

HEATHROW NCP PROPERTY LTD
PROPOSED ACCESS ARRANGEMENT
NCP CAR PARK, A4 BATH ROAD,
HEATHROW

STAGE 1 - ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

MAY 2021

the journey is the reward

Transport for London

Proposed Access Arrangement NCP Car Park, A4 Bath Road, Heathrow

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

Ref: S/NCPHeathrow.1.6

Prepared for:

Heathrow NCP Property Ltd

By:

Mayer Brown Limited

Prepared by: Martyn Parr, Audit Team Leader

Checked by: John Reid, Audit Team Member

Approved by: Martyn Parr

Version	Status	Date
Α	Draft Audit report issued to TfL	12/05/2021
В	Draft Audit report issued to TfL	20/05/2021
С	Final Audit report issued to Design Organisation	24/05/2021



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Commission

- 1.1.1 This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit carried out carried out on a proposed access at the existing NCP car park to the west of the Park Inn Radisson Hotel, Heathrow.
- 1.1.2 The Audit was undertaken by Mayer Brown Limited (Safety Team) in accordance with the Audit Brief issued by the Design Organisation on 14th May 2021. The Audit took place at the Audit Team Leaders home address (due to the Covid 19 pandemic) on during May 2021 and comprised an examination of the documents provided as listed in Appendix A, plus a visit to the site of the proposed scheme.
- 1.1.3 The visit to the site of the proposed highway works was made on Friday 14th May 2021. During the site visit the weather was overcast, the existing road surface was dry. Traffic conditions were low.

1.2 Terms of Reference

- 1.2.1 The Terms of Reference of this Audit are as described in TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014. The Audit Team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and how it impacts on all road users and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria. However, to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem the Audit Team may, on occasion, have referred to a design standard without touching on technical audit. An absence of comment relating to specific road users / modes in Section 3 of this report does not imply that they have not been considered; instead the Audit Team feels they are not adversely affected by the proposed changes.
- 1.2.2 This Safety Audit is not intended to identify pre-existing hazards which remain unchanged due to the proposals; hence they will not be raised in Section 3 of this report as they fall outside the remit of Road Safety Audit in general as specified in the procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014. Safety issues identified during the Audit and site visit that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference, but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Client Organisation, are set out in Section 4 of this report.
- 1.2.3 Nothing in this Audit should be regarded as a direct instruction to include or remove a measure from within the scheme. Responsibility for designing the scheme lies with the Designer and as such the Audit Team accepts no design responsibility for any changes made to the scheme as a result of this Audit.
- 1.2.4 In accordance with TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014, this Audit has a maximum shelf life of 2 years. If the scheme does not progress to the next stage in its development within this period, then the scheme should be re-audited.
- 1.2.5 Unless general to the scheme, all comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed design drawings and the locations have been indicated on the plan located in Appendix B.
- 1.2.6 It is the responsibility of the Design Organisation to complete the Designer's response section of this Audit report. Where applicable and necessary it is the responsibility of the Client Organisation to complete the Client comment section of this Audit report. Signatures from both the Design Organisation and Client Organisation must be added within Section 5 of this Audit report. A copy of which must be returned to the Audit Team.

Audit Ref: S/NCPHeathrow.1.6

1.3 Main Parties to the Audit

1.3.1 Client Organisation

Client contact details: Transport for London

1.3.2 Design Organisation

Design contact details: Alec Philpott – Mayer Brown Ltd.

Audit Team Approval

1.3.3 The Audit Team specified in 1.3.4 below were given approval to undertake this Audit by Andrew Coventry of TfL Road Safety Audit on 23rd April 2021.

1.3.4 Audit Team

Audit Team Leader: Martyn – Mayer Brown Limited

Audit Team Member: John Reid – Mayer Brown Limited

Audit Team Observer:

1.3.5 Other Specialist Advisors

Specialist Advisor Details: None

1.4 Purpose of the Scheme

1.4.1 The purpose of the scheme is to "provide direct vehicular access from the site onto the A4 Bath Road in the form of a simple left-in/left-out (LILO) junction, a concept which has been secured in two previous planning applications"*

*Taken directly from the Transport Statement.

1.5 Special Considerations

1.5.1 The Audit Team has no special considerations to raise.

2.0 ITEMS RAISED IN PREVIOUS ROAD SAFETY AUDITS

The Audit Team is not aware of any other Audits having been carried out on the proposals.

