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## Risk, distance travelled and casualties

Distance travelled


Risk determined by conditions and properties: SPI's, measures, factors

Casualties (road deaths, serious road injuries)


Dominant factor: Vehicle speed \& speed difference

## How to achieve safe speeds always, everywhere?



## How to achieve safe speeds always, everywhere?

Can we train all travellers, until they are perfect drivers, that obey all rules always?

Or should we design safe roads that enforce safe speeds?


Should we bet on intelligent vehicles that know and obey the speed limit?


## A safe system starts with safe roads, but traffic is not uniform!



## Traffic is not uniform!



## Traffic is not uniform!



## Sustainable safety in a nutshell

- As humans are fallible and vulnerable,
- ... although drivers should know and obey the rules, and enforcement efforts are essential,
- vehicles cannot ensure road safety for all, although it certainly helps (and has helped a lot).
- roads should be designed to meet the requirements for the road's traffic function.


## How do safe speeds depend on road function

| Types of road and traffic | Safe travel <br> speed (km/h) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Locations with possible conflicts between cars and <br> pedestrians (low traffic volume q) | $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Intersections with possible side collisions between cars <br> (and no possible conflicts as mentioned above!) | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Roads with possible frontal collisions between cars <br> (and no conflicts as above) | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Roads with no possibility of side or frontal collisions <br> and safe roadsides (and no conflicts as above, high q) | $\approx 120 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |

The design requirement: Safe roads should have a safe and credible speed limit, given the function of the raadn/:

## 30 km/h roads (urban), some Dutch examples



Traffic structures: tree

## $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (urban), no credible speed limit



## 30 km/h roads (urban), properties

|  | Property | Value | SSA | SaCreD | extra |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Length of road links | short/long |  | X |  |
| 2 | Road width | narrow/ wide |  | X |  |
| 3 | Paving | pavers/asphalt | X | X |  |
| 4 | Street lighting | low/high |  |  | X |
| 5 | Surroundings | closed/ open |  | X |  |
| 6 | Connections to houses/shops | yes/no | X |  |  |
| 7 | Road axis marking | no/ special/ yes | X | X |  |
| 8 | Road side marking | no/ yes | X |  |  |
| 9 | Separate lanes | no/ yes/ green/ water | X | X |  |
| 10 | Priority intersections | no/ yes/roundabout/ priority bicycle lane | X | X |  |
| 11 | Intersection layout | plateau/ punaise/ other color/ roundabout/ none | X |  |  |
| 12 | Traffic sign installations | no/ yes | X |  |  |
| 13 | Speed controlling measures | hump/road narrows/road axix shifts/ none | X | X |  |
| 14 | Pedestrian crossing possible | everywhere/ specific (ZEBRA)/ none |  |  | X |
| 15 | Pedestrian lane | sidewalk/ none |  |  | X |
| 16 | Bicycle lane | none/ coloured pavement/ separate | X | X |  |
| 17 | Car parking | parking spaces/ along the road/ none |  | X |  |

## $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (urban), credible speed limit



## 30 km/h roads (urban), some Dutch examples



## $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (urban), some Dutch examples



## $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (rural), before

- Before sustainable safety:
- 80 km/h
- central marking



## $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads, before-after

Wrong. Side strip too
narrow


Right: side strip with correct width



Wrong: no marking at roadside, no speed hump (road width $>4,5 \mathrm{~m}$ )

Right: correct roadside marking line and speed hump


## 60 km/h roads, intersections, before-after

Wrong: unclear priority, no speed
humps


Right: plateau speed reduction and clearly recognizable intersection


## $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads, transition region, before-after

Wrong, roads look similar

Right, recognizable road design elements


## $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads, transition region, before-after

Right: beacons on the hard shoulder


Right: rumblestrips


## $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (rural), before
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## $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (rural), before-after

Wrong: overtaking whith possible countertraffic above 70km/h


The sign doesn't prevent overtakings!


Right: physical barries between directions


## $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ roads (rural), before-after

Wrong: obstacle-free zone to narrow


Right:

- Double solid line road axis marking
- Dashed roadside marking + correction zone
- Obstacle free zone >6m



## Concluding remarks

- Roads need to be categorized by their functions
- Speeds should match the road function.
- Road design should enforce those safe speeds
- When road design cannot do the trick, we need enforcement.
- This is especially the case for high speed roads (motorways, highways).

