

# **Road Restraints Part 1**

A crash course into road restraint systems

Chris Clarke

Delivering a better world



### • Background / History

- Types of Road Restraint Systems
- Design Considerations



### **Safety Moment**

### How have you challenged someone who behaves in a way that is unsafe?

- Unsafe behaviour can occur in or out of the workplace, on or off site.
- Are you comfortable challenging people? is there a positive environment around challenge?
- Do you have / know the procedures to report / record any incidents / near misses, to ensure nothing happens again?
- Do you have plans for activities that mitigate or eliminate any hazards before someone can be exposed to them?
- AECOM have red cards for challenging, Lifeguard for reporting and SHE Procedures for preventing issues. However there may be more specific to your role or area that you should be aware of.



### Introduction to Road Restraint Systems (RRS)

### Why are RRS required:

- To prevent vehicles from impacting with or entering roadside hazards.
- To prevent vehicles crossing from one carriageway to another.
- To absorb some of the energy from the impact cause by an errant vehicle striking it.
- To redirect the vehicle along the line of the barrier to prevent it from turning around, turning over or re-entering the stream of traffic.



### Introduction to RRS



![](_page_4_Picture_2.jpeg)

### What is a Road Restraint System?

![](_page_5_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_2.jpeg)

History - Selby

### The Selby Rail Crash

![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_3.jpeg)

## History - Selby

![](_page_7_Picture_1.jpeg)

Location where the Land Rover left the carriageway

![](_page_7_Picture_3.jpeg)

• Final Position of the Land Rover and trailer

![](_page_7_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **History – Review of Standards**

 Following this accident the Deputy Prime Minister set up a Highways Agency Working Group to review the standards for the provision of nearside safety fences on major roads

### • Concerns:

- Not clear what lay behind standards
- It was not clear what risks the standard was trying to consider and then control
- The standard was written for new works with no need to manage risks for other types of work.
- It was not clear how risks were assessed when granting departures.
- It was not clear how consistency in overseeing organisations advice on safety was ensured.

![](_page_8_Picture_8.jpeg)

### **History - Overview**

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **Type of Terminals**

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Parapets and Guardrails

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations**

Once you know what hazards need to be protected by a VRS (covered in the next part of this training) what do you need to think about?

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Site Visit**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

June 2021 street view

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

March 2023 site photo

![](_page_14_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations - ERIC**

- Eliminate
- Isolate
- Reduce
- Control
- VRS is a control measure (and a hazard in itself)
- Can you remove the hazard or reduce the risk to the road user?
- Traffic sign posts of 76 mm or 89 mm diameter, with 3.2 mm wall thickness, are classed as passively safe already / 2 post signs of the same dimension with a 1500mm post spacing

![](_page_15_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_10.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Containment Level**

#### Permanent Deformable and Rigid Safety Barriers:

- (i) On roads with a speed limit of 50 mph or more:
  - (a) Normal Containment Level = N2
  - (b) Higher Containment Level = H1 or H2
  - (c) Very High Containment Level = H4a

![](_page_16_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_8.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Containment Level: Central Reservation**

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

• Where 2-way AADT>=25000

![](_page_17_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Working Width**

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

• Post spacing increase from W1 to W8 for deformable systems

![](_page_18_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Vehicle Intrusion Class**

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Impact Severity Level**

A safety barrier s level of impact severity gives an assessment of the safety for occupants in an impacting vehicle

For example:

- Impact severity class A: safety barrier
- Impact severity class B: vehicle parapet
- Impact severity class C: non deformable concrete barriers

Impact severity level	Index values	
Α	ASI ≤ 1.0	
В	<mark>ASI</mark> ≤ 1.4	THIV≤33 km/h
С	ASI ≤ 1.9	

![](_page_20_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Length of Need**

Required to ensure that:

- 1. Barrier performs as expected / tested
- 2. An errant vehicle that gets behind the barrier doesn't collide with the hazard you want to protect
- TD 19 specified specific lengths if the minimum length from the RRRAP is less than the specific lengths
- CD 377 specifies the greater of the lengths specified by the RRRAP or the manufacturer.
- From experience most systems still tested to TD 19 minimum requirements

Safety Barrier	MINIMUM "full height" lengths of safety barrier <sup>1</sup>		
Containment Level	In advance of hazard	Beyond hazard	
Normal (N2 or N2)	30 m	7.5 m	
Higher (H1 or H2)	30 m	10.5 m	
Very High (H4a)	45 m	18 m	

#### TABLE 3-1

Notes: 1. These are minimum lengths. Manufacturers may require longer lengths than specified above. (Refer to Chapter 1 Paragraph 1.42 Length of Need.)

