024

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

2. Introduction and Summary of Scheme

The scheme proposes to install cycle facilities along the western side of London Road between Abbey Road and the Tollbar Roundabout. The proposed cycle facilities consist of two-way segregated cycleways and shared use paths. With new signalised crossings also 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 – Lack of vertical segregation between cycle track and footway The cycle track and footway appear to be segregated by a white line marking. This type of separation increases the risk of pedestrian / cyclist conflicts and collisions and is a particular risk to visually impaired pedestrians.	The footway and cycle track should be segregated by means of a level difference and splay kerb.	Accepted, will be addressed where level constraints allow.	Vertical segregation will be provided where it is feasible to do so.	Agreed, no further action required.
Problem 2.2 – Lack of level difference between cycle track and buffer There is a lack of level difference between the cycle track and the buffer. As a result, there is a risk of errant cyclists cycling off the kerb into the path of oncoming traffic	A level difference and splay kerb should be introduced between cycle track and the buffer where possible. However, LTN 1/20 does permit flush buffers.	Accepted, will be addressed where level constraints allow.	This will be provided where it is feasible.	Agreed, no further action required.
Problem 2.3 – Risk of collisions Standard dropped kerbs are proposed at the vehicular access, the edge kerbs of the access extend into the cycle track and the cycle track	Dutch entrance kerbs should be provided to reduce the speed of turning vehicles.	Accepted, however gate setback to be agreed with site owners. Centre line markings will be continued.	This will be included but gate set back will need to be agreed with site owners. Discussions to	Agreed and discussions on gate relocation should be documented

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
markings do not continue across the access. As a result, vehicles may turn into the access at excessive speed. Furthermore, the proposed markings provide insufficient indication that cycles have priority and there is insufficient space for vehicles to wait at the gate without obstructing the footway and cycle track. These issues increase the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	The cycle track centreline markings should continue across the access and cycle symbols installed on the access to further highlight the cycle track. The gates should be set back from the cycle track and footway to prevent waiting vehicles obstructing the footway and cycle track.		commence with the landowner on the gate set back.	as evidence if required at a later date.
Problem 2.4 – Lack of bus stop clearway markings The lack of bus stop clearway marking reduces the conspicuity of the bus stop. The reduction in the number of running lanes from two to one southbound increases the risk of collisions involving vehicles overtaking a stationary bus.	Bus stop clearway markings should be provided to increase drivers' awareness of the bus stop.	Accepted, markings to be provided.	Update the scheme as necessary.	Agreed, no further action required.
Problem 2.5 – Inadequate width of toucan crossings The width of the toucan crossings is insufficient to accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians. This increases the risk of cyclist to pedestrian type collisions.	The width of the crossings should be increased to 4m in line with current guidance.	Accepted, to be increased to 4m.	Update the scheme as necessary.	Agreed, no further action required.


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 2.6 – Narrow, substandard cycle track The existing cycle track between the toucan crossing and Chace Avenue is narrow and substandard. This increases the risk of cyclist to cyclist and cyclist to pedestrian type collisions.	The cycle track should be redesigned in line with current guidance	Partially accepted however land ownership may not allow this. Will be considered as part of design progression.	This will be looked at during the stage 2 design and solution incorporated if feasible.	Agreed review at detailed design stage.
Problem 2.7 – Risk of collisions The proposed highway layout increases the risk of conflicts and collisions between cyclists and pedestrian boarding or alighting from a bus.	The highway layout at the bus stop should be redesigned in line with current guidance to minimise conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians	Partially accepted, road geometry to be reviewed as part of design progression.	We will review, however there are physical restraints here.	Agreed review at detailed design stage.
Problem 2.8 – Lack of safe, legible and coherent cycle facilities The proposed junction layout (in particular, the marked two-way cycle route across the northern arm of the junction, the shared use area and the advanced stop line on the southern arm of the junction) do not provide safe, legible and coherent facilities for cyclists travelling to and from St James' Lane. It increases the risk of confusion, conflict and collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	The proposed highway layout should be redesigned to provide safe, legible and coherent cycle facilities connecting the cycle track with St James' Lane	Partially accepted, will be considered as part of design progression.	Most likely solution is that this will be provided as a toucan, but further segregation will be reviewed, however, geometry may not ultimately permit this.	Agreed review at detailed design stage.

