



1. Project Details

Report Title:	Humber Road Cycleway Stage 1 Road Safety Audit & Humber Road Cycleway Stage 2 Road Safety Audit
Date of Report:	RSA 1 – 28/03/2025, RSA 2 – 20/08/2025
Document Ref & Revision:	N/A
Prepared by:	Joel Logue & Martin Wilkinson
On behalf of:	Coventry City Council

Authorisation Sheet

Project:	Humber Road Cycleway
Report Title:	Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit Response Report – Coventry City Council, Humber Road Cycleway
Prepared by:	
Name:	Scott Mills
Position:	Designer
Signed:	
Organisation:	Coventry City Council (on behalf of)
Date:	08/10/2025

Approved by:	
Name:	Jon Hendry
Position:	Project Manager
Signed:	
Organisation:	Coventry City Council (acting on behalf of)
Date:	08/10/2025

2. Introduction and Summary of Scheme

The scheme involves a new, LTN 1/20 compliant cycleway along Humber Road between the ASDA roundabout and Binley Roundabout. The scheme will predominantly include a segregated cycleway adjacent to a footway. It will utilise a length of existing cycleway along Humber Road and also includes shorter sections of shared footway. New toucan crossings will be installed, and existing signals and lighting will be upgraded along the route. Side road junctions adjoining Humber Road will include raised and coloured surfaces which will help to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists. There is a proposal to reduce the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph between Sunbeam Way and ASDA roundabout, which is subject to the approval of a Traffic Regulation Order.

3. Key Personnel

Overseeing Organisations:	CCC
RSA Team:	Coventry City Council (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
<p>Problem 2.1 Location: Extents of scheme</p> <p>No level difference is proposed between the cycle track and the buffer or kerb. As a result, there is a risk of errant cyclists cycling off the kerb into the path of oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>A level difference and splay kerb should be introduced between cycle track and the buffer.</p>	<p>3) Disagree</p> <p>The risk of errant cyclists cycling off the kerb and into the path of oncoming traffic is mitigated by the flush 500mm wide buffer, which this is in accordance with the LTN 1.20 Figure 6.3. This detail has been installed recently along London Road North.</p> <p>It is the design intent to provide a 75mm level difference between the footway and cycleway (cycleway lower) over most of the proposed new length of cycleway, subject to where the cycleway needs to be a shared surface and where the depth to utility covers permit.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 2.2 Locations: Humber Road, south of southern junction with Wheler Road and at southern arm of roundabout junction with Terry Road and Sunbeam Way</p>	<p>The width of the crossings should be increased to 4m in line with current guidance.</p>	<p>1) Accept</p> <p>Yes, this has been accepted and incorporated into the RSA 2 scheme and accepted by the auditors. Existing crossings on Terry Road and Sunbeam Way are 4m, so this will be corrected.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
The width of the toucan crossings is insufficient to safely accommodate both cyclists and pedestrians. This increases the risk of conflict and collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.				
<p>Problem 2.3 Location: Wheler Road, northern and southern junctions with Humber Road</p> <p>There is a lack of safe, legible and coherent access for cyclists to and from the proposed widened footway between Wheler Road and the proposed toucan crossings on Humber Road. As a result, cyclists are likely to use the uncontrolled pedestrian crossings. This increases the risk of confusion, conflict and collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The proposed highway layout should be redesigned to provide safe, legible and coherent cycle access to and from Wheler Road. A buffer of 0.5m should be provided between the proposed shared-use footway / cycleway and the carriageway.</p>	<p>1) Accept Both points are accepted. Improved cycle access will be provided to the main cycleway route toucan crossings. It is the design intent to encourage (by lack of good provision for cyclists) to the main cycleway/footway route on the western side of Humber Road. 0.5m buffer will be considered.</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and no further action required.
