

Road Safety Audit Response			RSA File Ref RSA 2526_250		
PROJECT DETAILS					
Report Title		Davidson's Mains RSA 1 - Mini Roundabout Option			
PREPARED BY					
Name					
Position					
Organisation		The City of Edinburgh Council			
Signed					
APPROVED BY					
Name				Date	1st May 2026
Position					
Organisation		The City of Edinburgh Council			
Signed					
INTRODUCTION					
We received with thanks the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for Davidson's Mains -Mini Roundabout on 27/02/2026. Below constitutes the Designers Response to the Audit. A Stage 2 RSA (Ref: RSA043_SCO_S2A) was previously undertaken by AtkinsRéalis in October 2022 in relation to proposed adjustments to the junction's existing mini roundabout layout. The main variation between the former amendment proposals and the current proposals are the removal of proposed raised tables at each of the zebra crossings on approach to the junction. Both proposed the removal of the existing refuge islands.					
RSA DECISION LOG					
RSA Problem		RSA Recommendation	Design Organisation Response	Overseeing Organisation Response	Agreed RSA Action
Number of problem from RSA REPORT	Insert problem from RSA REPORT	Insert recommendation from RSA report	Insert design organisation's response	Insert Overseeing Organisation's response	Insert design and Overseeing Organisation's agreed action
3.1	Risk of pedestrians being injured or struck by vehicles due to stationary vehicles obscuring visibility.	It is recommended that sufficient forward visibility is provided to both sides of each crossing at all times	This design has been developed in accordance with CEC scheme requirements for a single type zebra crossing with associated buildouts due to the current central crossing islands being insufficient in width. The buildouts also provide for an enhanced crossing provision and better visibility for pedestrians. It's noted that LTN 2/95 makes clear that a 5m separation would be appropriate in Section 2.1.1.1 which clarifies the guidance of Section 2.1.2.2. It's also noted that the separation should be provided to give drivers the opportunity to see the crossing and break effectively. The design would not step away from this guidance.	The design simplifies the Zebra crossings which had been at the junction into a Zebra crossings with a single crossing movement, which, reflects the majority of other Zebra Crossings and supports the Hierarchy of Road Users promoted by the Highway Code so that drivers should be looking for pedestrians and yielding to them crossing rather than moving through an apparently clear crossing on "their side". It is not considered that there is justification for change to the design at this time.	As per OO's response

3.2	Risk of blocked crossings resulting in conflict for pedestrians and those using wheeled devices. The proposed Zebra crossings are setback from the roundabout entry give way markings, a dimension for the setback is not provided. It was noted on site that the arms with proposed zebra crossings are active bus routes with semi frequent services (every 10-15 mins). There is a risk that busses and other large vehicles will obstruct the Zebra crossings when waiting for gaps in traffic to enter the roundabout. This may result in pedestrians being forced to cross at alternative locations, increasing the risk of tripping on full height kerbs. In addition, pedestrians may be obstructed from leaving the carriageway and be stranded centrally within the Zebra crossing, at risk of being struck by vehicles exiting the roundabout. These risks are exacerbated for pedestrians with prams and those using mobility aids.	Notwithstanding Problem 3.1, it is recommended that the layout is revised to ensure it can accommodate the regular large vehicle movements at the roundabout without obstructing the pedestrian crossings.	All crossings locations this are subject to final detail design, but proposed to be set back between 5m and 5.6m. It's accepted that long vehicles may block the Zebra crossings when waiting for a gap at the junction give-way. However, the junction is a mini-roundabout and as such gaps for vehicles will readily present opportunities to clear the crossings and unlikely to be blocked for lengthy periods. As per Rule 19 of The Highway Code, pedestrians can be expected to wait at the kerb side until traffic has stopped from both directions or the road is clear for an opportunity to cross. Buildouts with full height kerbs is a normal feature and is considered to provide a net benefit to road safety. A controlled crossing on the desire line is provided to encourage pedestrians to cross at the appropriate location.	Agree with Designer's Response	As per OO's response
3.3	The yellow globes associated with the existing Zebra crossing facilities around the junction are currently incorporated within street lighting columns (example in red above). If lighting columns are not retained when globes are repositioned the junction may become insufficiently lit. Additionally, the RSA team observed during the site visit that tree canopies surround some of the existing lighting columns on the north and southwest side of the junction (example in green above) are likely to reduce the illumination of the lighting columns. Street lighting obstruction and / or a reduction in street lighting infrastructure may reduce visibility of other road users and features during the hours of darkness. This may contribute to drivers inadvertently striking crossing pedestrians, stationary cyclists and kerblines.	It is recommended that the junction is sufficiently illuminated. This may include but is not limited to additional street lighting provisions and removing obstructive vegetation.	As this is not a detailed design we have not considered this stage. We would agree that adequate illumination should be provided. This will be considered at the detail stage.	Street Lighting design has been developed including new 6m lighting columns with LED lanterns and incorporated Midstar Belisha Beacons at crossings, and 7 new 10m lighting columns repositioned to ensure appropriate coverage.	As per OO's response
3.4	The existing warning sign for the vehicle weight restriction on Main Street is proposed to be relocated to the new kerbline on the north side of the carriageway. There is a risk that vehicles approaching from Quality Street or Crammond Road South will not receive advance warning of the restriction. As a result, vehicles may only become aware of the restriction after committing to a manoeuvre towards Main Street, increasing the likelihood of sudden braking or changes in direction, increasing the risk of collisions. In addition, the proposed sign location may obstruct visibility from Crammond Road South to the Zebra crossing's yellow globe on Main Street, potentially reducing conspicuity of the crossing.	It is recommended that advance warning signs for the restriction are provided on all approaches and that signs are located to ensure no detriment to visibility splays.	The plans do not show the advanced warning signs being relocated or removed. There are no plans to change those signs and so drivers will benefit from advanced warning. The layout maintains the current restriction arrangement. There is no issue currently and traffic is properly warned. As shown on the drawing the nearside globe would be located on a buildout placing the globe in a more conspicuous location. The current sign does not obscure the current globe or the proposed globe.	Agree with Designer's Response	As per OO's response

