Appendix D

North Yorkshire Council

TCF Harrogate

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit July 2025 – Designer Responses

Project Number: UK0029001
Our Ref. No: UK0029001_RSA_2_2025 Designers Response
Date: October 2025

Confidential

Ref	Remarks	Date	Made by	Checked by	Approved by
1	Draft response for review	19/9/25	Paul Field-Williams	Callum Henderson	Nick Clarke

1. Introduction

1.1 This report provides comments/responses to the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit (RSA) carried out on the proposed TCF Harrogate Scheme on behalf of North Yorkshire Council (NYC). The Road Safety Audit was completed 25th July 2025.

STAGE 1 PROBLEM 14 (CARRIED FORWARD FROM MAY 2023 REPORT) Location: Albert Street (Drawing: 70068634-WSP-GEN-OBC-DR-CH-XX04). Summary: Service vehicle tracking / conflict with on street parking bays leading to vehicle-to vehicle collisions. The scheme incorporates a loading bay to the western extents of Albert Street (opposite a private access). On the eastern extent of Albert Street, a series of on-street parking bays and a service bay directly opposite a disabled parking bay are proposed. At busy times the effective width of Albert Street will be reduced significantly with 'pinch' points created by parked vehicles. This may result in turning movements from accesses being restricted and service vehicles being unable to negotiate the corridor resulting in vehicle-to-vehicle type collisions.	**RECOMMENDATION** RECOMMENDATION AT STAGE 1 AUDIT It is recommended that the suitability and layout of the Albert Street corridor be confirmed through the use of vehicle tracking software.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** This part of the scheme has been de-scoped. There are no longer proposals to alter the existing markings/traffic management arrangements in Albert. The current proposal allows only for 'refreshing' the markings of the Loading Bay on the southern kerb line.	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Recommendation superseded.
STAGE 2 PROBLEM G7(CARRIED FORWARD FROM MAY 2023 REPORT) Location: Throughout the scheme.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the bays are designed with a flush kerb at the back and across the majority of the width, or colour contrast is	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** The kerb face will provide a defined edge at the back of the parking/loading bay. This	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Agree with designers' response. Recommendation rejected.

Summary: Kerb detail of inset parking & loading bays creating trip hazards for pedestrians. Inset parking and loading, and taxi bays are specified with a K1 half battered kerb at the back of the bay, with either a 100mm or 60mm upstand. The footways are to be paved in York stone slabs and the bays are to be paved in York stone setts, with a natural stone kerb. With no colour or tonal contrast, pedestrians with visual impairments or not paying attention may not be able to identify the kerb in their path when the bays are unoccupied and could trip and fall.	provided to highlight the bays when not in use.	will deter errant parking with vehicles straddling the bay and footway which would be dangerous for all pedestrians. In addition, the upstand helps partially sighted people identify defined parts of the footway when using a cane or guide dog, indicating where vehicles may be present. The yorkstone paving provides a clear visual contrast to the granite kerbing. Additionally, there is a noticeable visual difference between the yorkstone setts in the parking areas and the flags used for the footways.	
STAGE 2 (JULY 2024) GENERAL PROBLEM G1 Location: Signalised crossings throughout the scheme. Summary: Signalled crossings not incorporating tactile cones on all push buttons. Traffic signals throughout the scheme include push buttons on both upstream and downstream sides of crossings. Tactile cones are only provided on the right-hand side of the crossings, where the tactile paving tails are located. Some visually impaired pedestrians familiar with the area may locate the crossing without using the tails and may prefer to cross from the left side of the crossing. Without the tactile cone, this may result in them having insufficient information to determine when to cross and could result in them being struck by vehicles.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that tactile cones are provided on all push buttons.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** As per inclusive mobility guidance and TSRGD (2016): "the pedestrian demand unit should be installed between the area where pedestrians are waiting and the nearest approaching traffic. This is to encourage people to observe approaching vehicles. This usually means that the unit is installed to the right of pedestrians (facing on-coming traffic). This is compatible with the training from Guide dogs for the blind to guide a person from the left" to the push button and tactile cone. However, a 3rd and 4th tactile cone can be added to the left-hand units if required.	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** We accept and will adhere to the inclusive mobility guidance and reject the recommendation.
Stage 2 (JULY 2024) PROBLEM 7 **Location: Station Parade junction with Cheltenham Parade.**	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the crossings in the northern and southern arms are	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** All crossing points have been designed to balance pedestrian	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Break preferred. Instruction to be issued to contractor on site.

