



via e-mail

Yvonne Blake
Area Coroner for Norfolk
Norfolk Coroner Service
County Hall
Norwich, NR1 2DH

[REDACTED]

Your Ref: Reg 28 Report

[REDACTED]

Date: 27 August 2021

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Ms Blake,

Firstly, may I take this opportunity to express sincere and heartfelt condolences to Oscar's family and friends; this certainly is a tragic and awful incident.

Thank you for your report concluding your investigation into the death of Mr Seaman. The Council's specialist Network Safety Engineers have considered your observations in detail, and our responses are recorded below.

Firstly, it is beneficial for Norfolk County Council (NCC) as Highway Authority to attend inquests where a fatality has occurred on the highway where there may be an implication for the Council. This enables officers to help explain the Council's policies with regard to road safety and highway engineering, and provides an opportunity to discuss any such matters with all interested persons. I am advised that unfortunately the Council were not invited to the inquest and therefore were unable to contribute to this important element of your investigation.

Taking each point in turn:

You report that the road where the incident occurred is the scene of at least 126 traffic collisions. Highway authorities (including NCC) do not analyse collision only data; this is because collisions are generally not reported in a consistent manner to the police and therefore cannot be accurately relied upon when prioritising road safety interventions. Rather, highway authorities only analyse personal injury accident data from the police in order to identify where the greatest casualty reduction benefits can be achieved.

Continued.../

In terms of this junction, the ten-year personal injury accident data identifies eight injury accidents (five related to the southwest arm of the junction, two related to the northeast arm of the junction, and one single accident at the junction).

There have been a number of highway safety interventions introduced to include: red centre hatch treatment, provision of bend warning chevron boards which better reflect the alignment of the bend to the southeast, sign relocations, provision of hedges to control visibility, provision of 'Slow' markings on the carriageway, cutting back of other vegetation, and addition of side road triggers to the existing junction warning vehicle activated signs. In addition to the above interventions, the speed limit was reduced to 50mph in response to this incident. In light of your comments concerning vehicle speeds, it is agreed that NCC will undertake speed surveys to measure driver compliance.

With regard to the provision of "STOP" road markings and signs, such measures are restricted to those locations where visibility of a junction is severely impaired whereby highways users are reminded to stop and give way to traffic before proceeding ensuring it is safe to do so. This has been investigated previously in accordance with national guidance contained within the Traffic Signs Manual (Chapter 3), and neither junction met the requirements for the introduction of "STOP" markings and signs. This is particularly so for the southeast arm, where existing visibility is well above the minimum requirements even for a 60mph speed limit. However, a further review will be undertaken to reassess the visibility approaching the A134 from the northeast arm of the junction.

Your report mentions that the provision of a speed camera or an average speed camera system would help with speed limit compliance. Highway Authorities are required to follow Department for Transport (DfT) guidance when considering whether speed camera provisions are required to improve road safety. DfT circular 01/2007 recommends that only those sites with three recorded injury accidents within 36 month period could be considered where excessive speed was a factor. This is not the case at A134 Northwold.

I acknowledge your observation concerning the provision of a mirror at the junction. I regret that the installation of mirrors is not authorised or recommended by the County Council. This is because mirrors can dazzle highway users and can affect driver's ability to judge the distance of on-coming traffic.

I trust the above information is useful and I would be happy to clarify any further points you have in this regard.

Yours sincerely



Head of Paid Service