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1. Introduction

AECOM was commissioned by the National Transport Authority (NTA) to undertake a Road Safety Audit of a proposed Core Bus Corridor (CBC) scheme running from Dun Laoghaire to the City Centre. The Stage F Audit assessed the safety implications of the scheme for all road users and outlined recommendations for solving the problems. This report presents the designers’ responses to the problems identified and states whether the recommended measures, as per the RSA, or otherwise will be accepted.

1. Designers Response to Road Safety Audit

* Scheme: Dun Laoghaire to City Centre CBC
* Audit Stage: Stage F Road Safety Audit (RSA)
* Date Audit Completed: July 2017

Table below presents responses to items raised in the Stage F RSA. It demonstrates acceptance, or otherwise, of the comments raised.

|  |  | To be completed by Designer | | | | | To be completed by Audit Team Leader | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Problem | Chainage | Problem Accepted | | Measure Accepted | | Designers Response | Alternative Measures Accepted | |
| Yes | No | Yes | No |  | Yes | No |
| 4.2.1 | 575 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 1.8m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
|  | 1725 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 1.8m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
|  | 1850-1900 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 1.9m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
|  | 3250 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 1.8m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
|  | 4800 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 2m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
|  | 4800 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Agreed. Footpath width is 1.62m at narrowest section. The width of the adjacent designed cycle facility exceeds minimum required, therefore the updated design will redistribute the space between the proposed footpaths and cycle lane in balance. | Yes. |  |
|  | 5000 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Footpath width is 1.9m at narrowest section. |  | No. |
| 4.2.2 | 4325 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Proposed design is okay, higher demand (i.e. residential/Bellevue Avenue) was given preference. |  | No. |
|  | 4000 | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. A new staggered toucan crossing is proposed to address this issue. |  | No. |
| 4.2.3 | 1700 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Proposed design is okay. |  | No. |
|  | 3450 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Proposed design is okay. |  | No. |
|  | 5325 Southbound | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Indented bus lane is proposed. | Yes. |  |
|  | 5325  Northbound | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Disagree. Proposed design is okay. |  |  |
|  | 5550 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Proposed design is okay. |  | No. |
|  | 5675  Southbound | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Bus stop will be widened. | Yes. |  |
|  | 5975  Northbound | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Design will include pedestrian crossing. | Yes. |  |
|  | 6475 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Design will include a longer bus gate. | Yes. |  |
| 4.2.4 | 800 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. Wellington Road junction will be signalised, which will involve a loss of parking spaces and relocation of proposed bus stop. | Yes. |  |
|  | 3500 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. The pedestrian crossing is relocated 70m to the south to facilitate the wider area pedestrian movements. |  | No. |
|  | 4000 | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Pedestrian crossing is required through median. |  | No. |
|  | 5100 | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Possible signalisation of this junction to allow for both right turning movements and pedestrian crossings. | Yes. |  |
|  | 5375 | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Pedestrian crossing to be provided at Ch-5360. Southbound bus stop to be relocated further downstream. |  | No. |
| 4.2.5 | 4450 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Existing short lane is of very limited capacity and the removal benefits all road users. |  | No. |
| 4.2.6 | 250 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 775 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 1150 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 1775 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2000 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2250 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2375 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2425 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2475 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2725 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2775 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 2875 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 6340 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 6575 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 7100 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 7275 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
|  | 7275 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Provision of pedestrian facility according to DMURS, as required. | Yes. |  |
| 4.2.7 | 0-325 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. A decision will be made at a later design stage whether to include on-road cycle lanes or raised cycle tracks in the space provided for cycle facilities. |  | No. |
|  | 600-1100 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. A decision will be made at a later design stage whether to include on-road cycle lanes or raised cycle tracks in the space provided for cycle facilities. |  | No. |
|  | 1200-1450 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. A decision will be made at a later design stage whether to include on-road cycle lanes or raised cycle tracks in the space provided for cycle facilities. |  | No. |
|  | 1925-2100 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. A decision will be made at a later design stage whether to include on-road cycle lanes or raised cycle tracks in the space provided for cycle facilities. |  | No. |
|  | 2150-3000 | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agree. A decision will be made at a later design stage whether to include on-road cycle lanes or raised cycle tracks in the space provided for cycle facilities. |  | No. |
| 4.3.1 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. |  | No. |
| 4.3.2 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. The northbound cyclists will have a great risk conflicting with westbound cyclists. Design remains as is. |  | No. |
| 4.3.3 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Yield Markings will be provided on the bus lane. |  | No. |
| 4.3.4 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Cycle lane width will be in accordance with National Cycle Manual. |  | No. |
| 4.3.5 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. Due to the direction of adjacent traffic, the majority of parked vehicles will west-facing and open their door onto the bus lane rather than the cycle lane. | Yes | No. |
| 4.3.6 |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. Junction will be signalised | Yes |  |
| 4.3.7 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. A 0.79m buffer can be established (minimum buffer 0.75m). |  | No. |
| 4.3.8 | Ask Robbie | ✓ |  |  | ✓ | Agreed. The width of Temple Hill Avenue will be reduced at the Temple Hill junction and the bus lane will be extended. | Yes |  |
| 4.4.1 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. |  | No. |
| 4.4.2 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. The *straight-ahead and left* road marking at Chainage 4475 will be replaced by *Left Turn Only Except Bus*. |  | No. |
| 4.4.3 |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ | Disagree. |  | No. |
| 4.4.4 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Right turn lane will be reflected in any junction modelling. |  | No. |
| 4.4.5 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Right turning stage will be removed. |  | No. |
| 4.4.6 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. Stop line will be provided on bus lane at Chainage 7000. |  | No. |
| 4.4.7 |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |  | Agreed. The *STOP* road markings will be removed from the signal controlled junction at Chainage 7075. |  | No. |