<p>Problem 2.4 Location: Humber Road, Sunbeam Way and Terry Road</p> <p>The width of the existing cycle track is insufficient to safely accommodate two-way cycling. This</p>	The cycle track should be widened in line with current guidance.	<p>3) Disagree This has been reviewed comprehensively, and we will not undertake the recommendation for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LTN 1/20 does allow a minimum of 2m as a desirable minimum for cycleways less than 	As per designer's response. Constraints such as land boundaries, existing road widths and	Agreed and 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
increases the risk of cyclists colliding or losing control and entering the carriageway into the path of oncoming traffic.		300 cpd. The existing cycleway has been measured along the route and it is near or at 2m in width over most of the existing length. Local widening will be taken place where practical. Given how busy the road is we have chosen not to reduce road width along the existing cycleway length because of the impracticality of this, and the volume of traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accident data does not appear to suggest there are issues here with the width. Accident data does not indicate injuries to cyclists along the route. 	existence of trees will largely dictate the width of the cycleway.	
<p>Problem 2.5 Location: Humber Road and Terry Road.</p> <p>It is proposed to provide a buffer by means of an edge of carriageway marking only. Vehicles may overrun the edge of carriageway marking. This increases the risk of them striking passing cyclists.</p>	Both edges of the buffer should be formed by raised kerbs.	<p>3) Disagree</p> <p>The buffer design is compliant with fig 6.3 of LTN 1/20.</p> <p>This has been reviewed comprehensively and we will not undertake the recommendation for the following reasons:</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cycleway is raised above the existing road level and is protected by a kerb height of 125mm. The edge marking would reinforce this. • The existing cycleway has been in place for a long period of time. Accident data from the last 3 years does not suggest that the cycleway is inherently dangerous in its current format. • An edging line is a visible deterrent and moves the vehicle closer to the road centre, decreasing the already small risk of cars hitting kerbs. • Other alternatives have been considered such as ribbed lines, coloured surfacing or Armadillo/badger markers, but have been discounted for various reasons of maintenance, non-compliance with Chapter 5 Road Markings – Traffic Signs manual. Therefore, the pragmatic approach is to provide it because we believe it improves the existing scenario and reduces further any risk of collisions. 		
Problem 2.6	A buffer should be provided with a level	2) Partially accept	A buffer will be provided but	Agreed and no further

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>Location: Humber Road, Sunbeam Way and Terry Road</p> <p>The submitted drawings show the proposed buffer line to be in abeyance. The lack of a buffer between the cycle track and the carriageway increases the risk of vehicles striking passing cyclists and of errant cyclists entering the carriageway, particularly on bends.</p>	<p>difference to both the cycle track and the carriageway.</p>	<p>The designer has considered the use of buffers as described in 2.5. A buffer line can be incorporated on the carriageway to attempt to increase the safe distance between cyclists and vehicles.</p>	<p>without a level difference except that between the carriageway and footway.</p>	<p>action required.</p>
<p>Problem 2.7 Location: Terry Road, north of Dragoon Road</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the guard rail located in the cycle track. This reduces the usable width of the cycle track and increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and with pedestrians.</p>	<p>The guard rail in the cycle track should be removed.</p>	<p>1) Accept The guard rail on all the existing toucan crossings adjacent the cycleway are being removed to increase cycle track space. However, there is physical evidence that the PGR south of Terry Road roundabout has been hit by a vehicle previously. Therefore, it has been decided to keep this section in as there is perceived to be a greater risk to pedestrians.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 2.8 Location: Terry Road, footway links to Shropshire Drive and Jersey Close</p>	<p>The proposed highway layout should be redesigned to facilitate safe cycle access between</p>	<p>3) Disagree The proposal is not to change the footways from Shropshire Drive or Jersey Close, but to provide suitable corduroy paving at the junctions so cyclists</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
There is a lack of cycle access from the cycle track to Shropshire Drive and Jersey Close. Therefore, cyclists may use the footway links. There is a risk that they may lose their balance when traversing the raised segregation kerb and/or collide with pedestrians on the footway links.	the cycle track and Shropshire Drive and Jersey Close.	and pedestrians are aware of the footway, in accordance with the current guidance issued by the Department of Transport. The corduroy surface conveys the message 'hazard, proceed with caution'. Its purpose is to warn vision impaired people and other people of the presence of specific hazards, including steps, level crossings, the approaches to on-street tram and other Light Rapid Transit (LRT) platforms, and the transition from footways to areas shared with other users. There is no significant raised kerb here, it is only 20mm or so. It is not intended to change this as it is almost flush and traversable by cyclists. Vegetation will be trimmed back to improve visibility at the junction of the footways and cycle track. We feel this is an appropriate response to this problem.		
