

Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)

Date: 18 March 2014

Subject: Design and Cost Report for the Pedestrian Crossing Review 2014-15

Are specific electoral Wards affected? All If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

- 1 The Best Council Plan 2013-17 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best local authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: ensuring high quality public services, will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people Killed or Seriously Injured on the city's roads. By providing safe pedestrian crossing facilities where needed and justified, the Pedestrian Crossing Review will contribute to this objective being achieved. As children are ranked amongst the most vulnerable road users, the provision of safe crossing facilities where there is demand from children will help facilitate active modes of travel on journeys to school, contributing to the Leeds Education Challenge, which is part of the objective to build a child friendly city, delivery of the Better Lives programme and contribution to "Public Health which is embedded and effectively delivering health protection and health improvement".
- 2 This report summarises the results of the annual Pedestrian Crossing Review, and puts forward proposals for safe crossing facilities where these are justified by demand arising from pedestrian movements, particularly those of vulnerable users: children, older people and disabled people; and where traffic volumes or the complexity of crossing, in conjunction with accident records, would justify the provision of formal measures.
- 3 The report also includes recommendations for sites which do not meet the criteria for the provision of a formal crossing, but where crossing opportunities for pedestrians can be improved by the introduction of some informal measures.

- 4 The report includes recommendations for sites to be provided with appropriate pedestrian and cyclist facilities as part of externally funded schemes.

Recommendations

- 5 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
 - i) note the contents and recommendations of this report and the procedures carried out in respect of conducting the annual pedestrian crossing review;
 - ii) approve the recommendations as set out in Section 3 of the report and in Appendix 1 as the basis for the 2014/15 programme for introducing new pedestrian crossings, subject to detailed scheme approval and programming of the works; and
 - iii) agree the recommendations in respect of the provision of externally funded crossing facilities.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report summarises the results of the 2013 – 14 Review of proposed pedestrian crossing sites and seeks approval for recommendations for sites to be included in the forward programme for further consultation, detailed development and implementation during the year 2014-2015, subject to prioritisation.

2 Background information

- 2.1 Against the national trend for pedestrian and cycle casualties, Leeds has an improving casualty record, including for vulnerable road users. Where installed appropriately, pedestrian crossings form an important element in improving road safety and preventing casualties, particularly for vulnerable road users such as child and elderly pedestrians.
- 2.2 During the course of each year requests for the provision of new pedestrian crossings are received from members of the public and elected members. In order to prepare recommendations for a programme for the installation of new crossings, all such requests are investigated and the results collated and analysed. Feedback will then be provided to those that requested the crossing.
- 2.3 This review has been conducted in line with the agreed guidelines (revised in August 2008 and summarised in Appendix 2) and a site assessment process which takes account of the range of sites and circumstances where crossings are requested. It allows recommendations to be made where a clear and defined pedestrian desire line exists, combined with a heavy traffic flow, as well as for the less busy sites where a zebra crossing or alternative measures may be a more appropriate and effective means of meeting pedestrian needs. Whilst signal controlled crossings are generally more appropriate on busier and faster roads, zebra crossings provide safe facilities where speeds are lower and can achieve reduced pedestrian delay. Where used appropriately, Zebra crossings have achieved safety records just as good as equivalent signal controlled crossings. The following key factors underpin the evaluation and recommendations made for every site studied:

- The ease with which a pedestrian can currently cross the road;
- Whether a crossing site is on a pedestrian desire line and would be used regularly;
- Whether a crossing would be the most appropriate road safety measure or whether other measures are more suitable; and
- Other relevant factors, such as the number of children, elderly and disabled people crossing, proximity of schools, sheltered accommodation, community facilities, bus stops, shops and other attractors.

2.4 The results of the assessment and recommendations are summarised in Appendix 1.

3 Main issues

3.1 Following the review process, crossing facilities are recommended at the following sites, which will form the basis for the Local Transport Plan funded delivery programme, subject to prioritisation:

Site Location	Information and Justification
1) Ring Road Cross Gates/ Manston Drive	<p>This pedestrian crossing is on a busy, dual carriageway A classification road. The desire line for access from Cross Gates Avenue to Church Lane – en route to two primary schools – is not met by the current informal facility within the grass verge. High proportion of those crossing are school children. The provision of a signal controlled crossing would help facilitate walking journeys to school.</p> <p>Recommended: Pelican</p>
2) Oakwood Lane, Gipton	<p>This crossing is proposed in a location near bus stops, leisure centre and a small shopping parade. Vehicular movements are at times complex due to the junction with Amberton Approach and vehicular access to Fearnville Leisure Centre; coupled with relatively high vehicular flows, this creates a barrier to pedestrian movements.</p> <p>Recommended: Pelican</p>
3) Brownberrie Lane/ Roundabout	<p>This is another location where a crossing would facilitate journeys to school as the use by children, particularly in the morning peak, is significant but impeded by the location close to a busy roundabout. Area Management funding has recently been prioritised to reduce vehicular speeds on Brownberrie Lane, a formal crossing facility would complement traffic calming measures and help vulnerable road users where complex vehicular movements on and off the roundabout increase crossing difficulties.</p> <p>Recommended: Humped Zebra</p>

