

Dublin City Council

**Proposed Dublin City Metropanel
& Metropole Locations**

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

Dublin City Council

Proposed Dublin City Metropanel & Metropole Locations

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit

Document Ref:	10039 R01
----------------------	-----------

Rev	Prepared By	Reviewed By	Approved By	Issue Date	Reason for Revision
D1	DGF	PJM	-	10 th May 2010	First Draft

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Background.....	1
3	Main Report.....	2
3.1	General.....	2
3.2	Gardiner Street.....	2
3.3	Merrion Road.....	3
3.4	Temple Bar.....	3
3.5	Nassau Street.....	4
3.6	Baggot Street.....	4
3.7	Mount Street.....	4
3.8	North Earl Street.....	4
4	Audit Statement.....	5

Index of Appendices

Appendix A – Road Safety Audit Brief Checklist.....	6
Appendix B – Information Received.....	8
Appendix C – Feedback Form.....	10

1 Introduction

This report was prepared in response to a commission from Mr. Eoghan Madden of Dublin City Council to provide a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the Proposed Dublin City Metropanel & Metropole Locations.

The information supplied is listed in Appendix B. The information provided was considered adequate for the purposes of carrying out the road safety audit requested. The audit team members were as follows: -

Peter Monahan, (Team Leader)
Gene Flynn, (Team Member)

The road safety audit followed a site visit by both team members on the 10th May 2010. At the time of the site visit the weather was dry and the ground surface was dry. This Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of NRA HD 19/09 - Road Safety Audit, contained in Volume 5 of the National Roads Authority Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

The scheme has been examined and this report compiled in respect of the consideration of those matters that have an adverse effect on road safety. It has not been examined or verified for compliance with any other standards or criteria. The problems identified in this report are considered to require action in order to improve the safety of the scheme and minimise accident occurrence.

If any of the recommendations within this road safety audit report are not accepted, a written response is required, stating reasons for non-acceptance. Comments made within the report under the heading of Observation are intended to be for information only. Written responses to Observations are not required.

2 Background

It is proposed to provide metropole / metropanel items of roadside furniture at the following locations in Dublin City Centre:-

- Gardiner Street;
- Merrion Road;
- Baggot Street;
- Nassau Street;
- North Earl Street;
- Mount Street; and
- Temple Bar.

3 Main Report

3.1 General

3.1.1 Problem

It is proposed to provide metropoles with steel leg supports on the footpaths adjacent to Merrion Road and Gardiner Street. The drawings provided as part of the audit brief state that the cladding material to be used on these steel leg supports has not yet been decided. Should cladding material be provided which does not contrast in colour to the surrounding pavement there is a risk that these leg supports may be difficult to discern for visually impaired pedestrians.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the design team consider the provision of a cladding material of contrasting colour to the surrounding pavement.

3.2 Gardiner Street

3.2.1 Problem

The proposed location of the support leg for the metropole in the Gardiner Street eastern footpath is indicated as being offset from the rear of the footpath. The position of the leg support to the rear of the footpath, offset from the boundary wall may present a hazard to visually impaired pedestrians progressing to the rear of the footway.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposed metropole leg support be located in-line with the existing items of roadside furniture on the roadside edge of the footpath adjacent to Gardiner Street. In order to achieve this the leg support would have to be located on the opposite side of the metropole.

Care should be taken to ensure that the proposed sign is adequately offset from the running carriageway so as not to present a hazard to vehicles.

3.3 Merrion Road

3.3.1 Problem

The proposed location of the support leg for the metropole in the western footpath of the Merrion Road is indicated as being offset from the rear of the footpath towards the centre of the footpath. A number of other items of roadside furniture are currently located in the vicinity of the proposed metropole location including a public lighting column located close to the rear of the footpath and a number of road signs located close to the kerb.

The proposed position of the leg support, offset from the boundary wall and close to the existing public lighting column, may present a hazard to visually impaired pedestrians progressing to the rear of the footway.

