

## SOLIHULL METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Report to:</b>	Cabinet Member for Transport & Highways
<b>Meeting date:</b>	1 MARCH 2012
<b>Report from:</b>	Head of Highway Services
<b>Report Author/Lead Contact Officer:</b>	Davinder Chohan/David Lechmere
<b>Wards affected:</b>	All Wards
<b>Public/Private report:</b>	Public
<b>Exempt by virtue of Paragraph:</b>	N/A of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Subject/Report Title:****ROAD SAFETY ASSESSMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE****1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To seek Cabinet Member approval to introduce a Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure for Solihull.

**2. Decision(s) Recommended**

- 2.1 To approve the Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure as set out in Appendix A.

**3. Background**

- 3.1 Road safety audits are undertaken on highway schemes at various stages of their design and construction to ensure that they will not create future highway safety problems.
- 3.2 An auditor is an independent person who has had no previous involvement with the design of the scheme who undertakes an assessment of the proposal to determine if any road safety problems are likely to be created. Solihull MBC's Road Safety team then act as the highway authority lead on this issue. It considers the auditor's recommendation and the designer's response and where there is a difference of opinion indicates a way forward.
- 3.3 In 2003, the Highways Agency published revised guidance for carrying out Road Safety Audits on Trunk Roads and Motorways detailed in document HD 19/03. This document is also recommended for use by local authorities on their roads. However, it is not a mandatory requirement.

- 3.4 The Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) published Road Safety Audit Guidelines in 2008. The guidelines give advice on where road safety audits may be approached in a different way to the requirements set out in HD 19/03 in order to fulfil the objectives of all authorities undertaking Road Safety Audits. The advice is based on a practical and reasonable response to the issues facing local highway authorities.
- 3.5 The IHT guidance indicates that it is essential for each local highway authority to review its internal works programme and its development schemes, and assess the level of audit which is appropriate. Highway authorities can use a number of criteria to undertake this assessment.
- 3.6 The assessment can include the cost of a scheme but should not be restricted solely to cost. Issues such as the impact of the scheme in terms of traffic levels and mix, the status of the road within the road hierarchy and the exposure to risk for vulnerable road users of the scheme should also be taken into account.
- 3.7 Furthermore, the principles of Manual for Streets (MfS) which was published in 2007 should be catered for. MfS emphasises that streets should be places in which people want to live and spend time in, and are not just transport corridors. The manual aims to reduce the impact of vehicles on residential streets by asking practitioners to plan street design intelligently and proactively and gives high priority to the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport.
- 3.8 MfS is used predominantly for the design, construction, adoption and maintenance of new residential streets but can also be applied to the re-design of existing residential streets and encourages quality audits to be undertaken on these types of schemes. A road safety assessment of these types of schemes should take account of the principles that MfS is trying to achieve. Therefore, the policy needs to be tailored to cater for the principles that these types of schemes are trying to achieve.
- 3.9 The policy utilises the IHT guidance to allow a safety assessment to be undertaken which is appropriate for the complexity of the scheme. However, it also allows for the principles of MfS to be catered for.

#### **4. Evaluation of Alternative Option(s)**

- 4.1 The policy has been tailored to the authority's needs and specific circumstances. An assessment has been undertaken considering issues such as the complexity of scheme, road usage and classification to identify the level of road safety assessment which is required.
- 4.2 Consequently, it was not appropriate to consider alternative options as it was necessary for an individual policy to be developed which satisfied the highway authority's particular requirements.

#### **5. Reasons for Recommending Preferred Option**

- 5.1 The Highways Agency issued guidance for undertaking road safety audits in document HD 19/03 but the subsequent IHT guidelines were issued as it was recognised that it was not always appropriate for local highway authorities to undertake this level of assessment on their roads. The Road Safety Strategy for Solihull (2012-2016) states that Solihull MBC will develop a specific safety

assessment policy and procedure following the advice from the Institution of Highways and Transportation. The likelihood of a scheme having the potential to create future collisions is linked to the size and complexity of the scheme and we need to prioritise our resources to ensure they are being used effectively. In addition, we need to have a policy in place which allows for the principles of Manual for Streets to be promoted.

5.2 For local roads, individual highway authorities are able to determine the level of safety assessment undertaken provided they have a policy in place in accordance with guidelines issued by the Institution of Highways and Transportation.