Problem 2.9 Location: Humber Road	The proposed bus boarder should be a minimum of 2.5m wide,	3) Agree The kerb line has been adjusted to provide a 2.5m wide bus boarding platform.	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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
The width of the proposed bus boarder may not be sufficient to enable wheelchair users to board or alight safely using a ramp. As a result, they may stray into the cycle track, increasing the risk of collisions with cyclists.	in line with current guidance.			
<p>Problem 2.10 Location: Humber Road - Anglian Way to Humber A</p> <p>There is a lack of segregated cycle facilities proposed on the above section of Humber Road, including across the junction with Bolingbroke Road and across Anglian Way. This increases the risk of conflicts and collisions between cyclists and pedestrians, in particular outside the shops and public house, and between cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles on Anglian Way.</p>	Segregated cycle facilities should be provided, including a designated cycle crossing at the junction with Bolingbroke Road.	<p>3) Disagree</p> <p>Segregation is good but this section of cycleway is shared, so the designer believes the solution provided is a good compromise. The crossings are 4m wide. The designer did look at segregated crossing and a diagonal cycle crossing, but given the constraints of the junction it wasn't an ideal solution because of lack of width on existing footways etc adjacent the shop frontages.</p>	Whilst we have aimed to achieve segregated cycle route that is not possible on this section without significant impact upon other important factors such as traffic movement, capacity at critical junctions, local centre loading and parking, and pedestrian space. Preference is to have shared use	Agreed and 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
			section of route rather than jeopardise the full scheme by aiming for full segregation, and shared use path will improve on the current situation for cyclists as this section has no existing cycle route	
<p>Problem 3.1 Location: Start of cycleway at southern end of Humber Road.</p> <p>There is no tactile paving at the start of the segregated cycleway. Visually impaired pedestrians may inadvertently continue along the cycleway. This increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Tactile paving should be installed in line with current guidance. The material used for the tactile paving should provide sufficient skid resistance to minimise the risk of cyclists losing control on the tactile paving in wet weather.</p>	<p>1) Accept Tactile paving will be provided in the form of Tac-grid.</p>	<p>As per designer's response, add appropriate tac-grid/tactile paving.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
Problem 3.2 Location: Extents of scheme	The submitted drawings appear to show the omission of double yellow lines at uncontrolled pedestrian crossings. As a result, vehicles may park across the crossings. This increases the risk of vehicle to pedestrian type collisions.	1) Accept Double yellow lines should continue across uncontrolled pedestrian crossings.	As per designer's response, adjust double yellow lines as necessary.	Agreed and no further action required.
Problem 3.3 Wheler Road, southern junction with Humber Road. The proposed highway layout does not facilitate the safe transition for cyclists from the shared-use footway/cycleway to the carriageway on Wheler Road. As a result, cyclists are likely to use the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing. This increases the risk of confusion, conflict and collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	The proposed highway layout should be redesigned to facilitate the safe transition for cyclists from the shared-use footway/cycleway to the carriageway.	1) Accept We are reviewing as part of the final construction pack.	As per designer's response	Agreed and no further action required.