- 4) Queensway, Morley The existing pedestrian refuge does not sufficiently cater for the high number of pedestrians crossing at this location throughout the day. The pedestrian demand is boosted by the presence of a leisure centre, a park and supermarket within the vicinity and vehicular movements are high due to access to off street parking facilities and to the pedestrianised high street.
- Recommended: Zebra crossing
- 5) Old Road, Farsley This location is on a busy high street with only one existing formal crossing facility which does not meet the demand from pedestrians using shops, bus stops and other local facilities on both sides of the road. The presence of on street parking, and high level of demand for parking spaces, increases the difficulty of crossing.
- Recommend: Zebra
- 6) Tong Road, Armley This location was initially considered for an informal facility but the need to accommodate wide loads, coupled with high vehicular flows and significant pedestrian demand, make a formal provision a viable proposition.
- Recommended: Zebra
- 7) Oldfield Lane, Wortley This is a busy location outside a local supermarket and bus stops, generating high level of pedestrian movements across Oldfield Lane. The existing refuge does not provide an adequate facility to cater for the high pedestrian demand.
- Recommend: Zebra
- 8) Burras Lane, Otley Burras Lane is a busy local distributor and a bus route without any crossing facilities along its entire length. The demand for crossing is generated by the Waitrose supermarket and bus stop on one side, and residential properties/ bus stop on the other. Nearly half of the recorded pedestrians are elderly people and children who would find crossing more difficult. The vehicular numbers and pedestrian demand would indicate the need for a Zebra crossing.
- Recommended: Zebra (partially funded by local ward members)
- 9) Newall Carr Road A formal crossing facility is requested close to the entrance to Prince Henry's Grammar School. There are significant crossing movements from the pupils at the school in the morning and evening peak, and at lunchtime (in particular to access a local newsagent and fish and chips shop). There are no formal crossing facilities nearby and, despite relatively low vehicular movements, this route is a Road Safety Length for Concern. Two child pedestrian casualties have been recorded within the last five years and a formal crossing is recommended to improve road safety at this location.
- Recommended: Zebra crossing
- 10) Butcher Hill A local school has requested a crossing provision to aid access for the schoolchildren to playing fields on the opposite side of the road.

Despite chicane traffic calming, the school has repeatedly raised concerns over the ability of large numbers of children to cross Butcher Hill safely.

Recommended: Zebra

Note: Where a Pelican/Toucan is recommended, this may include any signal controlled crossing as appropriate.

- 3.2 The following sites have been investigated and, whilst they do not meet the criteria for a formal crossing, have other forms of improvement recommended:

Site Location	Information and Justification
11) A660 Adel – north of New Adel Lane	<p>A crossing has been requested to aid pedestrian movements across the busy A660 Otley Road. The current provision consists of a number of sub-standard, narrow refuges spaced widely apart. The number of pedestrians crossing has grown since the last survey in 2005, but the numbers are far below the criteria for a Pelican. There is also a concern that the provision of a Pelican at this location would not necessarily meet demand associated with access to a local Coop store and a small shopping parade near The Crescent.</p> <p>Recommend: Subject to feasibility, improved provision of refuges to aid pedestrian movements.</p>
12) Selby Road near Garland Road	<p>A crossing facility has been requested to aid pedestrians crossing near a busy roundabout to access bus stops. Currently pedestrians are using a narrow splitter island very close to a roundabout, which makes it difficult to judge vehicular movements, particularly for children, older people and blind and partially sighted pedestrians.</p> <p>Recommended: A refuge/ informal facility further away from the roundabout, subject to feasibility as siting may be difficult.</p>

- 3.3 The following sites have recommended crossing facilities funded from external sources:

Site Location	Information and Justification
13) Ring Road Cross Gates	<p>This is a complicated location for pedestrians to cross due to very busy traffic and a roundabout. A crossing facility has been requested on the arm of the roundabout forming part of the Ring Road. However, without full signalisation of the roundabout it is unlikely that pedestrian and vehicle conflicts will be sufficiently alleviated. It is proposed that full signalisation is considered as part of the upcoming major developments in East Leeds.</p>
14) Ring Road Moortown	<p>The dual carriageway Ring Road in Moortown area undoubtedly forms</p>

a barrier to pedestrian movements. There is currently a signal controlled crossing on the eastern side of the roundabout where the Ring Road intersects with the A61 Harrogate Road, and a pedestrian facility has been requested on the western side. A full signalisation of the roundabout has been a long term ambition and included within the West Yorkshire Transport Fund. This would also help address previous requests for the provision of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing on the A 61 north of the Ring Road.

