

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form:

 Planned Maintenance Resurfacing Station 17/SE/0301/006

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form:

Planned Maintenance Resurfacing

| 1. Scheme Name |
| :--- |
| 2. Scheme ID |
| 4. Work Year |
| SCHEME LOCATION |

A7 Hawick Police Station

\left.| 6. Road | A7 | 7. Location Description |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\right]$ East Stewart Place to Hawick Police $\quad$ 11039/36

SCHEME DETAILS

| 9. Carriageway $\times$ Section | CL1 \& CR1 |  | AADT | \%HGV | Year of count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10. Scheme Length (m) | 242 |  | 6165 | 12 | 2015 |
| 12. Traffic Management Restrictions | All restrictions shall comply with Sch 9 Pt 1 (Appendix 1/17) |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Network Operations equipment affected | No | N/A |  |  |  |
| 14. Other relevant site details | This scheme is in an urban location. The carriageway width is greater than 6.5 m and the works shall be undertaken using controlled Traffic Management. Drainage consists of a positive system using kerb/ top entry gullies. |  |  |  |  |
| CONDITION ASSESSMENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. Summary defect photographs attached? | Yes | Photos Attached |  |  |  |


| Comments | This area was highlighted due to the number of various failed patches, potholes and areas of cracking. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. Pavement Condition data from IRIS | In general, Iris suggests that deflectorgraph data is generally good with greater than 5 years residual life remaining. IRIS confirms RUT Data is less than 10 mm , this figure in association with positive residual life, suggests the existing pavement has no immediate structural issues and all defects are restricted to the surface layers. IRIS also confirms SCRIM values are poor throuahout. |  |  |
| 17. Maintenance history/overview | IRIS data confirms the last recorded maintenance was carried out in; |  | 2011 |
| FURTHER INVESTIGATION |  |  |  |
| 18 Further Investigation required? | No | N/A |  |
| 19. Scope, intended purpose and cost of any proposed further investigation and design works | Indicative Construction Cost | Cost of I and D (£) |  |
|  |  | £0.00 |  |
|  |  | $£ 0.00$ |  |
|  |  | £0.00 |  |

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form:

Planned Maintenance Resurfacing


| Revision Number | Date Issued | Comments |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  |

# Statement of Intent (SOI) Form: <br> Planned Maintenance Resurfacing 

## Location Plan



## Accident Stats

| A 7 |  | 11039/36 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | A7 (110: 443714 | 0000625 350908 616358 |  |  | 44371400000625 350908 616358 13/0272015 SLIGHT [SC03] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Cat 2 Defects

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE62279042- } \\ & 235189458 \end{aligned}$ | Pothole (POTH CATEGORY 2 | A7 | 11039/36 | CAT2 <br> POTHOLE <br> $8 \times 0.5 \mathrm{M}$ | Chainage: 135 m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SE59116146- } \\ & 341 \end{aligned}$ | Bituminous surl CATEGORY 2 | A7 | 11039/36 | A7 C/WAY <br> N/B \& S/B <br> FRETTING | Chainage: 226 m |

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form: <br> Planned Maintenance Resurfacing

## Visual Survey



CL1
CR1

| CL1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CR1 |  |


| Key |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cat 2 Pothole | Patch/Utility Repair $\square$ | Fretting $\square$ | Core | Joint <br> Failure <br> - | Cracking <br> $\square$ | Gully $\square$ | Nodes | Rutting | Manhole |

Statement of Intent (SOI) Form:
Planned Maintenance Resurfacing

## Patching Schedule






| CL1 |
| :---: |
| CR1 |

Key

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form: Planned Maintenance Resurfacing

## Photographs



11039/36 ch56m start of scheme, fretting
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TRANSPORT SCOTLAND


11039/36 ch95m SB starting to rut and fretting
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11039/36 CH113m fretting