Recommendation

It is recommended that a guardrail be provided on both approaches to the proposed metropole leg support and the existing public lighting column to provide guidance to visually impaired pedestrians. The guardrail provided should have a minimum upstand of 150mm in height to act as a tapping rail, and should terminate a maximum distance of 275mm from the boundary wall.

3.4 Temple Bar

3.4.1 Problem

It is proposed to provide a metropanel at Temple Bar adjacent to Crown Alley. This is a heavily trafficked area by pedestrians, particularly during evening hours. Should the metropanel be located as proposed it will result in a limited residual footpath width (less than 1m) between the kerb and the edge of the metropanel and may present an obstacle to mobility impaired movement.

In addition it is unclear to the audit team if it is proposed to relocate the existing public telephone booth in order to accommodate the proposed metropanel.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposed metropanel at Temple Bar be positioned at 90 degrees to the currently proposed orientation, in-line with existing roadside furniture items and the predominant direction of pedestrian traffic flow.

Alternatively ensure that the metropanel is sufficiently set-back from the carriageway edge as to ensure a minimum residual footpath width of 1.5m.

Should it be proposed to relocate the existing public telephone booth in order to accommodate the proposed metropanel details of the new location should be provided to the audit team for review.

3.5 Nassau Street

No specific issues relating to Road Safety were noted at this location.

3.6 Baggot Street

No specific issues relating to Road Safety were noted at this location.

3.7 Mount Street

No specific issues relating to Road Safety were noted at this location.

3.8 North Earl Street

No specific issues relating to Road Safety were noted at this location.

4 Audit Statement

We certify that we have examined the drawings referred to in 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 would recommend should be studied for implementation. The Audit has been carried out by the persons named below who have not been involved in any design work on this scheme as a member of the design team.

Peter Monahan Signed: _____

(Audit Team Leader) Dated: _____

Gene Flynn Signed: _____

(Audit Team Member) Dated: _____

Appendix A – Road Safety Audit Brief Checklist

Have the following been included in the audit brief?: (if 'No', reasons should be given below)

	Yes	No
1. The Design Brief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Departures from Standard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Scheme Drawings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Scheme Details such as signs schedules, traffic signal staging	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Collision data for existing roads affected by scheme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Traffic surveys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Previous Road Safety Audit Reports and Designer Responses/Feedback Form	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Previous Exception Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Start date for construction and expected opening date	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Any elements to be excluded from audit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Any other information? (if 'Yes', describe below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix B – Information Received

List of Information Provided

- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Gardiner Street Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Gardiner Street Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Gardiner Street Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Gardiner Street Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Nassau Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Nassau Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Nassau Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Nassau Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Baggot Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Baggot Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Baggot Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Baggot Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Mount Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Mount Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Mount Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Mount Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Merrion Road Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Merrion Road Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Merrion Road Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Merrion Road Metropole”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “Temple Bar Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “Temple Bar Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “Temple Bar Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “Temple Bar Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 1 entitled “North Earl Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 2 entitled “North Earl Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 3 entitled “North Earl Street Metropanel”;
- Drawing No. 4 entitled “North Earl Street Metropanel”; and
- Drawing entitled “Plan, Sections & Elevations”.

Appendix C – Feedback Form

Road Safety Audit Feedback Form

Scheme: Proposed Dublin City Metropanel & Metropole Locations

Route No.: _____

Audit Stage: 1 Date Audit Completed: 10th May 2010

To Be Completed By Designer				To Be Completed By Audit Team Leader
Paragraph No. in Safety Audit Report	Problem Accepted (Yes/No)	Recommended Measure(s) Accepted (Yes/No)	Describe Alternative Measure(s). Give reasons for not accepting recommended measure	Alternative Measures or Reasons Accepted by Auditors (Yes/No)
3.1.1				
3.2.1				
3.3.1				
3.4.1				3

Signed: _____ Designer Date: _____

Signed: _____ Audit Team Leader Date: _____

Signed: _____ Employer Date: _____