5.3 The impact of a highway scheme on a road with regard to its classification and level of usage by traffic and vulnerable road users has been used to determine the appropriate level of safety assessment.

## **6. Scrutiny**

6.1 Scrutiny will be undertaken by the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Board if necessary.

## **7. Implications**

### **7.1 Policy/Strategy Implications**

7.1.1 If approved, the Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure will be adopted.

7.1.2 The Council's Road Safety Strategy has stated that we formalise and adopt a safety audit policy that minimises the likelihood of new road safety risks inadvertently arising from building new road or highway improvements.

### **7.2 Meeting the duty to involve**

7.2.1 As this is a technical report it is not appropriate to undertake a consultation with the general public.

7.2.2 Similar policies adopted by a number of other local authorities (see paragraph 9.5) have been used in the preparation of this document.

### **7.3 Financial Implications**

7.3.1 The implementation of the Road Safety Assessment policy and procedure will allow better allocation of resources as the road safety audit will be appropriate to the road safety impact of the highway project.

7.3.2 The cost of the road safety assessment for highway authority schemes will be included within the project budget. Developers will have to fund the costs of the road safety assessment for their schemes.

7.3.3 The cost of providing highway authority comments' will be met from existing revenue budgets.

## **7.4 Legal implications**

7.4.1 The IHT Guidelines on Road Safety Audit is an accepted Code of Practice within the highway industry. It allows Council's to adopt their own policies according to issues such as impact of the scheme in terms of traffic levels, road classification and use by vulnerable road users.

7.4.2 A recent European Directive on Road Safety Management (2008/96/EC) places a requirement for Road Safety Auditors to hold a certificate of competency. The Council's policy has incorporated this requirement.

## **7.5 Risk Implications**

7.5.1 The Corporate Risk Management Approach has been complied with to identify and assess the significant risks associated with this decision/project. This includes but is not limited to political, legislation and reputation risks.

7.5.2 The approach is not intended to eliminate all risks and not all risks identified can be managed all of the time. Also, risks will still exist that have not been identified.

7.5.3 However, based on the information provided, it is the officer's opinion that the significant risks have been identified, assessed and arrangements are in place to manage them effectively.

7.5.4 This assessment identified that there are no net "red" risks that need to be reported.

## **7.6 Fair Treatment Assessment**

7.6.1 There is an established link between road safety and areas of disadvantage, in particular, for pedestrian casualties.

7.6.2 The Road Safety Strategy looks at why some groups are more likely than others to be injured in road traffic collisions.

7.6.3 The strategy promotes in depth analysis of data that will enable us to understand the socio-economic factors that influence driver and other road user behaviour and guide the development of future programmes.

7.6.4 The introduction of a Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure will enable an established way of safety assessing schemes which have been developed using this procedure.

## **7.7 Carbon Management/Environmental**

7.7.1 Road safety is only one contributor to the health of the nation and needs to be considered in a wider perspective. Reduced road safety risks will help encourage the adoption of sustainable modes of transport. There can be health benefits for those who choose to make cycling and walking journeys as well as benefits in reducing carbon emissions. There are many synergies between safer, healthier and more sustainable travel.

## **7.8 Partner Organisations**

7.8.1 The Policy will clarify the road safety assessment requirements for developments that the Council has an interest in such as the regeneration of North Solihull.

## **7.9 Safeguarding/Corporate Parenting Implications**

7.9.1 Road Safety programmes can contribute both directly and indirectly towards safeguarding vulnerable children. Generally, the greatest risk to children over the age of 11 is from road traffic collisions. In addition, there can be health benefits for those children who make cycling and walking journeys. Reducing the road safety risks for cycling and walking will encourage active travel.

## **7.10 Customer Impact**

7.10.1 A key part of the Road Safety Strategy action plan is the monitoring and evaluation of projects. Hence, this indicator is likely to be improved by the adoption of a formal safety assessment policy and procedure.

## **7.11 Other implications**

7.11.1 External engineering consultants undertaking road safety audits within the borough will be required to follow the Council's Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure.

