

# CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION TEAM

### SAFETY AUDIT STAGE 2a

**Scheme:** A603 Gonville Place - Gresham Road

**Date of Report:** 07 August 2006

**Auditor(s):** Malcolm Mugridge  
Andrea Haslock

**Information Supplied:** Dwg No G479/155/014

#### Introduction

The Audit was carried out at the request of:

**Name** Terry Bedding  
**Job Title** Signals Engineer  
**Organisation** Cambridgeshire County Council

The terms of reference of the audit are as described in HD 19/03. The audit has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the designs to any other criteria or design standards. Design standards are quoted only where those standards have road safety implications.

All comments and recommendations are referenced to the detailed design drawings specified above.

#### **Notified Departures from Standard - None notified**

Scheme outline: *(Description of proposals, reference to appendix or supplementary sketch if required)*. – Installation of cycle loops at existing toucan crossing.

Daytime site visit: 07 August 2006

Attending: Malcolm Mugridge  
Andrea Haslock

Conditions at Visit:  
Weather: Fine  
Traffic: Medium

Other

Existing Injury Accident Details (Where applicable):

In the period 1 January 2000 to 31 December 2005 there has been 8 reported injury accidents in the vicinity of the crossing but of these one was in Gresham Road before it was closed to traffic. There has only been 1 pedestrian and 1 cycle collision. The only common factor crashes are the 3 rear end shunts that have occurred. The worrying aspect is that 5 of these 8 accidents have occurred in the latter 5 months of 2005.

Items Raised at Stage 1 Audit:

None

## **B1 GENERAL COMMENTS**

### **B1.1 Problem**

Although it is understood that the loops will be unidirectional and that cyclists exiting the crossing will not activate the crossing needlessly, cyclists were witnessed riding over the proposed loop locations on the Gresham Road approach to the crossing but turning right and cycling north along the footway. Cyclists were also witnessed riding north along the cycleway on the western side of Gonville Place, past the crossing.

This is likely to result in the crossing activating at times when there are no pedestrians/cyclists wishing to cross, resulting in increased driver frustration. This in turn could lead to shunt type accidents. It may also lead drivers to believe that the crossing is faulty, and they may be tempted to take less notice of it. Similarly pedestrians with buggies etc could activate the crossing accidentally.

Cyclists approaching from Gresham Road are masked from vehicles until they are very close to the crossing but are able to see well in advance whether the signal is in their favour and may therefore not slow on their approach. Drivers may therefore be tempted to risk the last stages of the amber light and be surprised as a cyclist appears.

Cyclists who become used to the crossing activating automatically may not give their full attention to the oncoming traffic. The introduction of Puffin type crossings was intended to ensure that vulnerable road users were looking in the direction of the approaching traffic whilst waiting to cross, thereby reducing the risk of a pedestrian or cyclist automatically entering the carriageway as soon as the green man appears without checking that the traffic had stopped. Accidents of this type have occurred at similar crossings in Cambridge, in particular at Maids Causeway/Fair Street.

**Recommendation**

The auditors can see very little benefit to the installation of cycle loops at this location, and believe that they are likely to have a negative effect on the safety of cyclists using the crossing. It is therefore the opinion of the auditors that for the reasons stated above cycle loops should not be sited at this location

**Audit Team Statement**

We certify that we have examined the drawings and documents listed at the commencement of this report. The examination has been carried out with the sole purpose of identifying any features of the design that could be removed or modified in order to improve the safety of the scheme. The problems identified have been noted in this report together with associated safety improvement suggestions which we recommend should be studied for implementation. No one in the Audit Team has been involved with the scheme design.

**Malcolm Mugridge**

**Audit team leader**

Accident Investigation Team  
Office of Environment & Community  
Services  
ET1018  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Shire Hall  
Cambridge  
CB3 0AP

Signed

-----

Date

-----

**Andrea Haslock**

**Audit member**

Accident Investigation Team  
Office of Environment & Community  
Services  
ET1018  
Cambridgeshire County Council  
Shire Hall  
Cambridge  
CB3 0AP

Signed

-----

Date

-----

**CAMBRIDGESHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION TEAM**

---

**RESPONSE TO STAGE 2 SAFETY AUDIT**

---

**Scheme:** .....

**Date of Report:** .....

**Auditor(s):** .....

The Audit was carried out at the request of:

**Name** .....

**Job Title** .....

**Organisation** .....

Please give your comments on the points raised in the audit in the table below, continuing on the attached sheet as necessary. For CCC personnel, this form is also available electronically in the 'ET Shared/Accinv/Audit Responses' folder, or a copy may be obtained by emailing Sue.Parsons@cambridgeshire.gov.uk.

<i>Item Reference</i>	<i>Accepted (Y/N)</i>	<i>Action Taken/Reasons for Non-Compliance</i>

**Respondent's Name**

Signed .....

Date .....

**Received by Audit Team**

Date .....

---

<b>Item Reference</b>	<b>Accepted (Y/N)</b>	<b>Comments</b>