- 15) Armley Road Pedestrian facilities have been requested at two locations on Armley Road, at the junction with Canal Road and Pickering Street. Both locations have a refuge in situ to aid pedestrians in crossing the road. Despite relatively low numbers of pedestrians using these facilities, an upgrade to a signal controlled crossing is recommended in view of high volumes of traffic and to accommodate potential demand from cyclists. It is recommended that both sites are included in the City Connect funded cycle route for the provision of Toucan crossings.
- 16) Abbey Road A crossing facility has been requested around Vesper Walk to improve the links across the A65 between the residential area and bus stops/ green space. A major application for the development at Kirkstall Forge has recently been approved and will increase pedestrian movements across the road. A signal controlled crossing and some informal refuges have been made a condition of the planning application.

3.4 Details of the proposed schemes and the programme for implementation will be reported separately as individual schemes are brought forward for funding approval.

3.5 It is intended that those crossings in Section 3.1 will form a part of the 2013/2014 Integrated Transport Capital programme. Each scheme will then require further detailed design, consultation and financial approval.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

4.1.1 No external consultations have been undertaken in respect of this report at this stage. The recommendations put forward in this report have drawn on representation and comments where facilities are being considered as a result of requests from the public and ward members. Detailed consultation on schemes will be undertaken as part of the development of each proposal. Ward members will be involved as each individual scheme develops, and will be informed of the outcome of this review

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

4.2.2 The Pedestrian Crossing Review process has been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EDIA) which is attached as an appendix. The Assessment identified positive impacts of the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities on local people and communities generally but, in particular; on older and younger people, pregnant

women, people with children and disabled people. It also highlighted the need to continue to consider the needs of these equality groups and to ensure the transparency of the decision making process.

- 4.2.3 If a site does not meet the criteria for formal crossing facilities, the lack of such facility may impact most on children and elderly/ disabled people. Elderly and disabled people may be the most affected as they will find it more difficult to walk and cross at an alternative location, and will require additional time to cross. Blind people may also find it difficult or lack confidence to cross a busy carriageway without a dedicated facility. Children are less likely to be able to judge the speed of traffic and child pedestrians form a significant proportion of those killed or seriously injured in traffic collisions (36% nationally). The presence of the above type of users is recorded and weighs on the consideration as to whether a formal facility should be provided.
- 4.2.4 The lack of appropriate facilities to cross a busy road may also have a greater impact on disadvantaged communities (and on women and children in particular), as they are less likely to have access to a car and are more likely to walk, thus being more exposed to the negative effects of traffic.
- 4.2.5 The recommendations of the EqIA include:
- Having regard for road safety records and analysis;
 - Consultations on individual sites, which do meet the criteria for provision, at the detailed design stage in order to determine and overcome any potential negative impacts;
 - Further study to be undertaken at more marginal locations where there is a significant proportion of vulnerable pedestrians and where difficulty of crossing/ road safety history justifies this;
 - Continuing to note and give consideration to the needs of disabled people when recommending sites for the provision of a crossing.
 - Ensuring transparency in the decision making process.
- 4.2.6 The needs of elderly people, children and disabled people were weighed in the assessment process in favour of providing a formal facility at several sites noted throughout the report.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 By providing safe pedestrian crossing facilities where needed and justified, the Pedestrian Crossing Review will help achieve Leeds' ambition to become the Best City by reducing the number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured on the city's roads, by fostering links between the communities and local facilities, especially where the highway forms a considerable barrier, and by enabling more sustainable travel choices for local journeys, including for new developments within the city.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 Funding will be allocated from the Integrated Transport Parent Scheme 99609 in accordance with priorities and budget provision set out in the Local Transport Plan 3. For schemes listed in sections 3.1 approval will be sought individually as the schemes progress.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.2 There are no legal implications for the contents of this report. The report is eligible for call-in as it affects multiple wards.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 Detailed site conditions will be assessed as part of the scheme design or site review as appropriate. Delivery risks will be assessed for each project and reported in the individual scheme approvals.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The Pedestrian Crossing Review 2014 considered 46 sites where crossing facilities were requested, and put forward ten sites to be funded through the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan where sites either meet the criteria as detailed in Appendix 2, or where the presence of particularly vulnerable pedestrians, i.e. disabled people, children and elderly people, results in added difficulty of crossing. It is hoped that these will help overcome some of the barriers to journeys on foot

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) note the contents and recommendations of this report and the procedures carried out in respect of conducting the annual pedestrian crossing review;
 - ii) approve the recommendations as set out in Section 3 of the report and in Appendix 1 as the basis for the 2014/15 programme for introducing new pedestrian crossings, subject to detailed scheme approval and programming of the works; and
 - iii) agree the recommendations in respect of the provision of externally funded crossing facilities.