## **8 List of Appendices Referred to**

8.1 Appendix A – Road Safety Assessment Policy and Procedure.

## **9 Background Papers Used to Compile this Report**

9.1 Department for Transport Guidance Note HD 19/03.

9.2 European Directive on Road Safety Management (2008/96/EC).

9.3 IHT Guidelines on Road Safety Audit.

9.4 Manual for Streets (MfS).

9.5 Road Safety Audit Policy Documents of:- Devon County Council; Dundee City Council; Lancashire County; Sheffield City Council; Suffolk County Council; Transport for London and West Lothian Council.

9.6 Road Safety Strategy for Solihull (2012-2016).

**APPENDIX A**

**ROAD SAFETY ASSESSMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE**

**SOLIHULL MBC**

**March 2012**



## **Contents**

	Page
Section 1 - Introduction	3
Section 2 – Purpose of Policy	3
Section 3 – Policy	4
Section 4 – Auditor Requirements for Levels A, B, C, & D	8
Section 5 – Policy and Procedure for Levels A, B, C, & D	10
Section 6 – Road Safety Review Level E	12
Section 7 – Self Certification Level F	13
Section 8 – Quality Audit Definition and Process Level Q	14
Appendix 1 – Glossary of Definitions	15
Appendix 2 – Specimen Road Safety Audit Feedback Form	16

## **List of Tables**

Table 1 – Level of Safety Assessment of Solihull MBC Schemes	5
Table 2 – Level of Safety Assessment of Externally Funded Schemes	6
Table 3 – Road Safety Auditor’s Experience & Training Requirements	8

# **Solihull MBC Road Safety Assessment Policy & Procedure**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Road safety audits are undertaken on highway schemes at various stages of their design, construction and completion to ensure that they will not create future highway safety problems.
- 1.2 In 2003, the Highways Agency published revised guidance for carrying out Road Safety Audits on Trunk Roads and Motorways in document HD 19/03. This document is also recommended for use by local authorities on their roads but it is not a mandatory requirement.
- 1.3 The Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) published Road Safety Audit Guidelines in 2008. The guidelines give advice on where road safety audits may be approached in a different way to the requirements set out in HD 19/03 in order to fulfil the objectives of all authorities undertaking Road Safety Audits. The advice is based on a practical and reasonable response to the issues facing local highway authorities.

## **2 Purpose of Policy**

- 2.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the road safety assessment policy and procedure adopted by Solihull MBC.

### **3 Policy**

- 3.1 The Institution of Highways and Transportation Guidance indicates that it is essential for each local highway authority to review its internal works programme and its development schemes, and assess the level of audit which is appropriate.
- 3.2 The assessment can include the cost of a scheme but should not be restricted solely to cost. Issues such as the impact of the scheme in terms of traffic levels and mix, the status of the road within the road hierarchy and the exposure to risk for vulnerable road users should also be taken into account.
- 3.3 The following definitions set out the seven levels of safety assessments adopted by Solihull MBC. These are the basis for ensuring that the level of safety assessment is appropriate to the scale, complexity and nature of the proposed works:-
- A.** A full safety audit carried out in accordance with HD 19/03 guidance.
  - B.** A safety assessment at the three main stages: 1 - Preliminary Design, 2 - Detailed Design, and 3 - Pre-Opening. On occasions Stages 1 & 2 may be combined if necessary.
  - C.** As A or B above but an additional safety assessment should be undertaken prior to a traffic signal installation being switched on (Stage 3a).
  - D.** As A, but in addition a quality audit will be required. (*Section 8 outlines the process for undertaking a quality audit*).
- (*Section 5 outlines the procedure for Level A, B, C, & D safety assessments*).
- E.** An independent road safety review carried out by an experienced Road Safety Engineer. (*Section 6 details the road safety review process*).
  - F.** Self Certification where a Design Engineer will certify that the design has been assessed by him/herself. (*Section 7 details the self certification process*).
  - Q.** A Quality Audit that includes a Road Safety Champion will be required. (*Section 8 outlines the process for undertaking a quality audit*).
- 3.4 If the engineer undertaking either a Level E or F assessment considers at any time that the scheme necessitates a different level of safety assessment they are to refer the project to the Solihull MBC Road Safety team who will determine the appropriate level of road safety review which is required.

