

2304 Low Impact Scheme (LIS) – Pre-construction Safety Assessment



Ripe Parish Council – Island Improvement Scheme

Site Meeting Notes – 21st September 2021

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Safety audit process

1.1.1 Officers of East Sussex County Council have considered the proposed scheme to be of low impact and agreed that it was appropriate to undertake an on-site safety assessment. This assessment considers the issues that might have been raised as part of either Stage 1 or Stage 2 Road Safety Audits (pre-construction).

1.2 Scheme Promoter

Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council – Paul Richards – Parish Clerk

1.3 Site assessed by:

1.3.1 [REDACTED] Road Safety team (ESCC)

[REDACTED] – Transport Development Control (ESCC)

Steven Seear (RIBA Architect)

Cllr Geoff White (CWRPC) and Paul Richards (Clerk, CWRPC).

1.4 Documents examined

1.4.1 Drawing Numbers:

- 2106 Traffic Island One Exist Plan
- 2106 Traffic Island One Prop Plan - as per site meeting
- 2106 Traffic Island One Exist And Prop Elevs - as per site meetings
- 2106 Traffic Island Two Prop Plan - as per site meeting
- 2106 Traffic Island Two Exist Plan
- 2106 Location And Block Plans
- 2106 Power Supply Plan
- 9217-1
- 9217-2

1.5 Scheme Description

To improve the two islands in the centre of Ripe Village. To remove seating from one island and install seating on the other close to the Village Shop which is already used informally for seating.

2.0 Safety Assessment

█ advised that CWRPC should note any discussions and submit a copy of the notes of meeting to ESCC. █ reminded CWRPC that they will need both a site and road space licence for the works to proceed if agreed. He also advised that no WDC planning application would be required for the proposed works as this was a matter for ESCC Highways. █ then posed a number of questions and queries.

2.1 Site Issues - Main Island adjacent to the Ripe Stores

- 2.1.1 General – █ advised that ESCC records show only one ‘slight’ accident recorded at this location in 20 years. It was noted from the brief that vehicle speeds are low, and the proposed layout accommodates a situation that presently occurs.
- 2.1.2 Radius – █ queried the shape of the design. SS explained that the existing ‘egg’ shape of the island is not changing vastly but creates a neater circular shape reflecting the pattern of traffic use. █ suggested that vehicle swept paths are checked to ensure that any areas where the kerblines protrude beyond the existing does not adversely impact large vehicle movements;
- 2.1.3 Gradient – █ noted that the design should incorporate a maximum slope on the grass of 1 in 12 to allow for wheelchair access. SS agreed to review this and incorporate into a revised design;
- 2.1.4 Manhole covers – █ suggested that the manhole and utility covers should be replaced with a non-slip design given the anticipated pedestrian traffic on the island. SS agreed to review this and incorporate into a revised design;
- 2.1.5 Stop Valve post – █ suggested that the existing SV post was a low-level trip hazard and should be re-located. CWRPC agreed to contact the utility company and propose either a plate on the new bench or a suitable relocation;
- 2.1.6 Kerb upstand specification – █ queried why the bricks were offset and angled to the road. SS explained that the slight gradient in the design allowed for a ‘rumble-strip’ allowing vehicles to cross onto the kerbs without damage on a 1 in 12 incline. The requirements for a 6mm clearance for drainage and maximum upstand of 10mm to accommodate pedestrians were noted. SS advised that the kerbstones would sit atop of a concrete base to allow support;
- 2.1.7 Maintenance – █ advised that the ESCC highways maintenance team would maintain the islands from 12 months after installation. The maintenance team had no specific queries but █ reminded CWRPC that if repairs were needed, only basic measures would be taken. If like-for-like repairs were needed e.g., replacing kerbstones, then CWRPC would need to fund this. █ will provide to CWRPC an example fund calculation;
- 2.1.8 Sign height – █ suggested a minimum sign height of 2.3m to reduce the likelihood of head injuries to cyclists; and

2.1.9 Concrete slab – ■■■ suggested that a flat concrete slab might create water pooling which would present a slip hazard to pedestrians, and a slight gradient could be introduced to allow surface runoff to drain to the surrounding verge. SS agreed to review this and incorporate into a revised design with a 1 in 20 run-off.

2.2 Site Issues - Small Island

2.2.1 SS advised that his design effectively 'rounded-off' the kerb at the north east junction. ■■■ advised that hatchings on the highway might be considered to maintain the current alignment and discourage faster vehicle turning speeds at the junction. SS agreed to review this and incorporate into a revised design; and

2.2.2 ■■■ noticed the rutting inside the kerbstones to the south west junction. It was agreed that the kerbstones should be set to reflect the line of rutting and prevent further erosion once the new kerbing has been installed. SS agreed to review this and incorporate into a revised design.

3.0 Joint Safety Statement

3.1 These notes have been accepted as a true record of the safety assessment meeting.

Scheme Designer: Signature *P. S. Richards*

Date: 5/10/2021

Safety Auditor: Signature..... ■■■

Date: *5/10/21*

Meeting notes prepared by: Paul Richards, Clerk to Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council