Problem 3.4	The proposed highway layout should be	1) Accept	As per designer's response	Agreed and no further

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>Location: Wheler Road, northern junction with Humber Road.</p> <p>The proposed highway layout does not provide a protected transition for cyclists from the shared-use footway/cycleway to the carriageway on Wheler Road</p>	<p>redesigned to facilitate the safe transition for cyclists between the shared-use surface footway/cycleway and the carriageway.</p>	<p>This will be reviewed but we are trying to encourage use of the proposed cycleway by making other routes less desirable.</p>		<p>action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.5 Location: Humber Road, junction with Abbey Park</p> <p>Cycle provision ceases at the junction where conflicts and hazards are greatest, and cyclists and pedestrians have to share a narrow uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point. This significantly increases the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A raised table should be provided to reduce the speed of vehicles turning into the junction and approaching it on the minor arm; • The pedestrian and cycle crossing should be widened; • Safe cycle priority should be provided across the junction and on the approaches. 	<p>2) Partially accept We agree with the comment, but consultations with Methodist Homes Association have indicated that they are unwilling to accept a raised table of sorts or any alterations to the junction, because it impacts on their land boundary and they believe any table will impact on ambulances.</p>	<p>As per designer's response. MHA will not agree to any amendments of the junction.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>Problem 3.6 Location: Extent of scheme</p> <p>The submitted drawings should specify corduroy tactile paving in horizontal and vertical formation. Corduroy tactile paving (with narrow rounded bars in horizontal formation) indicates a hazard such as steps. Use of corduroy paving on the footway side of a segregated footway/cycleway may confuse visually impaired pedestrians, and as a result they may stray onto the cycle track, increasing the risk of collisions with cyclists. Use of corduroy paving in vertical formation on a cycle track can catch narrow cycle tyres, increasing the risk of a cyclist losing control.</p>	<p>The correct type of tactile paving (with wide, flat-topped bars) should be used in tramline/ladder formation to indicate a segregated footway/cycleway.</p>	<p>1) Accepted We accept the issue but indicate this is just a drafting issue and how they are shown, but the drawings clearly indicate that the tactile paving is in accordance with the latest tactile paving guidance.</p>	<p>As per designer's response.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.7 Location: Humber Road, access to Whitley Depot.</p> <p>The junction layout features a wide junction mouth, wide radii and two exit lanes. This facilitates increased vehicle speeds at the junction and significantly increases the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The speed of turning vehicles and the distance pedestrians and cyclists cross should be reduced, for example by reducing the number of exit lanes, reducing the width of the junction mouth and</p>	<p>1) Accept The recommendations on reducing radii and width of the junction have been considered and incorporated. The number of lanes has been reduced to an in-and-out lane only. However, given the use of salt vehicles etc from the depot means that a raised table may not be appropriate. This has been accepted in principle by the design team.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
	junction radii to the minimum required to facilitate turning movements, and providing a raised crossing.			
<p>Problem 3.8 Location: Humber Road, access to allotments 1 & 2.</p> <p>An extended standard vehicular dropped kerb is proposed at the access. This facilitates increased vehicle speeds at the junction, and the ramp extends into the cycle track, creating an uneven surface for cyclists. Furthermore, there is insufficient space for vehicles to wait at the gates without obstructing the footway and cycle track. Vegetation either side of the accesses may obstruct intervisibility. These issues increase the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dutch entrance kerbs should be provided to reduce the speed of turning vehicles, and a continuous at grade cycle track and footway should be provided across the access; • The gates should be set back from the cycle track and footway to prevent waiting vehicles obstructing the footway and cycleway; 	<p>1) Accept We will incorporate Dutch style kerbs, move gates back (this has been agreed in principle with the Allotments Association).</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation should be cut back on either side of the gates and regularly maintained. 			
<p>Problem 3.9 Location: Humber Road, north of Wheler Road (northern junction)</p> <p>The submitted drawing indicates that proposed trief kerbs on the railway bridge are in abeyance. The existing bridge parapet may not be sufficient to prevent an errant vehicle accessing the railway tracks. This significantly increases the risk of train to vehicle type collisions.</p>	<p>A comprehensive assessment should be undertaken of the adequacy of the existing bridge parapet to prevent an errant vehicle accessing the railway tracks, and the results acted upon.</p>	<p>1) Accept The proposal for the trief kerb was following consultation with Network Rail and their request to prevent vehicles weighing more than 3T be prevented from the verge. NWR have done a bridge assessment and containment report and made these recommendations.</p>	<p>Actions taken are in full agreement of NWR.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.10 Location: Humber Road – southwestern side of junction with Terry Road and Sunbeam Way.</p> <p>There is a lack of segregated cycle facilities proposed on the southwestern side of the above junction, and it is not proposed to convert the puffin crossing on the western arm of Humber Road to a toucan crossing. This increases the risk of</p>	<p>Segregated cycle facilities should be provided on the southwestern side of the junction, and the puffin crossing on the western arm of Humber Road should be converted to a toucan crossing.</p>	<p>3) Disagree We've checked with the signal designer's, and they confirm toucan crossings to this arm. However, we are proposing to keep to the widened shared-use cycleway currently proposed. We do not believe that the number of cyclists warrant a fully segregated network here as we have been requested to remove the existing one along the 4th arm. We have currently kept this in place.</p>	<p>Design is considered sufficient.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
conflicts and collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.				