- 3.5 The Solihull MBC Road Safety team undertakes an annual review of the collision data within the borough. This collision analysis will be used as a substitute for the Stage 4 safety audit. Consequently, only larger schemes will require a Grade A assessment.
- 3.6 The following two tables indicate the **minimum** level of safety assessment. Table 1 includes works that are generated by Solihull MBC and the complexity of the scheme indicates which level of assessment should normally be used. Table 2 includes works funded by other sources, such as developers. The type of assessment of these schemes is determined by the level of impact that the scheme or development has on the immediate road network in terms of increased usage by all road users.

**Table 1 – Level of Safety Assessment of Solihull MBC Schemes**

Type of Scheme	<£10,000	£10,000-£125,000	£125,000-£249,000	>£249,000
Bridge Assessment & Strengthening	F	B	B	B
Highway Efficiency Measures	F	B	B	A
Highway Improvement Schemes	F	B	B	A
Local Safety Schemes	E	B	B	A
New/Improvements to Pedestrian Crossings or Traffic Signal Installations	F	B/C	B/C	A/C
Road Maintenance schemes which involve significant changes to the existing highway layout	F	B	B	B
Schemes in Areas of Special Interest *(see paragraph 3.7)	Q	Q	D	D
Streetscape Schemes **(see paragraph 3.8)	E	Q	D	D
Vulnerable Users	E	B	B	A

**Table 2 – Level of Safety Assessment of Externally Funded Schemes**

Type of Scheme	Impact 1	Impact 2	Impact 3
Section 38 – New estate roads	E	B	D
Section 106/278 – Works	E	B	A or D (as appropriate)

*Impact 1* – Where daily increased vehicle movements of less than 500, and/or less than 100 vulnerable road user movements (pedestrians or cyclists) are predicted to be generated by the development.

*Impact 2* – Where daily increased vehicle movements of between 500 and 5000, and/or between 100 and 500 vulnerable road user movements (pedestrians or cyclists) are predicted to be generated by the development.

*Impact 3* - Where daily increased vehicle movements of over 5000, and/or more than 500 vulnerable road user movements (pedestrians or cyclists) are predicted to be generated by the development.

- 3.7 In Table 1, schemes in the following areas of special interest may require a Grade Q, Quality Audit. The final decision will be made jointly by the Solihull MBC Road Safety and Transport Planning teams:
- Rural road in a village with frontage/pedestrian movement.
  - Strategic urban roads with frontage/pedestrian movement.
  - Centres of all scales including parades of shops.
  - Conservation areas.
  - Built up areas with major pedestrian movement.
- 3.8 In Table 1, “Streetscape” is a term used to describe the natural and built fabric of the street. Streetscape schemes improve the design quality of the street and its visual effect, particularly how the paved area (carriageway and footway) is laid out and treated. Such schemes may also include buildings, the street surface, and also the fixtures and fittings that facilitate its use – from bus shelters and signage to planting schemes.
- 3.9 Generally, temporary traffic arrangement schemes will not be audited as the design of such schemes should be considered as part of the CDM process used to monitor the proposed construction/installation of a highway improvement. However, for schemes with a complex temporary traffic arrangement, particularly on high speed roads, an audit may be required at the discretion of Solihull MBC Road Safety team.

- 3.10 It may only be necessary to undertake a quality audit and not a full safety audit for a Level D assessment. The final decision will be made at the discretion of the Solihull MBC Road Safety team.
- 3.11 Although, generally, Tables 1 & 2 will be followed the Solihull MBC Road Safety team reserve the right to request a different level of road safety assessment to be undertaken if it is considered appropriate.
- 3.12 A decision on what level of safety assessment is required for future schemes which are received and not covered by the general descriptions given in Tables 1 & 2 will be made on an individual basis by the Solihull MBC Road Safety team.
- 3.13 Section 4 of this document details the auditor requirements for Grade A, B, C, & D assessments. Sections 5, 6, & 7 of the policy document detail the separate levels of safety assessments and outline the procedure for each. Section 8 details the procedure for undertaking Quality Audits.

#### 4 Auditor Requirements for Levels A, B, C, D

4.1 This section shall apply to all highway schemes meeting the requirements for Road Safety Assessments – Levels A, B, C and D, in Tables 1 and 2, in section 3.6.

4.2 The Road Safety Assessment (Levels A, B, C, & D) Team for each stage of audit will comprise of at least two safety auditors with the levels of training, skills and experience defined in Table 3.

