




DAVID W. G. RIDLEY
Senior Coroner for Wiltshire and Swindon

	<p>REGULATION 28 REPORT TO PREVENT FUTURE DEATHS</p> <p>THIS REPORT IS BEING SENT TO:</p> <p>██████████ Senior Traffic Management Engineer Wiltshire Council – Highways County Hall Trowbridge Wiltshire BA14 8JN</p>
1	<p>CORONER</p> <p>I am DAVID W. G. RIDLEY, Senior Coroner for Wiltshire and Swindon</p>
2	<p>CORONER'S LEGAL POWERS</p> <p>I make this report under paragraph 7, Schedule 5, of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 and regulations 28 and 29 of the Coroners (Investigations) Regulations 2013. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/25/schedule/5/paragraph/7 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2013/1629/part/7/made</p>
3	<p>INVESTIGATION and INQUEST</p> <p>On 14/03/2014 I commenced an investigation into the death of Tracy Michelle ROOKE aged 43. The investigation concluded at the end of the Inquest on 06 October 2014. The conclusion of the Inquest was that Tracy sustained multiple traumatic injuries as a result of a road traffic collision that occurred on 13 March 2014 on the A3102 at Mile Elm, Wiltshire.</p>
4	<p>CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DEATH</p> <p>The circumstances of her death were that Tracey was travelling south along the A3102 at Mile Elm having just negotiated a left hand bend when she lost control of her vehicle which then crossed the centre of the highway before colliding with a van travelling in the opposite direction. I found that the weather conditions and in particular thick fog and her unfamiliarity with the road more likely than not contributed to the incident and her death.</p>
5	<p>CORONER'S CONCERNS</p> <p>During the course of the Inquest I heard evidence from ██████████ whose role is the Force's Traffic Management and Road Safety Assessment Officer. He is a former Collision Investigator. As part of his evidence he produced a copy of his report dated 26 June 2014 in respect of which I believe you received a copy back in June.</p> <p>In that report and specifically at pages 10 & 11 of the report, a copy of which I have attached to this Regulation 28 report, he sets out a number of recommendations. I share the concerns that are raised by ██████████ in his report which focuses on identified issues concerning road signage, the location of road signage and the current state of road signage in this particular area.</p> <p>I am concerned that if these are not addressed that they potentially could contribute to future road traffic incidents that may result in injury of even death.</p> <p>I am additionally concerned having regard to the evidence that ██████████ gave in respect of which he indicated that whilst you have been given a copy of his report including recommendations that</p>

	<p>no action would be taken until I make a report with a view to the prevention of future deaths. That concerns me as if as Highways Authority you believe there is merit in relation to the recommendations then it should not have to wait until a Coroner makes a report some months after the Traffic Management and Road Safety Assessment Report is submitted before action is taken.</p>
6	<p>ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN</p> <p>In my opinion action should be taken to prevent future deaths and I believe you and your organisation have power to take such action and I would be grateful if you could consider the recommendations made by [REDACTED] and indicate whether or not they are to be implemented together with a review of the Council's practice and procedure if there is no issue in relation to the recommendations as regards implementing them sooner rather than waiting for a Regulation 28 report from a Coroner after an Inquest.</p>
7	<p>YOUR RESPONSE</p> <p>You are under a duty to respond to this report within 56 days of the date of this report, namely by 04 December 2014. I, the coroner, may extend the period.</p> <p>Your response must contain details of action taken or proposed to be taken, setting out the timetable for action. Otherwise you must explain why no action is proposed.</p>
8	<p>COPIES and PUBLICATION</p> <p>I have sent a copy of my report to the Chief Coroner and to the following Interested Persons:-</p> <p>[REDACTED] Traffic Management and Road Safety Unit</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>I am also under a duty to send the Chief Coroner a copy of your response.</p> <p>The Chief Coroner may publish either or both in a complete or redacted or summary form. He may send a copy of this report to any person who he believes may find it useful or of interest. You may make representations to me, the coroner, at the time of your response, about the release or the publication of your response by the Chief Coroner.</p>
9	<p>Dated 09 October 2014</p> <p>Signature </p> <p>Senior Coroner for Wiltshire and Swindon</p>

Discussion and recommendations

The A3102 at Mile Elm has previously been subject to a national speed restriction of 60mph for cars, reduced to 50mph on the 12th August 2013 following a national speed limit review. The road layout and condition at the collision scene is such that, in normal driving conditions, a car could travel through the bends at the maximum permitted speed without issue. It is my opinion that the 50mph restriction is correct for the road.

Road signs – there is a lack of consistency in that a 'slippery road' warning is only given to drivers travelling south. The double bend sign (photograph 2) is in a poor condition and the position of the sign pole is such that the signs are obscured by a telegraph pole. Verge marker posts and chevron markers are ineffective due to damage / vegetation or dirt.

Recommendation: A 'slippery road' warning sign should be provided to warn drivers travelling north. The double bend sign for southbound traffic should be replaced, with consideration for the sign pole being relocated to avoid it being obscured by the telegraph pole. Verge marker posts / chevrons should be cleaned, damaged posts replaced and vegetation cut back and maintained – an alternative could be to replace the verge markers and chevrons with more modern flexible chevron posts on both approaches to the bends (example below). This could reduce the level of signage / maintenance required whilst highlighting the presence of the bends.



Road markings – these are in a worn condition. The double white line system for southbound traffic does not commence until the apex of the bend (photograph 2) allowing drivers the opportunity to overtake without an appropriate view ahead. The 'catseyes' within the white line system are in a poor condition and ineffective.

Recommendation: the road markings should be repainted, the solid white line system for southbound traffic extended to approximately 100 metres prior to the bend (this would be similar to the northbound approach). The 'catseyes' should be refurbished and maintained.

Farm access/mud on road – on rural roads with multiple farm access points, it is inevitable that there will be a transfer of mud / debris onto the road surface. It is my opinion that the amount of mud shown in photograph 10 is excessive and unacceptable. The mud, unless cleared promptly, will be spread by traffic and extending the area of road and signage affected.

Recommendation – the Highways Authority should liaise with local farmers to identify reasonable measures that can be put in place to avoid any future excessive mud deposits on the road surface.

5



Traffic Management Officer.