<p>Problem 3.11 Location: Terry Road, north of junction with Sunbeam Way.</p> <p>The proposed highway layout creates a pinch point on the cycle track. This increases the risk of cyclists colliding or losing control and entering the carriageway into the path of oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>The carriageway markings should be amended (for example, by reducing the number of zig-zags on the exit from the toucan crossing_ and the buffer lines reconfigured to maximise the width of the cycle track.</p>	<p>1) Accept Yes, adjustments to the zig-zags and buffer lines can be adjusted.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.12 Location: Humber Road, footway link to Jersey Close.</p> <p>The tramline/ladder tactile paving to the south of the footway link is incorrectly configured. The tramline paving is on footway side and the ladder paving is on the cycle track side. As a result, visually impaired pedestrians may inadvertently enter the cycle track. This increases the risk of cyclists colliding pedestrians.</p>	<p>The configuration of the tactile paving should be corrected.</p>	<p>1) Accept This is a drafting error and will be corrected.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>Problem 3.13 Location: Dragoon Road and Anglian Way.</p> <p>The proposed width of the junction mouth may enable vehicles to turn left into the minor road at excessive speeds. Furthermore, the cycle track markings do not continue across the junction. These issues increase the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The width of the junction mouth should be reduced to the minimum required to facilitate turning movements into and out of the minor road to reduce the speed of turning vehicles; • Cycle track markings should continue across the junction and cycle symbols installed on the junction to highlight the cycle track; • On Anglian Way, to maximise the impact of the red surfacing, it should be confined to where the cyclists and pedestrians cross. 	<p>2)Accept but alternative solution. Design to be amended to reflect CCC's typical detail for a side road treatment. The opinion being that the set back of the cycleway is not enough if the lines are carried through the junction, therefore decision is to retain the junction as shared.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>Problem 3.14 Location: Dragoon Road, Anglian Way, Humber Avenue, Hollis Road, Hugh Road.</p> <p>A setback Give Way is proposed on the minor roads listed. The visibility splay at the proposed Give Way may be obstructed by vegetation and fences either side of the highway. This increases the risk of vehicle to cyclist and vehicle to pedestrian type collisions.</p>	<p>The design should ensure that the visibility splay is kept free of obstructions.</p>	<p>2) Partially accept We believe the situation can be improved. Vegetation will be trimmed back as necessary, but the layout will remain as it reflects CCC's details at side roads.</p>	<p>As per designer's response, add additional road markings to improve safety. Ensure good visibility.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.15 Location: Terry Road, junction with Dragoon Road.</p> <p>There is a lack of horizontal clearance between the proposed bollards either side of Dragoon Road and the cycle track. This reduces the usable width of the cycle track and increases the risk of cyclists catching the posts or moving onto the path of oncoming vehicles.</p>	<p>The bollards should be relocated to the rear of the footway.</p>	<p>1) Accept. Relocate to rear of footway and replace with post signs due to lack of space.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.16 Location: Terry Road, bus stop south of junction with Anglian Way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed zebra crossing should be retained to give pedestrians priority; 	<p>1) Accept Zebra crossing to be removed and replaced with an uncontrolled crossing, as agreed during a team review. Tactile colour to be corrected. Level</p>	<p>As designer's response.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>The submitted drawing indicates that the provision of a zebra crossing at the bus stop island is to be confirmed. As cycle speeds may be high at this location, and pedestrians may be concentrating on boarding and alighting from the bus, omission of the zebra crossing increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The correct tactile paving (L-shaped) for a controlled crossing layout should be provided; • There should be a level difference between cycle track and the adjacent footway and bus stop island, except at the zebra crossing and the link to Shropshire Drive, to reduce the risk of bus passengers straying onto the cycle track; • Transition kerbs (shown in green) should be outside the extents of the zebra crossing and cycle link. 	<p>difference has been provided between cycleway and footway, but can be incorporated between cycleway and bus stop. This will mean lowering footway and possible provision of additional gullies. Transition kerbs will be corrected.</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