(UK0029001-WSP-TCHHGPN-DR-C-20101-P01.01). Summary: Overlapping tactile paving creating confusion for visually impaired pedestrians. Tactile paving for the proposed crossing layouts on the north-east and south-east corners of the junction are overlapping and could result in confusion for visually impaired pedestrians. This could result in them inadvertently stepping into the carriageway, or in the case of paving laid on the radius, could result in them crossing in the wrong direction and failing to find the kerb on the other side, increasing their exposure to risk of being hit by vehicles.	moved slightly further away from the junction.	desire lines, pedestrian safety and accessibility for motorised users and considering the physical geometry and boundaries of the site. It is recommended initially that engagement with Guide Dogs for the Blind and the local Access group are consulted to identify any concerns they may have. Options to relocate the northern and southern crossings can be explored if required.	
Stage 2 (JULY 2024) PROBLEM 9 **Location: General – segregated cycle route.** **(UK0029001-WSP-TCHHGPN-DR-C-20101-P01.01 / 30101-P01.01).** Summary: Cycle segregation units (CSUs) are proposed with a 125mm upstand throughout the cycle facility. There is an unbroken length of 80m between the Cheltenham Parade junction and the bus station exit. The cycle lane appears to be 1.7m wide. This section of the route is uphill, meaning that some cyclists may be slow, or take additional room if they struggle on the hill while others may wish to overtake. LTN 1/20 suggests a 2.0m minimum for a kerbed cycle track to allow overtaking. Faster cyclists may try to overtake where there is insufficient room, causing slower or less confident cyclists to fall. They may attempt to overtake where there are gaps in the CSUs by entering the traffic lane where there are passing vehicles, resulting in shunts, or cyclists being struck.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the cycle track is widened in line with LTN 1/20 guidance, or CSUs are removed or reduced in height so that they can be ridden across without causing problems for cycles. If the kerbs are removed, a natural stone surface dressing is recommended.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** Whilst it is accepted that desirable widths for cycles have not been achieved in this section, LTN 1/20 suggests however, that 1.5m is acceptable in localised areas and it is considered that a slightly narrower segregated cycle lane is safer than no facility at all. The height of the CSU is 125mm and bevelled. This is a standard unit used in many other cycle schemes in the UK. This kerb will deter other vehicles attempting to cross into the cycle lane and therefore protecting cyclists. Encouraging cycles to overtake by leaving/crossing over the CSU may put them in conflict with vehicles in the traffic lane behind them. Confident cyclists who prefer to travel at faster	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** There is a very slight gradient on Station Parade. we accept the designers response and reject the recommendation.

In areas where there are trees proposed, leaves may collect against the CSUs, making the cycle track slippery or further reducing the useable width.		speeds can use the general traffic lane, as permitted by the Highway Code, if they feel that the cycle lane will slow them down. Alternatively, they can maintain a slower speed for that section, just as other road users would in similar circumstances. Design options could include replacing the kerbs with a solid white line that can be physically crossed (by cycles and motorists) or removing the cycle lane and providing no facility for cycles.	
Stage 2 (JULY 2024) PROBLEM 13 **Location: Station Parade (South) opposite James Street.** **(UK0029001-WSP-TCHHGPN-DR-C-30101-P01.01).** Summary: Extent of CSUs unable to accommodate cycle movements. The CSUs extend from the station across the James Street junction and terminate at the ASL for the Station Bridge junction. Cyclists wishing to join the cycle track from James Street will be unable to do so. Similarly, cyclists in the cycle track wanting to turn into Albert Street will have only a short length to cross two lanes of traffic, including left turning traffic. This could result in cycle collisions with other traffic.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the CSUs are removed over this length, or altogether on approach to the junction.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** A gap in the CSU has been proposed to allow cycles to join the cycle facility from James St. This can however be extended to increase the gap if required.	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Increase the gap south by a metre. To be instructed on site.
PROBLEM 1 **Location: Station Parade south of Cheltenham Parade.** **(UK0029001-WSP-TCHHGPN-DR-C-20101-C01).** Summary: Right turning vehicles in 2 lanes merging when loading vehicles are present, resulting in shunts and side collisions.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that loading restrictions are extended further south to allow adequate time for vehicles to merge.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** The off-peak loading restrictions provide a valuable opportunity for local traders to load and unload. By virtue of the restrictions being 'off-peak' traffic volumes at expected to be low. It is	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** The Council recognises the importance to traders of loading capability. The conditions described within the problem are common in a town centre where a compromise between all users is necessary. The council will monitor