Date: 24th May 2021 5 Version: C

3.0 ITEMS RAISED AT THIS STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT

This section should be read in conjunction with Paragraphs 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 of this report.

3.1 NON-MOTORISED USERS

3.1.1 PROBLEM

Location: Proposed car park access (please refer to reference point 3.1.1 in **Appendix B**).

Summary: Inconsistent use of tactile paving – NMU confusion.

DETR recommends that 'in-line' tactile paving should be 1200mm deep across the full width of the dropped kerb, this is to ensure that necessary warning is provided to a vision impaired pedestrian proceeding at normal pace.

However, the tactile paving provided is 800mm deep when measured back from the channel line, which could lead to a vision impaired pedestrian stepping over the tactile paving and entering the carriageway unaware, with consequent risk of being struck by a moving vehicle.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that that tactile paving is provided in accordance with DETR 'Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces'.

Design Organisation Response	Accepted / Part Accepted / Rejected	
Client Organisation Comments		

End of list of problems identified and recommendations offered in this Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

Audit Ref: S/NCPHeathrow.1.6

4.0 ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING THE STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY AUDIT THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Safety issues identified during the audit and site inspection that are considered to be outside the Terms of Reference, but which the Audit Team wishes to draw to the attention of the Client Organisation, are set out in this section. It is to be understood that, in raising these issues, the Audit Team in no way warrants that a full review of the highway environment has been undertaken beyond that necessary to undertake the Audit as commissioned.

The Audit Team has no issues to raise within this section.

Audit Ref: S/NCPHeathrow.1.6

Date: 24th May 2021 7 Version: C

5.0 SIGNATURES AND SIGN-OFF

5.1 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

We certify that we have examined the drawings and documents listed in Appendix A. to this Safety Audit report. The Road Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with TfL Procedure SQA-0170 dated May 2014, with the sole purpose of identifying any feature that could be removed or modified in order to improve the safety of the measures. The problems identified have been noted in this report together with associated suggestions for safety improvements that we recommend should be studied for implementation.

No one on the Audit Team has been involved with the design of the measures.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER:

Name: Martyn Parr

MSoRSA.

MCIHT, HECoC Date: 24th May 2021

Signed:

Position: Road Safety Manager
Organisation: Mayer Brown Limited

Address: Lion House

Oriental Road

Woking Surrey GU22 8AR

Contact: mparr@mayerbrown.co.uk

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER:

Name: John Reid

MSc, DipHTE, MCIHT,

FSoRSA, MITAI, HECoC Date: 24th May 2021

Position: Technical Director - Safety

Organisation: Mayer Brown Limited

Address: Lion House

Oriental Road

Woking Surrey GU22 8AR

Contact: jreid@mayerbrown.co.uk

5.2 DESIGN TEAM STATEMENT

In accordance with SQA-0170 dated May 2014, I certify that I have reviewed the items raised in this Stage 1 Safety Audit report. I have given due consideration to each issue raised and have stated my proposed course of action for each in this report. I seek the Client Organisations endorsement of my proposals.

	name:		
	Position:		
	Organisation:		
	Signed:	Dated:	
5.3	CLIENT ORGANISATION STATEMENT		
	I accept these proposals by the Design Organisation.		
	Name:		
	Position:		
	Organisation:		
	Signed:	Dated:	
5.4	SECONDARY CLIENT ORGANISATION STATEMENT (where appropriate		
	I accept these proposals by the Design Organisation.		
	Name:		
	Position:		
	Organisation:		
	Signed:	Dated:	

APPENDIX A

Documents Forming the Audit Brief

DRAWING NUMBER MBSK210222-01 P4 MBSK210222-02 P2 MBSK210222-03 P3 MBSK210222-04 P3 MBSK210222-05 P3 MBSK210222-06 P3 MBSK210222-07 P4 MBSK210222-08 P3 MBSK210222-09 P2 MBSK210222-09 P2 MBSK210222-01 P4

DOCUMENTS DETAILS (where appropriate)

Safety Audit Brief Site Location Plan Traffic signal details TfL signal safety checklist Departures from standard Previous Road Safety Audits Previous Designer Responses Collision data Collision plot Traffic flow / modelling data Pedestrian flow / modelling	Audit Brief
data	
☐ Speed survey data☐ Other documents	Transport Statement
M other documents	Transport Statement

Audit Ref: S/NCPHeathrow.1.6

APPENDIX B

Problem Locations

Date: 24th May 2021 11 Version: C



