ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

Agenda Item 42

Brighton & Hove City Council

Subject: Pedestrian Crossing Assessment and Priority List

Date of Meeting: 7th October 2014

Report of: Executive Director – Environment, Development &

Housing

Contact Officer: Name: Tracy Beverley Tel: 29-3813

Email: Tracy.beverley@brighton-hove.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT

- 1.1 On the 21st June 2010 The Environment & Community Safety review Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC), as part of its annual work plan, requested officers to provide information on pedestrian crossings and how requests from members of the public are prioritised. Following the initial ECSOSC review, officers have developed a more robust and up to date prioritisation procedure that takes into account Members' concerns such as residents fear of crossing busy roads and the public perception of dangerous roads.
- 1.2 At its meeting of 25th January 2011, ECSOSC resolved to welcome the new methodology and agreed that it should be put forward for approval at a future Cabinet Member Meeting. At the 26th May 2011 Environment Cabinet Member Meeting the revised methodology was explained including case studies. A revised pedestrian crossing assessment methodology was approved and permission granted to carry out assessments of all sites on the pedestrian crossing request list in the financial year 2011/12. Assessments have been carried out annually since and funding allocated to make necessary improvements at priority locations.
- 1.3 Since 2011/12, 33 of the priority crossing locations identified have been improved through either LTP, Safer Route to Schools funding or other external funding sources such as Local Sustainable Transport Fund & Better Bus Area. The full list can be seen in Appendix 2, Table C.
- 1.4 This report presents the findings of the pedestrian crossing assessments of locations requested up to May 2013 and identifies priority crossing points to be delivered over the next 12 months, subject to the availability of funds.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**:

2.1 That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves the priority crossing list and grants permission for officers to begin implementing the prioritised pedestrian crossing locations where funding has been identified.

- Where crossing points require higher funding levels these should be acknowledged and identified as part of future work plans
- That the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee authorises officers to construct the prioritised pedestrian crossings for which funding has been identified within the financial year 2013/14, subject to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) being advertised prior to implementation of crossing points.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 3.1 Requests for new pedestrian crossings are received regularly from members of the public and local Ward Members. Subject to the availability of funding, potential crossing locations were previously prioritised based on the number of pedestrian accidents in the immediate vicinity. At the Environment & Community Safety Overview Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) meeting on 21st July 2010, Members requested a review of this process. It was felt that the existing methodology did not consider the social issues associated with a lack of safe crossing points, nor did it consider the perceived danger of crossing the road.
- 3.2 Following the initial 21st July 2010 ECSOSC meeting officers undertook an investigation of pedestrian crossing assessment procedures used by other authorities in the South East region and proposed a point scoring system to enable a more wide ranging assessment to take place, taking into account the social factors in addition to collision history. Following this investigation a new robust pedestrian crossing methodology was proposed to assess crossing requests. This improved new methodology considers a range of important social factors which effect pedestrian movement such as public perception of danger, the impact of crossings on community cohesion, access to key services and green space and improvements for mobility impaired people.
- 3.3 In publishing the results of the crossing assessments on an annual basis the new methodology enables a more transparent approach to assessing pedestrian crossings and a more proactive approach to responding to requests from Ward Members and the public
- 3.4 At its meeting of 25th January 2011, ECSOSC resolved to welcome the new methodology and this was approved at the 26th May 2011 Cabinet Member Meeting. At this meeting approval was granted to apply the new methodology to crossing requests received up until May 2013 and funding was allocated to install those crossings identified as a priority.

The Assessment Process

- 3.5 The approved methodology as set out in Appendix 1 for pedestrian crossing requests considers 14 different categories including; pedestrian collisions, access to services, pedestrian movements and vehicle counts at each location.
- 3.6 Ward Members were invited to request crossing locations for inclusion in this assessment process, in addition to the requests received by residents until the end of May 2013. In total 22 locations were assessed.

3.7 Each crossing request was subject to a pre-qualification assessment (see appendix 1). Those crossing points with a recorded pedestrian casualty in the last 3 years within 50 metres of the request location, and / or where a sample one hour vehicle and pedestrian count at peak time exceeded the threshold, were then subject to a full assessment.