![](_page_21_Picture_10.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations - Setback**

### • CD 127 Highways Cross Section

#### Table 2.24 Set-back

Location	Desirable minimum set-back value (mm)	Available relaxations described in notes
In verges with no adjacent hard strip or hard shoulder	1200	Notes 1) and 2)
In verges with an adjacent hard strip or hard shoulder	600	Note (3)
Central reserves	1200	Notes 1) and 2)
Notes:		

Relaxations to set-back are permitted as follows:

- Relaxation to 600mm for roads of speed limit 50mph or less (including temporary mandatory speed limits).
- Relaxation to 1000mm at existing roads with physical constraints (e.g. a structure) where it could be difficult to provide the desirable value.
- Relaxation to 450mm where it is considered necessary to position the VRS away from the edge of an existing embankment in order to provide support to the foundation.
- Drainage, road furniture, other hazards and visibility can affect the level of set-back achieved.

![](_page_22_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_10.jpeg)

(with no Offside Edge Line)

![](_page_22_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Locations of hazards**

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

- 3. Flare only provided where required by Manufacturer's system, e.g. to maintain set-back to terminal.
- 4. See Figure 3-4 and Paragraphs 3.21 to 3.23 for details of Set-back requirements.

![](_page_23_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Taper lengths and transitions**

Taper lengths - Changes in horizontal alignment (setback)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

Transition length: Gradual change in performance

![](_page_24_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Taper lengths and transitions**

Transition length - Gradual change in performance

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Taper lengths and transitions**

Taper and transition lengths are required to avoid 'pocketing'

- Change in type, cross-section or material
- Manufacturer-specific

![](_page_26_Figure_4.jpeg)

Taper lengths and transition lengths required to avoid pocketing If an errant vehicle hits a section of barrier where the performance changes rapidly say from W4 to W2 the first section would deflect more than the next. The errant vehicle would then in effect hit the end of the W2 barrier causing unacceptably high decelerations to the vehicle and its occupants

## **Design Considerations – Posts / foundations**

Driven posts

- Posts driven into the ground / foundation
- Most commonly used post type

Socketed Posts

- Posts socketed into a concrete pad foundation
- Easily removeable from the foundations (useful if the VRS has to be replaced often)
- Useful in poor ground conditions
- If there are bound materials greater than 150mm thick present

![](_page_27_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Height of systems**

If the system is close to the carriageway the height is generally measured relative to the carriageway, if its far away from the carriageway it may be measured at the post

As designers we don't tend to specify the height, its specific to the chosen system.

However, it must be considered if:

- We're raising the height of the carriageway
- Adding / removing kerbs
- Changing the position of the VRS relative to the road
- Have sudden deviations in the ground height underneath the VRS

If height tolerances of the system are not met, then it may not perform as expected in a collisions.

Parapet heights vary based on anticipated NMU usage

### **Design Considerations – Motorcycle guard**

Posts cause most of the damage to motorcyclists

When you get traffic data for VRS assessments request splits by vehicle type, especially if there are sharp bends where motorcyclists are most at risk of falling or skidding.

![](_page_29_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Terminal Design**

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Terminal Design**

![](_page_31_Picture_1.jpeg)

- P4 or P1 ??
- P4s typically 8-12m in length (some systems shorter such as OBEX systems below)

![](_page_31_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_5.jpeg)

Also available are P2 terminals: they're not as high a performance as a P4, but still suitable where a P1 is suitable, however they generally do not have a ramped end, and can easily be installed in areas of hard standing as opposed to soft verges.

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations - visibility**

- Rails at small setbacks can impact stopping sight distance
- Especially to the low object height
- Especially around bends
- Visibility is often checked when carrying out the geometric design
- Don't forget to do it while carrying out VRS design

![](_page_32_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_7.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Gap closures**

- Gaps in verge VRS mean more approaches, more potential for head on collisions with terminals, more terminals are required, therefore higher costs and greater maintenance requirements. As well as more chance for errant vehicles to travel behind the VRS
- Gaps of up to 50m shall be closed, gaps of up to 100m should be closed
- In England gaps of up to 100m shall be closed

![](_page_33_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Non motorised users**

- Trunk roads may have PROWs that cross them and require gaps
- A gap may be required in a verge for the provision of telephones / crossings

![](_page_34_Figure_3.jpeg)

 There may be defined equestrian movements in a verge, the designed setback must allow for this (to allow horses in front or behind the VRS)

### **Design Considerations – Pedestrian guardrail**

- NOT a restraint system
- Only used to influence pedestrian movements
- Can 'trap' pedestrians that cross on a desire line within the carriageway
- Can narrow footways
- Can narrow crossings

![](_page_35_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_9.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Pedestrian guardrail**

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Pedestrian guardrail**

![](_page_37_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_2.jpeg)

### **Design Considerations – Other interesting systems**

 Illuminated low level lighting beams (polyurethane membrane that fits over the top of new and existing barriers)

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

 Steelgard parapet: works by using heavy steel sections interlocked together and anchored at each end of the system. It doesn't have a foundation connected to the bridge deck, so is useful if the string course of the bridge isn't suitable for a traditional parapet (works by long chain principal)

![](_page_38_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_5.jpeg)

### **Design Outputs**

- Results of RRRAP / LARA
- Series 400 Specification including Schedules

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

Drawings (Various Standard)

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Thank you.

Any questions

Delivering a better world

![](_page_40_Picture_4.jpeg)

**AECOM** Delivering a better world