## Statement of Intent (SOI) Form: Planned Maintenance Resurfacing



11039/36 ch298m end of scheme old patches and fretting

In general, ITis suggests that deflectorgraph data is generally good with greater than 5 years esidual life remaining. IRIS confirms RUT Data is less than 10 mm , this figure in association with positive residual Ifife, suggests the existing pavement has no immediate structurati issues throuahout. in general, ris suggests that defeectorgraph data is generally poor with less than 5 years ssociation with low residual life, suggests the existing pavement has some structural issue within the lower layers. IRIS IIso confifms that SCRIM valued sre poor. In general, Iris suggests that deflectorgraph data is generally good with greater than 5 years esitual iffe remaining. IRIS confirms RUT Data is less than 10 mm , this figure in a ath positive residual life, suggests the existing pavement has no immediate structural issues aood throuahout.
in general, Inis suggests that deflectorgraph data is generally poorwit less inan 5 years In general, Inis suggests that deflectorgraph data is generally poor with less than 5 years
residual life remaining. TRIS also confirms the RUTT Data to be greater than 10 mm , this figu esidual life remaining. RRIS also confirms the RUT Data to be greater than 10mm, this figure
nassociation with negative ersidual Iffe, suggests the existing pavement has some structural Isues within the lower layers. IRIS also confims that SCRIM values are poor.
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| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2023/24 | 0308 | A1 | CL1\&CR1 | 2017 |
| 2015/16 | 0309 | A68 | CL1,CL2,CL3 | 2018 |
|  | 0310 | A6091 |  | 2019 |
|  | 0311 | A7 |  | 2020 |
|  | 0312 | M90 |  | 2021 |
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|  | 0314 |  |  | 2023 |
|  | 0315 |  |  | 2024 |

2022/23 A720 HS,CL1,CL 2016
2023/24 0308 A1 CL1\&CR1 2017 2015/16 0309 A68 CL1,CL2,CL3 2018
-The first 18 m length of the slip road is kerbed on both sides of the
carriageway. An
uncontrolled pedestria
crossing is present Ch15 consisting of drop kerbs only (no tactile
slabs).
-A filter drain is provided - Alongside the nearside carriageway edge
between Ch18 and the end of the slip. No
gullies exist within the
Cho
scheme length is
illuminated by three
street lighting columns
street lighting columns
located on the nearside verge. *VRS is located along the offside edge of the carriageway
throughout the schem
extents
This scheme is in an rural location. The carriageway width is greater than 6.5 m and the works shall be undertaken using controlled Traffic Management.
This scheme is in an Urban location. The carriageway width is greater than 6.5 m and the works shall be undertaken using undertaken using Management.
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## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Commission and Terms of Reference

1.1.1. This report results from a Stage 2 (Design Phase) Road Safety Audit (referred to as a Stage 2 Audit) carried out on the following scheme: installation of two new pedestrian refuge island crossings; extension of footpaths including new dropped kerbs and tactile paving; warning signs associated with the new crossings; and resurfacing works at A7 Guthrie Drive on the north side of Hawick.
1.1.2. The Audit was undertaken at the request of the Designer, Amey on behalf of the client Transport Scotland.
1.1.3. The Stage 2 Audit comprised an examination of the documents forming the Audit Brief and an inspection of the site during daylight hours. The documents forming the Audit Brief were provided by the Design Organisation and are listed in Appendix A.
1.1.4. The approved Audit Team membership is as follows:

Gordon Boyd BSc, MSc, C Eng, MICE Audit Team Leader
Amey Consulting, Edinburgh Office (Certificate of Competency in Road Safety Audit gained in November 2013)
Shelley Bain
Observer
Amey Consulting, Eurocentral Office
1.1.5. A site visit was undertaken on the afternoon of Tuesday 2nd August 2016 when the weather was overcast and showery.
1.1.6. No other Road Safety Audit has been undertaken on the scheme.
1.1.7. The Terms of Reference are described in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document HD 19/15 'Road Safety Audit'.
1.1.8. The Audit Team has examined and reported only on the road safety implications of the proposed scheme as presented and has not examined or verified the compliance of the design to any other criteria. The audit has been carried out on the layout and does not comment on any other aspects of the scheme. The scheme has been examined and this report compiled only with regard to the safety implications for road users of the scheme as presented. It has not been examined or verified for compliance with any other Standards or criteria. However, in order to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem, the Audit Team may on occasion have referred to a design standard for information only. Any audit comments should not be construed as implying that a technical audit has been undertaken in any respect.
1.1.9. Section 2 of this report describes the safety issues identified in the Stage 2 Audit together with recommendations for improvement to either remove or reduce the associated risk in connection with this temporary traffic management proposal.
1.1.10. Any recommendations included within this report should not be regarded as being prescriptive design solutions to the problems raised. They are intended only to indicate a proportionate and viable means of eliminating or mitigating the identified problem and in no way imply that a formal design process has been undertaken. There may be alternative methods of addressing a problem which would be equally acceptable in achieving the desired elimination or mitigation and these should be considered when responding to this report.
1.1.11. The Project Sponsor is advised of the following:
1.1.12. The purpose of this draft report is to allow discussion on the content between the Project Sponsor and the Audit Team Leader as required by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges HD 19/15 Road Safety Audit standard before a final version of the report is submitted for consideration.
1.1.13. If any Problem or Recommendation is not accepted on submission of the final report, a signed Exception Report is to be approved by the Project Director. A copy of the signed Exception Report is to be sent to the audit Team Leader for record keeping purposes.