7 Background documents¹

- 7.1 None

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works. U:HWT/Admin/Wordproc/Comm/2014/Pedestrian Crossing Review 2014-15.doc

Appendix 1 – Site specific recommendations

Site location	All Day Activity		2 hour peak (per hour)		PV2 value (All Peds) 2hr	Assists School Journey	Assessed Category	Recommendation
	Pedestrian Flow (2 way)	Traffic Flow (2 way)	Pedestrian Flow	Traffic Flow				
	0700-1900							
Ring Road Cross Gates/ Manston Drive	212	19951	58.5	1866	2.03	yes	A	Pelican crossing
Armley Road/ Canal Road	220	23311	30	2097	1.32		A	Toucan crossing as part of the CCAG. LSTF Funded
Ring Road Cross Gates/ Travellers Pub	313	19254	30.25	1889	1.29		A	Pelican as part of full roundabout signalisation. Potentially developer funded
Ring Road, Moortown	214	22110	30.5	2055.5	1.27		A	Pelican as part of full roundabout signalisation. WYTF funded
Brownberrie Lane/ Roundabout	198	14269	47	1558.5	1.19	yes	B	Humped zebra crossing
Armley Road/ Pickering Street	151	23727	19.5	2114.5	0.87		A	Toucan crossing as part of the CCAG. LSTF funded
Oakwood Lane	287	12896	43	1345.5	0.76		A	Pelican crossing
Queensway, Morley	692	8708	101	797.5	0.64		B	Zebra crossing

A660 Adel – north of New Adel Lane	180	14929	26.5	1493	0.60		A/C	Upgraded refuges, subject to feasibility
Selby Road/ Garland Road	168	15881	22.5	1567.5	0.54		C	Refuge subject to feasibility
Old Road, Farsley	873	6167	114	678.5	0.52		B	Zebra crossing
Oldfield Lane, Wortley	891	6287	108	635.5	0.51		B	Zebra crossing
Tong Road, Armley	290	11821	54	949	0.49		B	Zebra crossing
Abbey Road nr Vesper Walk	157	16757	20	1620	0.47		A/C	Pelican and series of refuges as part of Kirkstall Forge planning application
Butcher Hill			244	398	0.39	yes	B/C	Zebra crossing or informal measures
Newall Carr Road, Otley	436	6179	105	597	0.38	yes	B	Zebra crossing
Burras Lane, Otley	328	7535	44.5	763.5	0.25		B	Zebra crossing with ward members funding

Appendix 2 - PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SITE ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

Technical criteria

Proposed indicative PV ² value	Existing indicative PV ² value	Guidelines for appropriate crossing provision	Typical site characteristics and road conditions
Category A >0.75 (busiest 2 hours, all pedestrians)	0.85 (busiest 4 hours, usually adults only)	<p>Puffin crossing will generally be preferred for the busiest sites.</p> <p>Used at school or crossing patrol sites only where significant other pedestrian movements exist.</p>	<p>Very busy road where traffic speed >35 mph 85th percentile. Typically traffic flows will exceed 1000 vehicles per hour and over 70 pedestrian movements in busiest hours. At some sites there will be a record of pedestrian injuries. Pedestrian waiting time will generally exceed 1 minute.</p> <p>For sites are at the lower end of speed and traffic range zebra crossings will be preferred.</p>
Category B 0.6 – 0.85 (busiest 2 hours, all pedestrians)	n/a	<p>Zebra crossing will generally be preferred at these quieter sites. In some instance other informal measures may be recommended.</p> <p>May be used as part of a package of measures to assist an SCP or as part of a school travel initiative.</p>	<p>Medium trafficked road with flows typically over 700 vehicles and where traffic speed <35 mph 85th percentile. Pedestrian flows will typically exceed 40 in the busiest hours and should exceed those on adjacent sections of road by at least 3:1 thereby demonstrating a clear desire line. Most sites unlikely to have a pattern of pedestrian casualties. Waiting times up to 30 seconds and occasionally exceeding 1 minute. Some sites at the higher end of the range may be best suited to Puffin crossing control.</p>
Category C <0.6 (busiest 2 hours, all pedestrians)	n/a	<p>Informal measures to assist those having difficulty crossing the road.</p> <p>At SCP sites package of measures to assist warden or as part of a school travel initiative may be appropriate.</p>	<p>Lightly trafficked road where flows usually <600 v.p.h. provide ample and frequent gaps in traffic. No discernible pedestrian desire line nor usually a pattern of pedestrian road injuries. Minimal delay crossing road within 30 seconds of reaching it. Exceptionally a formal crossing may be justified where traffic flows are high or firm evidence of suppressed demand exists.</p>

Note: Threshold PV² values