

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

West End Lane, Henfield

Road Safety Audit Log cover sheet

This report should be read in conjunction with the Stage 1 Safety Audit ref
REPORT NUMBER 2023/M/1935.

Having reviewed the recommendations of the Safety Audit and considered
the comments of the Client Project Manager and Design Team, I accept
the conclusions of the Road Safety Audit log on behalf of the Highway
Authority.

Produced : Stephen Gee

Date : 31st August 2023



Signed : Stephen Gee (Principal Transport Planner)

Reviewed : Ian Gledhill

Date : 4th September 2023

Signed : 

Para No.	Problem (as identified by Safety Auditor)	Recommendations (Made by Safety Auditor)	Designer's Response	Proposals
3.1.1	Increased risk of head on conflicts <i>Concern is expressed that due to the traffic calming feature that gives priority to eastbound traffic, that there could be an increased risk of conflicts between westbound traffic approaching but already committed to the priority system and traffic turning out of the proposed development site access or Beverly Road which may assume they have priority.</i>	<i>The priority system should be reversed.</i>	RSA Recommendation is not accepted. Reasons provided below. The problem raised by the auditor relates to an event whereby the eastbound traffic has already entered the priority system at the same time as the vehicle exiting the proposed development and turning right. In such an event, driver exiting the site and turning right will first come across the proposed speed hump on West End Lane; and at the same time will have a clear forward visibility along West End Lane. In fact, this driver will be able to clearly see the oncoming westbound vehicle on West End Lane even before exiting the proposed site access junction as this made clear through the provision of visibility splays. This driver will naturally wait before the proposed speed hump, or where they think is the safest (widest) part of West End Lane taking advantage of the familiarity of the highway network, thereby reducing the risk of collision. The likelihood of a risk of collision is further reduced due to the fact that this is a low speed environment induced by single lane chicane system and the speed hump. All in all, it is the designer's opinion that the proposed priority system is safe and suitable. There is therefore no highway safety justification for reversing the priority system. In any case, at a Detailed Design (S278) stage, this would be discussed in detail and further tweaks could be made at that time.	WSCC consider the priority direction is correct. The feature is on a straight section of road and visibility for traffic would not be an issue, Traffic turning from the development would wait behind the proposed speed hump to allow an opposing vehicle through