3.5	Based on the proposed tactile paving layout for the uncontrolled crossing on East Barnton Gardens, the effective crossing width appears narrow as per existing layout. During the site visit, the RSA team observed a high volume of pedestrian activity in this area. If a narrow crossing is retained, there is an increased likelihood that pedestrians may cross outside the area intended, increasing the risk of trips and falls over full-height kerbs.	It is recommended that the crossing facility is widened to accommodate the anticipated level of pedestrian movements.	The crossing over the western arm is not proposed to be changed under the proposal. We note that Inclusive Mobility 2021 section 4.11 paragraph 2 notes that the recommended minimum width would be 1200mm. The current crossing is 1200mm due the presence of a stone pillar and two service hatches on one side and a service hatch on the other. Widening of the crossing to Edinburgh's preferred width of 2400mm would incur significant cost. We note from the STATS 19 record that no issues were highlighted with the crossing. We also note that, this is the quiet side of the road. There would therefore be no apparent justification for a widening of the crossing that would be sufficient to offset the cost and place making implications of widening the crossing.	Agree with Designer's Response	As per OO's response
3.6	High friction surfacing (HFS) is currently provided on the approaches to the existing mini roundabout, although it was worn and in poor condition at the time of the site visit. The plans do not indicate its provision / renewal. Worn surfacing and a reduced level of skid resistance may extend braking distances for drivers on approach to the roundabout and associated crossings. It may also give rise to sudden braking and loss of control type collisions.	It is recommended the carriageway surface is of sufficient skid resistance. This may include but is not limited to the providing a high polished stone value in the surface course and / or the provision of high friction surfacing.	It is proposed to resurface the junction and its approaches at the same time as these works. This would renew the surface and so ensure an appropriate level of skid resistance. There will be a determination at the detailed stage on the need for an enhanced skid resistance from the use of a high Polished Stone Value stone or the use of a High Friction Surfacing within a layout subject to a 20mph speed limit.	Agree with Designer's Response	As per OO's response
3.7	As observed during the site visit and supported by the traffic volume data provided, the existing junction is a busy intersection for both vehicles and pedestrians, particularly during peak periods. The combination of high traffic flows and single-stage pedestrian crossing facilities requires pedestrians and drivers to assess multiple opposing movements whilst attempting to cross and navigate the junction. Whilst it is acknowledged that drivers should give way to pedestrians using a Zebra crossing facility, visibility and crossing obstructions concerns raised above (see Problems 3.1 and 3.2) may lead to longer waiting times and fewer suitable gaps. This may cause pedestrians to hesitate or attempt to cross quickly, thereby increasing the potential for conflicts and collision between pedestrians and vehicles.	It is recommended that alternative crossing types, such as signal controlled, are provided	The prior designers response to this issue stated "This design has been developed in accordance with CEC scheme requirements for a single type zebra crossing with associated buildouts due to the current central crossing islands being insufficient in width. The buildouts also provide for an enhanced crossing provision and better visibility pedestrians with no scope for retaining a centre island due to site constraints. Street clutter and signage will be further reviewed with the design updated as necessary." The use of single stage Zebra crossings would prioritise pedestrians and highlight to drivers that they are not the primary user type encouraging space appropriate behaviour. The provision of push button crossings would do the opposite, may lead to further stacking traffic and contribute to congestion during busy times, with contingent risk of impacts on health and road safety.	Agree with Designer's Response. The simplified single phase type crossing removes the existing multiple beacon posts that contribute to overall street clutter and impact on approach sightlines.	As per OO's response
3.8	Drainage gullies are located where footway widening is proposed around the junction. In the absence of new / relocated drainage facilities, there is potential for surface water to gather on the carriageway and at crossing facilities. Water pooling may contribute to: - pedestrian injury from slips and falls; and - cycle and vehicle collisions from loss of control due to reduced tyre grip and potential skidding. These risks may be exacerbated during colder temperatures when standing water may form ice.	It is recommended that positive drainage is provided across the scheme extents to enable surface water to drain.	As this is not a detailed design, we have not considered the detail of the drainage design. We would agree that adequate drainage should be provided. This will be considered at the detail stage.	The final detailed design has incorporated appropriate new carriageway and footway gullies, as required to provide adequate drainage.	As per OO's response

DESIGN ORGANISATION STATEMENT			
On behalf of the design organisation I certify that:			
1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in the road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the Overseeing Organisation.			
Name		Date	1st May 2026
Position			
Organisation	The City of Edinburgh Council		
Signed			
OVERSEEING ORGANISATION STATEMENT			
On behalf of the Overseeing Organisation I certify that:			
1) the RSA actions identified in response to the road safety audit problems in the road safety audit have been discussed and agreed with the design organisation; and			
2) the agreed RSA actions will be progressed.			
Name		Date	1st May 2026
Position			
Organisation	The City of Edinburgh Council		
Signed			