Vehicles will be permitted to turn right from both lanes from Cheltenham Parade into Station Parade. Loading will be permitted off peak immediately after the junction on the right-hand side, forcing vehicles to merge where they will have limited forward visibility and may therefore not expect to merge. This could result in shunts and side collisions.		accepted that on many town centre streets there may be temporary obstructions. Traffic speeds are low and in the main, such issues resolve themselves by motorists waiting for a safe and convenient opportunity to move ahead. If required, the loading restrictions can be altered to 24hrs but, this will remove the loading opportunities in this area, and statutory consultation will be required.	for 6 months post completion with vivacity camera. We reject the recommendation.
PROBLEM 2 **Location: Station Parade, south of Cheltenham Parade.** Summary: Cycle lane creating a pinch point for right turning vehicles, resulting in side collisions. The intended route for cyclists proceeding south across the junction is marked with "elephant's feet" Diagram 1055.3. The nearside line runs outside of the double yellow line on the south side of the junction, and the outer edge of the offside line is 3m from the kerb. This restricts the width for two lanes of right turning traffic to 5.5m. This could result in collisions between right turning vehicles.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the nearside line of 1055.3 markings is terminated north of the double yellow line and realigned so that it leads directly into the kerb, and the offside marking is adjusted to line up with the CSU south of the crossing to maximise the available width for right turning vehicles.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** Accepted. This alteration can be made if required.	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Recommendation accepted.
PPROBLEM 3 **Location: Station Parade junction with Station Bridge.** Summary: Cyclists proceeding south unable to merge, resulting in side collisions with other vehicles. A buildout is proposed south of Station Bridge to protect the loading bay. The width of the carriageway next to the buildout is 7.4m, matching the width next to the CSU	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the presence of cyclists in the carriageway is highlighted in advance of the crossing. It is also recommended that the lane markings south of James Street are offset so that the left lane is wider than the right lane to	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** Accepted. This can be accommodated if required.	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Recommendation accepted. Please move by one metre on drawings.

on the north side of the junction. Cyclists heading south on Station Parade beyond Station Bridge. The Audit Team consider that cyclists will ignore any cycle specific signals that prevent them from proceeding when general traffic is at green, forcing them to merge with general traffic south of the junction, next to the buildout. This could result in side collisions between cyclists and other vehicles.	take account of the presence of cyclists.		
PROBLEM 4 **Location: Station Parade / Bus Station exit.** Summary: Carriageway narrowing through raised table and bus station exit leading to side collisions between vehicles. The proposed layout of Station Parade is that of two southbound lanes with a raised table signalised crossing connecting the bus station with the town centre for pedestrians. The southbound traffic lanes look to narrow to a pinch point at the raised table crossing and bus station exit. There is also a slight bend in the road at this location. Station Parade is subject to high traffic flows including loading vehicles such as HGV's and buses, the narrow carriageway could lead to side- by-side collisions where the carriageway is insufficient in width for vehicles to be travelling adjacent to one another. This risk is further exacerbated due to the vehicles having to navigate the bend in the road through this section.	**RECOMMENDATION** It is recommended that the carriageway maintains a consistent width through station parade that is suitable for large vehicles to travel side by side.	**DESIGNERS RESPONSE** It is accepted that there is a localised 'pinch point' at this location where the carriageway is proposed at 6.15m. This was designed to avoid a possible clash with utilities. Although not desirable, the widths comply to DMRB & Manual for Streets, which states that although 'not necessarily a recommendation' the widths of roads with two HGV travelling side by side can be accommodated at 5.5m	**CLIENTS COMMENTS** Accept designers response and reject recommendation.