



AIRPETS, SPOUT LANE NORTH HEATHROW


NEW SECURITY GATES AND PERIMETER SECURITY FENCING

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

March 2026

DC-RW-26-5104-RSA1

Report title:	Airpets, Spout Lane North Heathrow
Date:	13/03/26
Document reference and revision:	DC-RW-26-5104-RSA1
Prepared by:	The Safety Forum
On behalf of:	London Borough of Hillingdon

Revision Status	Prepared by: (Name)	Checked by: (Name)	Approved by: (Signature)	Date Approved:
Original	D Crawford	R Westhead		13/03/26
Designer's Response				
Authority's Response				
Audit Response				

Client:	
Union 4 Planning	The Safety Forum Ltd
10 York Rd London SE1 7ND	Polygon Yard 39A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB
Date: 13/03/26	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0 ITEMS CONSIDERED	5
3.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM THIS STAGE 1 AUDIT.	6
4.0 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT	8

APPENDIX A Location Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report results from a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) carried out on the proposed revised access arrangements and boundary fencing at Airpets, Heathrow.
- 1.2 The development proposals consist of upgrading the existing pedestrian and vehicular access to provide an 'air lock' facility and installing new perimeter security fencing.
- 1.3 The Stage 1 RSA was carried out at the request of Union 4 Planning.
- 1.4 The Road Safety Audit Brief was supplied by Union 4 Planning. The overseeing organisation is LB Hillingdon. The RSA Brief was accepted by the Audit Team as adequate to complete the RSA.
- 1.5 The Audit was carried out between 11th and 12th March 2026 by consultants working on behalf of The Safety Forum Limited. The Audit Team, which is established from The Safety Forum Ltd and independent of the project design team, has had no involvement with the project.

The Auditors were:

David Crawford – Team Leader (BSc IEng MICE MIHT RSA Cert of Comp)

R Westhead – Team Member (BSc, MSoRSA, RSA Certificate of Competency)

- 1.6 The report has been prepared in accordance with General Principles and Scheme Governance General Information, GG 119, Road Safety Audit.
- 1.7 The Audit consisted of a desktop study and a site visit. The site visit was carried out on 11th March 2026, between 09:30 and 10:05 hours by all members of the Audit Team together. The weather was clear and dry with sunny spells, and the road surface was dry. Traffic conditions were quiet, with vehicles accessing Spout Lane, and Airpets during the site visit. No pedestrian or cycle movements were observed.
- 1.8 Issues relating to the health & safety of operatives constructing, operating or maintaining the highway are not covered by Road Safety Audit. Only issues relating to the design and construction of facilities for highway maintenance that may potentially contribute to a Road Safety Matter are considered by the Road Safety Audit process.

Road Safety Audit is not a technical check that the design conforms to Standards and/or best practice guidance. Design Organisations are responsible for ensuring that their designs have been subjected to the appropriate design reviews (including, where applicable, Walking, Cycling & Horse Riding Assessment & Review) prior to Road Safety Audit.

Road Safety Audit is not a check that the scheme has been constructed in accordance with the design.

Whilst reference is made to certain design standards, where safety may be compromised by a reduction in standard, this report is not intended to provide a design check. The Auditors have only reported on matters that might have an adverse effect on road safety in the context of the chosen design. No attempt has been made to comment on the justification of the scheme or the appropriateness of the design. Consequently, the Auditors accept no responsibility for the design or construction of the scheme.

- 1.9 The recommendations in this report are aimed at addressing the road safety problems; however there may be other alternative acceptable ways to overcome a specific problem, when other practical issues are considered. The recommendations contained herein do not absolve the Designer of his/her responsibilities.
- 1.10 The Overseeing Organisation response to the RSA should be formally recorded and reported to the Designer and the RSA Team so that a record of the Audit process is contained in the *As Built* design pack to be provided and retained by the Overseeing Organisation on final completion.
- 1.11 All problems identified in this Road Safety Audit Report are indicated on a location plan in Appendix A

2.0 ITEMS CONSIDERED

2.1 The Road Safety Audit was undertaken on the scheme detailed in the following documentation.

Drawing No.	Rev	Title
-	-	Road Safety Audit Brief
<input type="checkbox"/> OS location plan (drawing no. 506/P/2.1) <input type="checkbox"/> Site Block Plan (drawing no. 506/P/2.2) <input type="checkbox"/> Perimeter Fence Plan (drawing no. 506/P/2.3 Rev A) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed fence system (drawing no. 506/P/2.4) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed security gates (drawing no. 506/P/2.5) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Access Engineering Layout Option 1 (drawing no. C-001 Rev P9) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Vehicle Tracking (Large Van) (drawing no. C-003 Rev P4) <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Access SPA - Max Legal Arctic (drawing no. C-004 Rev P2) <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Access SPA - Large Van (drawing no. C-005 Rev P2) <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Vehicle Tracking (Drawbar Vehicle) (drawing no. C-006 Rev P3)		

2.2 No departure from standards or other information was submitted to the Audit Team.

3.0 MATTERS ARISING FROM THIS STAGE 1 AUDIT.

3.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Outer Air lock gate.

SUMMARY: Wait here sign.

The audit team noted with the existing gates that visitors may position themselves too close to the gates to allow them to operate. With the airlock gates, longer vehicles who may stop, too close to the gate, may then have to reverse, presenting a risk of collision with other vehicles on Spout Lane North.

RECOMMENDATION

Provide a “wait here until gate opens” type sign and road marking.

3.2 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Spout Lane visibility into site.

SUMMARY: Exiting vehicles.

With the alignment of the access road, if a vehicle is leaving the site at the same time as one wants to enter it is more difficult due to the alignment. The inbound vehicle may choose to reverse, which may result in a collision with traffic on the public highway. If there was good intervisibility the inbound vehicle would be able to see oncoming vehicles leaving the site, and wait clear of the exit.

RECOMMENDATION

Provide intervisibility between exiting and entering vehicles, to allow vehicles to safely manoeuvre in and out of the site.

3.3 PROBLEM

LOCATION: New access.

SUMMARY: Sign heights and position.

When developing the scheme the designer should place signs where they do not unduly obstruct the footways, and at a height where people would not hit their heads (normally between 2.1 to 2.3m clearance).

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure signs and their posts do not pose a risk to footway users.

4.0 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

4.1 We certify that this audit has been carried out in accordance with GG 119.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER

Name: D Crawford
Position: Road Safety Consultant
The Safety Forum Ltd
Polygon Yard
39A Islington Road
Bristol
BS3 1QB

Signed: 

Date: 12/03/26

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER

Name: R Westhead
Position: Director
The Safety Forum Ltd
Polygon Yard
39A Islington Road
Bristol
BS3 1QB

Signed: 

Date: 13/03/26