### 1.2 Purpose of the Highway Scheme

1.2.1 The scheme is located on the A7 between the Galalaw Roundabout and 300 m south of Guthrie Drive, on the northern approach to Hawick.
1.2.2 To cater for pedestrian movements across the A7 at this point a number of crossing points are being either establish or enhanced. Refuge islands are being introduced along with tactile paving and resurfacing of part of the carriageway and footways. No Departures have been approved for the scheme.

## 2 Items Raised at This Stage 2 Audit

### 2.1 General

### 2.1.1 PROBLEM

Location: A7 between Guthrie Drive and B6359 Junctions
Summary: Drawing 0700/031 shows areas of new surfacing with differing properties (PSV values) over the width of the carriageway. This could result in vehicles having different levels of grip to the wheels during poor weather conditions depending upon the manoeuvre being undertaken with the potential for loss of control.

RECOMMENDATION:
Ensure that the carriageway surface has consistent properties over the full width of the carriageway

### 2.2 Junctions

### 2.2.1 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 3


Summary: There is clear evidence of vehicles overrunning the existing central hatching when turning right into the B6359 road. The scheme will introduce a refuge island where the markings currently exist resulting in the potential of it being stuck by vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ensure that the central hatched markings reflect vehicle swept paths and the stacking length required for the two side road junctions

### 2.2.2 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 2
Summary: Drawing 1200/031 shows varying lane widths on the approach to the Galalaw roundabout which could result in vehicles coming into contact.

RECOMMENDATION:
Ensure that the lane widths are of a consistent width

### 2.3 Non-Motorised User Provision

### 2.3.1 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 1
Summary: Drawing 1100/031 shows the tactile paving will be of different widths over the new crossing point, it is shown as 1.838 m wide at the kerb edge and 2 m within the refuge island. To avoid confusion for visually impaired users of the crossing facility the paving widths should be consistent.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Ensure that the width of the tactile paving is consistent over the crossing

### 2.3.2 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 1
Summary: Drawing 1100/036 shows the refuge island layout with the tactile paving in line with the edge of the new physical island. This could result in pedestrians with visual impairments stopping in close proximately to live traffic with the risk of them being struck.

RECOMMENDATION:
Set back the edge of the tactile paving from the face of the new refuge island

### 2.3.3 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 1

Project Name A7 Guthrie Drive Pedestrian Improvements
Document Title Road Safety Audit Stage 2

Summary: The new refuge island will be installed on a steep gradient and lies within a section of the trunk road where vehicle speeds would be expected to be high. To make drivers more aware of the presence of the island particularly in poor lighting conditions it would be beneficial to have a beacon installed to aid visibility of pedestrians waiting at the refuge island.

## RECOMMENDATION:

Install a refuge beacon at the new refuge island

### 2.3.4 PROBLEM

Location: Pedestrian crossing location 2


Summary: The surface of the western footway at crossing point 2 is uneven and presents a trip hazard for users. To effectively remove this hazard and ensure that the footway has a consistent gradient the existing manhole could be lowered to avoid issues for the mobility impaired.

RECOMMENDATION:
Reduce the level of the existing manhole so that a consistent surface level is provided