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
<p>Problem 2.9 – Lack of cycle connectivity</p> <p>There is lack of connectivity between the cycle track and Kenelm Court. As a result, cyclists are likely to use the pedestrian crossing point. This increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The crossing point should be widened to accommodate an uncontrolled cycle crossing.</p> <p>The central refuge should be widened and lengthened to enable cyclists to wait whilst crossing.</p> <p>The break in the cycle track should be removed and a pedestrian crossing point with tactile paving provided across the cycle track.</p>	<p>Partially accepted, will be considered as part of design progression. Site constraints may not permit increase from 2m to 2.5m.</p>	<p>Update drawings to reflect widest refuge possible</p>	<p>Agreed review at detailed design stage.</p>
<p>Problem 2.10 Lack of footway on desire line</p> <p>There is a lack of surfaced footway on a clear desire line at the southern end of Kenelm Court. As a result, pedestrians may slip and fall in inclement weather, and this increases the risk of personal injury.</p>	<p>A footway link should be provided on the desire line and a pedestrian crossing point provided across Kenelm Court</p>	<p>Accepted, 2m footway will be provided. This is an existing scenario but will try and incorporate this solution.</p>	<p>Scheme will be updated to reflect a footway on the desire line.</p>	<p>Agreed, not further action required</p>
<p>Problem 2.11 – Excessive length of vehicular accesses</p> <p>The proposed length of the vehicular accesses may enable vehicles to turn in at excessive speeds. This increases the risk of vehicle to cyclist type collisions.</p>	<p>The length of the vehicular accesses should be reduced to the minimum required to facilitate access to the commercial premises to supplement the proposed</p>	<p>Partially accepted, will be considered as part of design progression. Issues with access to adjacent business may provide constraints.</p>	<p>Review as part of the stage 2 design and see if solution can be incorporated.</p>	<p>Agreed review at detailed design stage.</p>

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
	Dutch entrance kerbs and reduce the speed of turning vehicles. Cycle symbols should be applied on the vehicular accesses.			
Problem 2.12 – Lack of cycle facilities It is proposed to widen the existing footway between the toucan crossing and Pilot Close. However, no designated cycle facilities are proposed. As result, cyclists are likely to use the footway to access the retail park, commercial premises and the residential area to the north. This increases the risk of conflicts and collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.	Designated cycle facilities should be provided on the northeastern side of London Road from Kenelm Court across Robert Close and along Pilot Close.	Partially accepted however land ownership may not allow this. Will be considered as part of design progression but ultimately may be out of our control.	Looks like this is feasible and will likely be incorporated into the scheme, subject to land boundary review.	Agreed review at detailed design stage.
Problem 2.13 – Removal of splitter island The removal of the splitter island may encourage drivers wishing to travel south on London Road to exit the car park directly into the roundabout. This increases the risk of vehicle-to-vehicle type collisions.	A splitter island should be provided to prevent drivers from turning right out of the customer car park.	Accepted, shared approach to be amended. Issues with access to adjacent business may provide constraints also.	This will be reviewed and incorporated into the scheme.	Agreed, no further action required.
Problem 2.14 – Lack of pedestrian and cycle crossing facility There is a lack of a pedestrian and cycle crossing facility at the access. Visually-impaired pedestrians may be unaware that they are entering the carriageway. It also increases the risk of vehicle to cyclist and cyclist to pedestrian type collisions.	An uncontrolled crossing point wide enough to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists should be provided with tactile paving in line with current guidance	Accepted, design to be amended in detail design.	Update scheme to resolve this issue.	Agreed, no further action required.

4. Design and Overseeing Organisation Statements

On behalf of the Design Organisation, I certify that:	
1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.	
Name:	Scott Mills
Signed:	
Position:	Lead Designer
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	25/09/25

On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation Coventry City Council, I certify that:	
1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in this road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the design organisation; and	
2) the agreed RSA actions will be progressed.	
Name:	Ian Lewis
Signed:	
Position:	Transport and Development Design Manager
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	03/10/2025