

Havant Thicket Reservoir

PW.PACKAGE

Havant Thicket Reservoir

North Access Road Safety Audit Brief

Risk Assessment

18/11/22

Doc No.: HTR-ATK-XX-XX-HS-Z-0004

Revision No.: RV.MAN.01

Atkins Baseline - Low Risk

Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for Portsmouth Water and use in relation to the Havant Thicket reservoir project. Atkins Limited assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

Document history

PW Revision	Status	Purpose Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
RV.MAN.01	A1	First Issue	AIH	TP	AIH	JF	18/11/22
RV.MAN.02							
RV.MAN.03							
RV.MAN.04							
RV.MAN.05							
RV.MAN.06							
RV.MAN.07							
RV.MAN.08							
RV.MAN.09							

Atkins Baseline - Low Risk

Risk Reduction done in accordance with Method C of "Provision of Road Restraint Systems on Local Highway Authority Roads"

Risk Reduction

Vehicles coming in opposite directions not being able to pass.

The following risk reduction measures are proposed to reduce this risk:

1. New road with speed limit of 20 mph. Due to the single lane single carriageway design the likelihood of higher speeds is considered to be unlikely to occur.
2. Single lane single carriageway with passing bays.
3. Timber bollards at 5 m centres on either side of the carriageway to define edge.
4. There is full intervisibility between adjacent passing bays in both directions
5. Each bay is typically 20m full width in length and therefore able to hold several vehicles
6. Road is only open to traffic in day light hours. Therefore night time driving will not occur.

Measures/Features that are present in the design

1. Northern Access Road is for vehicles only, non motorised users are prohibited from using it.
2. Northern Access Road has two non-motorised user crossing points that are clearly defined and fully visible.
3. Clear visibility from one passing bay to the next provides sufficient time to yield.
4. Full SSD is provided but the critical vision requirement is passing bay to passing bay.
5. There is full intervisibility between adjacent passing bays in both directions

Features considered by not taken forward

Single carriageway was not taken forward to limit the land take of irreplaceable ancient woodland

Road Restraint System considered not desirable

1. Considered unnecessary due to road layout and speed limit.
2. Low speeds are likely to be self enforced due to the cross section layout.
3. A RRS is not likely to add any benefit.

Risk Analysis done in accordance with Method C of "Provision of Road Restraint Systems on Local Highway Authority Roads"

Method used as

ROAD RESTRAINT SYSTEM (RRS)		Mead Way (Westbound ch. 400 to 540)			
Criteria	Factor	Priority Rank	Risk Factor Score	RFS(For specific site)	Remark
Location	Part1	0 - All other roads	0	0	Unclassified single lane single carriageway with passing bays and 20 mph limit
		1 - Rural U & B roads and urban C roads	1		
		2 - Rural A roads and urban B roads	3		
		3 - Urban A Roads	6		
Layout	Part1	0 - Straight alignment and/or complies with TD9	0	0	Visibility SSD meet and passing bay to passing bay visibility met.
		1 - One step below desirable minimum R with superelevation of 5%	1		
		2 - Two step below desirable minimum R with superelevation of 5%	2		
		3 - Three steps below desirable minimum R with superelevation of 5%	3		
		4 - Four steps below desirable minimum R with superelevation of 5%	4		
	5 - Five steps below desirable minimum R with superelevation of 5%	5			
	Part2	0 - No reason for lane changing/manoeuvres.	0	2	The manoeuvre considered is when two oncoming vehicles encounter each other. There is sufficient forward inter- visibility inter between passing bays to allow vehicles to safely pass.
		1 - Some potential for lane changing, overtaking, positioning manoeuvres or avoiding action.	2		
2 - High likelihood of lane changing, overtaking, positioning manoeuvres or avoiding action.		3			
Collision	Longitudinal Features	0 – Individual spot hazard	0	1	Timber bollards at 5m spacing considered as a longitudinal hazard
		1 – Series of individual hazards less than 50m apart or a longitudinal hazard that might be reached.	1		
		2 – Longitudinal Hazard that is highly likely to be reached resulting in harm or a spot hazard downstream of a feature which may guide the vehicle towards the hazard.	2		
	Severity of outcomes	0 - Percentage of KSI for primary hazard < 20%	0	0	Very low speed impact of vehicle into timber bollard
		1 - Percentage of KSI for primary hazard 20 -30%	1		
		2 - Percentage of KSI for primary hazard >30%	2		
Consequential	Secondary Incidents	0 - No secondary events likely.	0	0	Considered to be unlikely.
		1 - When damaged or collapsed the feature could give rise to the risk of secondary vehicular accidents.	1		
	Network Disruption	0 - No impact on network availability.	0	0	Network Disruption will not be for more than a day
		1 - If hazardous feature was damaged or collapsed this could give rise to network disruption for more than one day.	1		
	Cost of damage	0 - No significant cost implications.	0	0	
		1 - Significant cost of repair or replacement following collision.	1		
Total Priority Score			3	Low priority	

TOTAL RISK RANKING SCORE	CATEGORY
14 or more	Higher Priority
9 to 13	Medium Priority
0 to 8	Lower Priority