**Table 3 –Road Safety Auditors Experience and Training Requirements**

Title	Experience/Training Required
<b>Audit Team Leader</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of at least 4 years Accident Investigation and Prevention or safety engineering experience.</li> <li>• Completion of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents 10 day Accident Investigation &amp; Prevention course.</li> <li>• Undertaken at least five road safety audits in the last twelve months as a team leader or member.</li> <li>• Undertaken at least two days formal Continuous Professional Development road safety training in the last twelve months.</li> <li>• Hold a Road Safety Auditor Certificate of Competency.</li> </ul>
<b>Audit Team Member</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of at least two year's accident investigation/road safety experience.</li> <li>• Completion of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents 10 day Accident Investigation &amp; Prevention Course.</li> <li>• Undertaken at least five road safety audits in the last twelve months as either team leader, member or observer.</li> <li>• Undertaken at least two days formal Continuous Professional Development road safety training in the last twelve months.</li> <li>• Hold a Road Safety Auditor Certificate of Competency.</li> </ul>
<b>Audit Team Observer</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of one year's accident investigation or safety engineering experience.</li> </ul>
<b>Specialist Advisor</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be an experienced professional with a background in road safety, for example, police officer or be a person with a specialist interest such as a wheelchair user or a partially sighted person.</li> </ul>

4.3 In schemes where it is felt appropriate the Audit Team Leader can ask advice from a specialist advisor, e.g. a traffic signal engineer, highway maintenance engineer or police officer (preferably a traffic officer), but advisors should not be considered as part of the Audit Team.

- 4.4 The Council's Road Safety team may require organisations/auditors that wish to undertake audits within the borough to provide evidence that they meet the necessary standard.
- 4.5 It is essential that the members of the Road Safety Audit team are independent and have had no previous involvement in the design of the scheme.
- 4.6 For external organisations, such as independent engineering consultants, suitability will be determined by the submission of their curriculum vitae to the Solihull MBC Road Safety team. Requests may be made for copies of previous road safety audit reports which have been undertaken by the organisation to allow the Council to satisfy itself that the organisation has the experience and expertise to undertake the audit. The previous safety audits will also be used to determine if the necessary quality required by the Council can be met.
- 4.7 The organisation undertaking the audit may be required to submit a record of the CPD training undertaken by its members during the last twelve months to demonstrate that they meet the requirements stipulated in Table 3.

## **5 Policy and Procedures for Levels A, B, C & D**

- 5.1 The Design Team Leader is responsible for providing the Audit Brief and should send a formal request for any of the Safety Assessment Levels. The Brief should include the following (where appropriate):-
- A description of the section of carriageway or junction to be audited.
  - A description of the purpose of the scheme.
  - Detailed scheme drawings.
  - Known departures from standard.
  - Schedules of any traffic orders.
  - Copies of previous road safety audits undertaken on the scheme.
  - Previous exception reports relating to the scheme.
  - Existing traffic/pedestrian flows and predicted changes to these.
  - Most recently available three year collision data.
  - Any other information relating to proposals that the Design Team Leader considers would be required by the Audit Team.
- 5.2 The Audit Team shall prepare a written report in the “Ambridge” style (see description of Ambridge Style in glossary in Appendix 1) at all stages of the road safety audit including details of: -
- the scheme being audited.
  - the stage of audit.
  - the documents and drawings examined.
  - the Audit Team Members and details of the site visit (Date and time, weather and traffic conditions and attendees).
- 5.3 Furthermore, each road safety problem identified should be referenced as follows:
- Location of problem.
  - Specific casualty problem defined (i.e. which road user is at risk).
  - Detailed explanation of the problem.
  - Quantify the level of concern.
  - Recommendation to mitigate or remove problem.
  - Each problem separately referenced and identified on a location map.
- 5.4 In addition, the findings of the audit are then to be summarised in a “table” format which gives the Problem, Designers Response and the Highway Authority’s response. The table will allow the subsequent processes following the road safety audit to be more easily tracked. A specimen copy of the table format which is to be used is given in Appendix 2.
- 5.5 The completed report should be sent to the scheme designer/developer for his consideration and responses to the issues raised.
- 5.6 The design team/developer is required to respond to each of the issues raised by the safety audit by completing the relevant column in the table. They should state whether they intend to undertake the recommendation made by the road safety auditor. A reason should be provided explaining why a particular recommendation is not to be

accepted. The designer may offer an alternative solution to resolve the problem.