<p>Problem 3.17 Location: Hollis Road</p> <p>The proposed continuous shared-use footway/cycleway across Hollis Road is located adjacent to an off-street car park for a supermarket. Vehicles may over-run the footway/cycleway when entering and leaving the car park. This increases the risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Bollards should be installed along the edge of the car park to prevent vehicles over-running the continuous shared-use footway/cycleway.</p>	<p>1) Accept. Bollards to be provided as recommended.</p>	<p>As designer's response.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.18 Location: Eastern side of Humber Road between Bolingbroke Road and Gosford Park.</p> <p>A shared use footway/cycleway is proposed on the eastern side of Humber Road between Bolingbroke Road and Gosford Park. The precise extents of the shared use facility are not clear due to incomplete signage. This lack of segregated cycle facilities and the incomplete signage increases the risk of conflicts and collisions between cyclists and pedestrians, in particular outside shops and cafes, and on the corners of Bolingbroke Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Segregated cycle facilities should be provided, including a designated cycle crossing at the junction with Bolingbroke Road. All cycle facilities should be clearly signed, particularly where the facility is shared with pedestrians. 	<p>2) Partially accept The purpose of the design is to allow pedestrians and cyclists to mingle here due to it being a shop front destination. Segregation would hinder and confuse cyclists and pedestrians wishing to go to different destinations. There is also insufficient space for full segregation, but we would prefer to utilise this as an informal space in front of shops. We have more signage than the existing scenario so are trying to warn footway users. Some minor corrections to the signage may be needed.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>Problem 3.19 Location: Humber Road, south of Hugh Road</p> <p>The proposed narrow section of shared use footway/cycleway south of Hugh Road is located between a parking bay and a garage forecourt. Vehicle movements are likely to be frequent and unpredictable; parking may obstruct the footway/cycleway and drivers may over-run the continuous shared use footway/cycleway across Hugh Road to access the garage forecourt. These issues significantly increase the risk of conflicts and collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This location is not suitable for a shared use footway/cycleway. An alternative design should be developed to facilitate cycle access to and from Hugh Road; • Measures such as bollards should be installed to contain vehicular movements to and from the garage forecourt and ensure safe and un-obstructed passage by pedestrians, particularly those with visual and mobility impairments. 	<p>2) Partially accept Instead, it is proposed to formalise the footway and keep it at the existing width. Signage encourages cyclists to utilise the nearest crossing and then the proposed cycle track. There are restrictions on what we can do here do to feedback from the garage owners wishing us to do the minimum and keep the existing parking in place.</p>	<p>As per designer's response. Minor corrections to signage required, but proposal to demarcate the footway is the better and viable solution.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</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
<p>Problem 3.20 Location: Humber Road (minor road).</p> <p>Two parking bays are proposed at an acute angle to the adjacent traffic lane between two junction. Drivers will have to reverse from the main carriageway into the bays or from bays onto the main carriageway. This increases the risk of vehicle to vehicle collisions.</p>	<p>The proposed parking bays should be removed or configured.</p>	<p>1) Accept. We will review this and rotate the spaces 90 degrees so they are parallel to the carriageway. This may mean we can only provide 1 space, rather than 2.</p>	<p>As designer's response.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.21 Location: Humber Road (minor road).</p> <p>The cycle track markings do not continue across the junction and the red surfacing does not distinguish between where the cycle track crosses the junction and the area south of the cycle track where vehicles wait. This reduces the conspicuity of the cycle track and increases the risk of collisions vehicle to cyclist type collisions.</p>	<p>Cycle track markings should continue across the junction and cycle symbols installed on the junction to highlight the cycle track.</p> <p>To maximise the impact of the red surfacing, it should be confined to where the cyclists cross.</p>	<p>1) Accept Scheme will be amended to reflect the recommendations.</p>	<p>As designer's response.</p>	<p>Agreed and no further action required.</p>
<p>Problem 3.22 Location: Humber Road (minor road).</p>	<p>The proposed highway layout should be amended to</p>	<p>1) Accept Investigate incorporating a new dropped kerb and provide appropriate tactile paving.</p>	<p>As per designer's response</p>	<p>Agreed and no further</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
There is no uncontrolled pedestrian crossing on the western side of the cycle track to facilitate direct access between the southern side of Humber Road (minor road) and the proposed improved path across Humber Road open space.	accommodate an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing point on the western side of the cycle track.			action required.
