

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Limited

HINCKLEY NATIONAL RAIL FREIGHT INTERCHANGE

The Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange Development Consent Order

Project reference TR050007

Appendix 12 - M69 J2 Road Safety Audit Stage 1 Response Report

Revision: 01

December 2024

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009
Regulation 5(2)(q)

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN

Tritax Symmetry (Hinckley) Ltd.

Hinckley National Rail Freight
Interchange

M69 J2 Stage 1 Road Safety Audit
RESPONSE REPORT

DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

Report Title:	Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange – M69 J2 Stage 1 RSA Response Report
Document Number:	HRF-BWB-HGN-RSA-RP-CH-0005
Prepared By:	BWB Consulting Ltd
Overseeing Organisation:	Leicestershire County Council & National Highways
BWB Reference:	NTT2814

Revision	Date of Issue	Status	Author:	Checked:	Approved
P01	28 November 2024	S4	Sam Carter CEng MICE	Simon Hilditch CEng MICE MCIHT	Sam Carter CEng MICE

Notice

This document has been prepared for the sole use of the Client in accordance with the terms of the appointment under which it was produced. BWB Consulting Limited accepts no responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this document by any third party. No part of this document shall be copied or reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of BWB.



CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION..... 3
 - Objectives 3
 - Key Personnel 3
 - Summary of Findings 3
- 2. ITEMS RAISED AT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT: DECISION LOG 4
 - 24-1363.01-RSA1C – Amendments to J2 and New Link Road 4
- 3. DESIGN ORGANISATION AND OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENTS 7
 - Design Organisation Statement..... 7
 - Overseeing Organisation Statement 7

1. INTRODUCTION

Objectives

- 1.1. This report comprises a Response Report undertaken with reference to the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) report relating to the works to M69 J2 associated with the Hinckley National Rail Freight Interchange (HNRFI).
- 1.2. The RSA was conducted independently of the design team by Midlands Road Safety. The purpose of the Audits is as described in the Audit Report.
- 1.3. This Response Report has been based on the template in DMRB standard GG 119.
- 1.4. The text of the Audit reports has been copied into this report for ease of reference. Locations of the items raised are as given in the Audit.

Key Personnel

- 1.5. The following key personnel have been involved in this Road Safety Audit:

	Name	Key Contact	Role	Contact Details
RSA Team	BWB Consulting Ltd	Chris Berry	Audit Team Leader	██████████@midlandsroadsafety.co.uk
Design Organisation	BWB Consulting Ltd	Sam Carter	Project Lead	██████████@bwbconsulting.com ██████████

Summary of Findings

- 1.6. The Design Organisation has agreed with all of the recommendations of the road safety auditor and will implement the recommendations at the detailed design stage.

2. ITEMS RAISED AT THE STAGE 1 AUDIT: DECISION LOG

24-1363.01-RSA1C – Amendments to J2 and New Link Road

RSA Ref.	RSA Problem and Recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing organisation response	Agreed RSA action
3.2	<p>Location: M69 J2 southern circulatory carriageway.</p> <p>Summary: Confusing road markings risk side swipe type collisions.</p> <p>Around the southern carriageway of the circulatory the lane destinations show an “ahead” and a “right turn” arrow. However, approaching the junction and on the approaches before this point, “ahead” and “ahead and right” arrows are shown. This could lead to late lane changes, sudden and unexpected braking and side swipe type collisions due to driver confusion and late decision making as a result of confusing and misleading lane destinations.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that the markings are amended so that they are consistent with the available movements around the southern half of the circulatory and on the westbound link road exit.</p>	<p>Agree with RSA Recommendation: Yes</p> <p>Road markings on the circulatory will be reviewed during detailed design to ensure consistency.</p>	<p>Problem and Design Organisation's recommendation accepted</p>	

RSA Ref.	RSA Problem and Recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing organisation response	Agreed RSA action
3.3	<p>Location: M69 southbound approach to the new signalised junction.</p> <p>Summary: Poor forward visibility of signals risks late braking and junction overshoot type collisions.</p> <p>The southbound off-slip approach to the proposed signals at Junction 2 has a significant vertical and horizontal alignment change on the approach to the current Give-Way line. There is a concern that, given these changes and the existing signing infrastructure, that forward visibility towards the signal heads will not be provided for vehicles.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that the signals are located and designed, including raised poles and/or gantry signals if needed, so as to provide adequate forward visibility for approaching vehicles. Furthermore, it is recommended that the signing on the approach is amended so as not to pose an obstruction.</p>	<p>Agree with RSA recommendation: Yes</p> <p>Visibility on the existing southbound diverge slip road has been assessed and full stopping sight distance compliant with CD 122 and the design speed of the slip road (70kph) will be made available through the detailed design incorporating site clearance works and relocation of existing signage to ensure that there are no significant obstacles within the visibility envelope.</p>	<p>Problem and Design Organisation's recommendation accepted</p>	
3.4	<p>Location: M69 southbound approach to the new signalised junction.</p> <p>Summary: Amended stop line position risks loss of control type collisions and shunts.</p> <p>The provision of the stop line at the signalised off-slip means that the existing high friction surfacing will be substandard in length. This could lead to loss of control collisions or shunts involving late braking vehicles.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that, as part of the detailed design, the length of high friction surfacing is amended to consider the amended stop line position.</p>	<p>Agree with RSA recommendation: Yes</p> <p>The surfacing of the roundabout and approaches to stop lines will be assessed in accordance with the relevant DMRB standards and appropriate PSV surface course will be specified through the detailed design.</p>	<p>Problem and Design Organisation's recommendation accepted</p>	

RSA Ref.	RSA Problem and Recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing organisation response	Agreed RSA action
3.5	<p>Location: M69 southbound approach to the junction.</p> <p>Summary: Amended signing missing diversion information risks late manoeuvres and shunts / side swipe collisions.</p> <p>Whilst it is appreciated that the sign design is at a preliminary stage, the proposed signing eliminates / does not include the existing diversion route symbol. This could result in confusion for drivers following the diversion route, resulting in late lane changes and shunt type collisions.</p> <p>Recommendation: It is recommended that, as part of the detailed design, the diversion route symbols are included where appropriate.</p>	<p>Agree with RSA recommendation: Yes</p> <p>Through the detailed design, the relevant asset lead for diversion routes within NH will be contacted and diversion route symbols provided where required. This exercise will also take into account the provision of the new link road through the development as a potential new diversion route should this be desired by NH.</p>	<p>Problem and Design Organisation's recommendation accepted</p>	
4.1	<p>Between J2 on the M69 and the first internal roundabout it is proposed to install a Pegasus crossing. The crossing is shown as a single stage crossing for all users, with the roundabout to the north shown as only a two-arm junction at this time. The crossing is approximately 18m in length - as part of the detailed design it should be ensured that the crossing timings and on-crossing detection account for slow moving equestrians, especially as the central splitter island is not of sufficient width for equestrian or cyclists to safely wait..</p>	<p>Noted. Crossing timings will be specified at detailed design with due regard for all potential users of the crossing.</p>	<p>Problem and Design Organisation's recommendation accepted</p>	

3. DESIGN ORGANISATION AND OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENTS

Design Organisation Statement

1.7. On behalf of the Design Organisation, I certify that:


- 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:	Sam Carter
Signed & Dated:	
Position:	Project Lead
Organisation:	BWB Consulting Ltd

Overseeing Organisation Statement

1.8. On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation I certify that:

- 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
- The agreed RSA actions will be progressed.

Name:	Patrick Thomas
Signed & Dated:	
Position:	Spatial Planner
Organisation:	National Highways



A **CAF** GROUP COMPANY