4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 From the most recent 22 requested crossing points, 11 locations did not meet the pre-qualification criteria so were removed from the priority list. Appendix 2(Tables B,C &D) lists all crossing points removed from the priority list.
- 4.2 The remaining 11 crossing requests were subject to a full assessment and have been ranked in priority order and listed in Appendix 2 (Table A).
- 4.3 The Church Road, Portslade Crossing point missed the assessment process deadline but is being investigated separately by the Councils Road Safety Manager, Martin Heath
- 4.4 Table 1 lists the top 10 scoring pedestrian crossing points. For each crossing point proposed actions have been listed along with funding sources.
- 4.5 Those crossing locations achieving a ranking within the top 10 will be prioritised for funding but this does not automatically qualify a particular location for implementation. For example, the cost of a crossing facility at a particular location may be prohibitive or upon closer investigation it may become apparent that suitable pedestrian provision already exists in a particular location and therefore further investment would not represent good value for money.
- 4.6 At crossing points where actions are proposed this is subject to further design work, associated TROs and Road Safety Assessments. The type of crossing facility proposed is considered on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Department for Transport guidance and determined by the existing road network, pedestrian and vehicle volumes and funding availability.
- 4.7 Where priority crossings require significant capital funding such as Sackville Road, Old Shoreham Road & Hangleton Link Road (A293) near Fox Way they are recommended for inclusion within future LTP works programmes, subject to the availability of funding
- 4.8 As part of the Better Bus Areas Project, funding has been allocated to implement crossing facilities at two of the priority crossing locations Pavilion Parade, Edward Street & Upper Rock Gardens/ Edward Street Junction West Arm.
- 4.9 Suitable provision for pedestrians crossing Preston Drove, opposite Blakers Park already exists where a pedestrian refuge serves pedestrians adequately. As there have been no recent related collisions it is suggested that no further improvements should be made to this existing pedestrian crossing facility.
- 4.10 The assessment of new requests will be carried out once annually, and a new priority list established accordingly. The amended priority list will be proposed for

approval at the relevant Cabinet Member Council Meeting. Identified priority crossing points will then be implemented within that financial year, subject to funding.

Table 1 - Top ten identified priority crossings

Crossing Number	Crossing Location	Priority Score	Proposed Actions	Proposed Crossing Facility	Funding Source 2011/2012	Future funding required
1	Pavilion Parade, Edward Street,	68	Implement as part of BBA project scheduled implementation 2014/15	Signalised Crossing Point	*BBA	none
2	Church Road Hove near Hova Villas	30.2	Design & implement within the financial year 2014/15	Pedestrian island	LTP	none
3	Sackville Rd, Old Shoreham Road	21.9	To be considered as future LTP/ Section 106 schemes	Full signalised junction with pedestrian facilities on all arms	none	Section 106 contributions & LTP
4	Hangleton Link Road (A293) NR Fox Way	20.1	To be considered as a future LTP project	Possible speed table/ surfacing & treatment	none	Proposed for inclusion in future LTP programmes
5	Cromwell Road East of Selbourne Place	18.2	Design & implement within the financial year 2014/15	Pedestrian island	LTP	none
6	Dyke Rd / The Droveway	17.7	Design & implement in next 6-12 months	Pedestrian refuge or junction improvement	LTP	LTP
7	Old Shoreham Rd near Olive Road	15.5	To be considered as a future LTP project	Possible corridor treatment or signalised junction	none	LTP
8	Goldstone Villas/Station Approach	14.1	Design & implement in next 6-12 months	corridor treatment & resurfacing	LTP	none
9	Preston Drove, opposite Blakers Park	13.4	No further action due to existing pedestrian refuge	none	none	none

10 Upper Rock Gardens/ Edward Street Junction West Arm	Improvements made, no further action	Formal pedestrian phase introduced on west arm	BBA	none
--	--------------------------------------	--	-----	------

^{*}Better Bus Areas

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The proposed assessment methodology has been considered and approved by Members of ECSOSC and furthermore has been approved at the Cabinet Member Meeting on the 26th May 2011.
- 5.2 Works Notifications will be distributed at each location once feasibility and design work is completed, prior to implementation. In locations where Traffic Regulation Orders are required these will be advertised accordingly.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 The adopted pedestrian crossing methodology was applied to crossing requests previously received and the list of priorities has now been identified. The report asks for approval to continue to prioritise new requests and to implement those recommended priorities.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 7.1 The capital costs associated to the recommendations in the report will be funded from a mixture of Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital funding, Section 106 receipts and identified grant funding.
- 7.2 The total LTP budget allocation for pedestrian crossings in the 2014-15 financial year is £0.143m as approved at Policy and Resources Committee; which includes £0.080m of 2014-15 LTP allocation and a £0.063m reprofile from previous financial years.

Finance Officer Consulted: Name Steven Bedford Date: 12/09/14

Legal Implications:

- 7.3 The Council must comply with the requirements of section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Before establishing, altering or removing a pedestrian crossing the Council must:
 - A consult the chief officer of police about the proposal
 - B give public notice of the proposal; and
 - C inform the Secretary of State in writing.

Adequate time must be given for responses to be made to the public notice and any responses must be taken into account in finalising proposals.

Lawyer Consulted: Katie Matthews Date: 10/09/14

Equalities Implications:

7.4 None identified directly in relation to this report

Sustainability Implications:

7.5 Improving the pedestrian environment will increase the number of people choosing to walk. Walking is the most sustainable form of all transport modes as it produces zero emissions and also improves public health through increased physical activity.

Any Other Significant Implications:

7.6 None relating to this report

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

- 1. Pedestrian Crossing Priority Methodology
- 2. 2014/15 Pedestrian Priority List

Documents in Members' Rooms

1. None

Background Documents

1. None