- 5.7 Solihull MBC Road Safety team will consider the road safety auditor's recommendation together with the designer's response and where there is a difference of opinion indicate a way forward.
- 5.8 The highway authority decision will be recorded in the appropriate column in the table and kept with the other documents associated with the particular audit, such as drawings etc, on the "electronic" road safety audit file. The highway authority will then advise the designer of the decision. It will be the designer's responsibility to forward the decision of the highway authority to the road safety auditors/developer's as appropriate.
- 5.9 The scheme should not commence on site until all the highway authority comments have been received and any modifications that are required incorporated into the design.
- 5.10 The completed audit together with the developer's/designer's responses, the Council's decision, and scheme drawings will be kept on file for a period which complies with the Council's corporate retention schedule.
- 5.11 Safety Audit reports and documentation may be required to be produced as part of legal proceedings or as a result of a Freedom of Information (FOI) request. When the Council is responding to a Freedom of Information request, the individual names of auditors should be omitted to comply with the Data Protection Act.

## **6 Road Safety Review Level E**

- 6.1 This section shall apply to all Highway schemes meeting the requirements for Level E Road Safety Review, in Tables 1 and 2, in section 3.6.
- 6.2 An Engineer from the Council's Road Safety team is considered to be an appropriate officer to undertake the road safety review. The independent engineer from the Council's Road Safety team will undertake a check of the proposed changes of the drawings submitted and an inspection of the site may be undertaken if it is necessary. The necessity for a site visit will be made on an individual scheme basis at the discretion of the engineer.
- 6.3 A written record will be made by the Road Safety Engineer of any problems identified and the design modifications that the designer/developer is required to make using a modified version of the Table in Appendix 2.
- 6.4 The designer/developer should respond in the appropriate column of the table by:-
- accepting to undertake the changes requested or
  - not accepting the road safety engineer's recommendation and submit a justification for not undertaking the change or
  - suggest an alternative proposal together with the justification in the appropriate column of the table.
- 6.5 A statement on whether or not the justification was accepted by the Solihull MBC Road Safety team should then be recorded on the table.
- 6.6 If the engineer undertaking a Level E assessment considers at any time that the scheme necessitates a different level of safety assessment they can refer the project to their line manager who will determine the appropriate level of road safety review required.

## **7 Self Certification Level F**

- 7.1 This section shall apply to all highway schemes meeting the requirements for Level F, Self Certification, in Tables 1 and 2, in section 3.6.
- 7.2 A design engineer will certify that the design has been assessed by him/herself.
- 7.3 The design engineer will use checklists provided by the Solihull MBC Road Safety team.
- 7.4 The design engineer will record that they have undertaken the self certification by initialling the project drawings and providing a written statement, preferably by email, to the Solihull MBC Road Safety Team stating that they have undertaken the self certification process.
- 7.5 The Solihull MBC Road Safety team will place the design engineer's self certification statement together with copies of the scheme drawings and documents on the electronic road safety audit file.
- 7.6 If the engineer undertaking a Level F assessment considers at any time that the scheme necessitates a different level of safety assessment they can refer the project to the Solihull MBC Road Safety team who will determine the appropriate level of road safety review required.