<p>Problem 3.23 Location: path through Gosford Park</p> <p>The barriers at each end of the path do not facilitate cycle access, and there is no access at the northern end of the path to and from the Binley Cycleway. This increases the risk of personal injury to cyclists. The lack of lighting increases the risk to personal injury.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the path is to be converted to a shared use footway/cycleway, cycle access should be provided at both. • Lighting should be installed along the path. 	<p>2) Partially accept However, this does appear to be a dead end, and other considerations should be made, if feasible.</p>	The widening of this path will be held in abeyance and reviewed further until value for money and affordability within the CRSTS programme can be confirmed.	Agreed and no further action required.
<p>Problem 3.24 Location: Uncontrolled pedestrian and cycle crossing, Humber Road adjacent to Gosford Park.</p> <p>The tactile paving indicates to visually impaired pedestrians that the full width of the controlled crossing is for pedestrian use. This increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>The crossings should be widened to accommodate pedestrians and two-way cycling.</p> <p>The tactile paving should only extend across the</p>	<p>1) Accept Review of the island/crossing will be undertaken to consider the recommendations.</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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
Furthermore, the tactile paving on the refuge and eastern side of the road. As a result, visually impaired pedestrians may collide with the central islands, increasing the risk of trips, falls and collisions between vehicles and visually impaired pedestrians.	part of the crossing that is for use of pedestrians.			
<p>Problem 3.25 Location: Eastern side of Humber Road, adjacent to Gosford Park.</p> <p>The footway on the eastern side of Humber Road adjacent to Gosford Park is not wide enough to accommodate cyclists, pedestrians and a buffer adjacent to the carriageway. This increases the risk of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	The path should be widened in line with current guidance, or an alternative design should be developed to enable cyclists to cross Humber Road.	<p>2) Partially accept the issue Upon review, the path will not be widened to avoid the loss of existing hedgerow. Instead, the proposed link from the new cycleway to the uncontrolled crossing will be removed. This is to direct cyclists along the safer route towards the shops along Humber Road rather than utilising an uncontrolled crossing.</p>	As per designer's response.	Agreed and no further action required.
<p>Problem 3.26 Location: Western side of Humber Road, adjacent to Humber Road open space.</p> <p>The submitted drawings do not show the removal of the bollards in the cycle track. Retention of the bollards increases the risk of personal injury</p>	The bollards in the cycle track should be removed.	1) Accept Bollards to be removed.	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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
resulting from cyclists clipping the bollards as they pass.				
<p>Problem 3.27 Location: Humber Road, northern end of cycle track.</p> <p>There is insufficient space on the northern end of the zebra crossing for a cyclist to wait without obstructing the junction. This increases the risk of collisions between cyclists.</p>	The proposed zebra crossing should be replaced with an uncontrolled crossing.	<p>1) Accept. Uncontrolled crossing to replace the zebra crossing.</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and no further action required.
<p>Problem 3.28 Location: Cycle crossing at northern end of Humber Road.</p> <p>It is proposed to relocate the stop lines on the cycle track beyond the cycle signals. A cyclist waiting at the stop line may not be able to see the cycle signal and may proceed when the signal is on red. This increases the risk of vehicle to cyclist type collisions.</p>	The stop lines should remain in their current locations.	<p>1) Accept Drawing will be corrected to remove the proposed stop lines.</p>	As per designer's response	Agreed and 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:	Highway Lead – Foleshill Transport Plan and Coventry South
Organisation:	Coventry City Council
Date:	08/10/2025

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:	09/10/2025