## **8 Quality Audit Definition and Process Level Q**

- 8.1 Quality Audit is a process, independent of, but involving the design team, which through the planning, design, construction and management stages of a project, provides a check that high quality places are delivered and maintained by all relevant parties, for the benefit of all end users. Quality audit is a process applied to highway, traffic management or development schemes, which systematically reviews projects using a series of evaluations and ensures that the broad objectives of place, functionality, maintenance and safety are achieved.
- 8.2 Any schemes that fall within road safety assessment Levels D or Q, in Tables 1 & 2 in paragraph 3.6, will require a Quality Audit to be undertaken.
- 8.3 Quality Audit for small schemes should be proportionate and may on occasions only involve one brief review meeting before construction commences. The final decision will be made jointly by Solihull MBC Road Safety and Transport Planning teams.
- 8.4 For larger schemes, a quality audit will include a review meeting(s) at outline design, detailed design, post construction and post opening stages where the project is reviewed against the design objectives set out in the brief.
- 8.5 All project briefs should include:
- Functional objectives
  - Streetscape objectives
  - Safety objectives
  - Maintenance objectives.
- 8.6 In addition, to the design team and appropriate council officers, the review meeting(s) should include a representative who is a Road Safety Champion. This individual should be independent and had no previous involvement with the scheme.
- 8.7 The Road Safety Champion should be familiar with the current version of Manual for Streets and be of the experience and standard required of a Road Safety Audit Team Leader detailed in Table 3 in paragraph 4.2. The champion's role is to challenge the design in terms of highway safety and public realm quality.
- 8.8 The results of the user audit should be worked through. The discussion and agreed decisions should be recorded and action points for the detailed design agreed.
- 8.9 Further quality audits should be planned at the detailed design stage and on the completion of construction.
- 8.10 A final user audit will be carried out when the scheme is completed and opened.

## **Appendix 1 - Glossary of Definitions**

*Ambridge Style* – A report which details each individual road safety audit comment by stating the location of the problem then followed by a general description of the problem; the likely effect if the issue is not resolved and an auditor's recommendation to alleviate the problem.

*Audit Brief* - The instructions to the Audit Team defining the scope and details of the Highway Scheme to be audited, including sufficient information for the audit to be undertaken.

*Audit Report* - The report produced by the Audit Team describing the road safety related problems identified by the team and the recommended solutions to those problems.

*Audit Team* - A team that works together on all aspects of the audit, independent of the Design Team. The team shall consist of a minimum of two persons with appropriate levels of training, skills and experience in Road Safety Engineering work and/or Accident Investigation.

*Audit Team Leader* - A person with the appropriate training, skills and experience who has overall responsibility for carrying out the audit, managing the Audit Team and certifying the report.

*Audit Team Member* - A member of the Audit Team with the appropriate training, skills and experience necessary for the audit of a specific scheme reporting to the Audit Team Leader.

*Audit Team Observer* - A person with the appropriate training, skills and experience accompanying the Audit Team to observe and gain experience of the audit procedure.

CDM –The CDM (Construction Design and Management) Regulations 1994 require clients to appoint a planning supervisor and principal contractor, and provide a health and safety plan & file.

*Design Team* - The team undertaking the various phases of scheme design, preparation and construction.

*Highway Authority* –Solihull MBC's Highway Services Division.

*Road Safety Audit* - The evaluation of Highway Improvement Schemes during design and at the end of construction (preferably before the scheme is open to traffic) to identify potential road safety problems that may affect any users of the highway and to suggest measures to eliminate or mitigate those problems. The Stage 4 Audit will include the analysis and reporting of 12 and 36 months of completed personal injury accident data from when the scheme became operational.

*Road Safety Engineer* –An engineer from the Council's Road Safety team. Can be at Principal Engineer, Senior Engineer or Engineer level.

*Vulnerable User* –A pedestrian, a highway worker, or a person riding an animal, scooter or a bicycle on the highway.

**Appendix 2 – Specimen Road Safety Audit Feedback Form**

**Title of Scheme - Road Safety Audit Feedback Form**

Item No.	Problem identified by Auditors and Recommended Measure	Designers' Response	Highway Authority Response
<p>RSA Para no.</p>	<p><u>Problem</u></p> <p><i>A brief description of the problem highlighted by the road safety auditors in this paragraph of their report.</i></p> <p><u>Recommendation</u></p> <p><i>The measure(s) recommended by the road safety auditor to alleviate the problem described above.</i></p>	<p><u>Problem Accepted &amp; Recommendation to be undertaken</u></p> <p><i>A statement by the designer accepting this particular road safety audit problem and agreeing to undertake the auditor's recommended solution.</i></p> <p><u>OR</u></p> <p><u>Recommended Measure not accepted.</u></p> <p><i>A statement by the designer refuting that this is a problem together with the reason why or offering an alternative solution to resolve the problem.</i></p>	<p><i>A statement by an engineer in the Council's Road Safety Team adjudicating on whether the road safety audit problem is justified and if the designers' response is adequate. The highway authority comment can offer an alternative solution if it is considered appropriate.</i></p>