

**Report to the Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation)**

**Date: 14 April 2015**

**Subject: Puffin crossing technology trial**

**Capital Scheme Number: 32294**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Middleton Park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" 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 It is proposed to trial Puffin pedestrian detection technology at the existing crossing on Middleton Ring Road by St George's Road.

**Recommendations**

- 2 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
  - i) note the contents of this report;
  - ii) approve the proposal at the total cost of £20,000; and
  - iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £12,000 works costs and £8,000 staff costs, to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme.

**1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek approval to spend £20,000 to install Puffin technology at the existing crossing on Middleton Ring Road by St George's Road.

## **2 Background information**

2.1 Puffin crossing technology has been available for a number of years. Puffins use kerbside detector equipment to cancel a pedestrian demand if the pedestrian has crossed the road before the green man appears, and on-crossing detectors to extend the clearance time for a slower pedestrian. Based on site trials in 2006 the decision was made not to install this equipment.

2.2 As more Puffins are installed across the country, and more sophisticated detection equipment has become available, it is appropriate to fully test the latest technology by installing it at an existing site and monitor its performance.

2.3 If satisfactory, use of pedestrian detection equipment has the potential to reduce vehicle delays at pedestrian crossings and increase pedestrian safety at other crossings in Leeds.

## **3 Main issues**

### **3.1 Design Proposals and Full Scheme Description.**

3.1.1 The objective of this proposal is to trial pedestrian detection equipment by converting an existing site to a fully equipped Puffin crossing.

3.1.2 It is proposed to convert the crossing on Middleton Ring Road by St George's Road. This site has been chosen as it is currently perceived to operate inefficiently, as people frequently cross before the green man, and it is wide crossing so individual crossing times are very variable. Also it is convenient for monitoring due to its proximity to the Highways and Transportation offices, meaning a large amount of data and site knowledge can be obtained to facilitate a full assessment, both objective and subjective.

3.1.3 A Puffin conversion entails changing the far side red/green man symbol on the top of the pole to nearside symbols on the pushbutton. Kerb side detectors, on crossing detectors and a camera for monitoring purposes will be installed.

3.1.4 The performance of all detection will be monitored in various conditions, to confirm that the equipment performs satisfactorily irrespective of lighting, traffic, and weather conditions.

3.2 **Programme** – Work will commence as soon as the report is approved, and will be complete during summer 2015, with monitoring continuing through the year

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

4.1.1 Not appropriate, as the visible change is very minor and this is a trial.

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

4.2.1 A screening document has been prepared (see Appendix 1)

4.2.2. The screening process identified that the following impacts on the equality Characteristics:

Positive impact:

- The proposals will have a greater impact for people with mobility issues, the infirm, elderly, wheel chair users, the blind and people with pushchairs as they will be given more crossing time if they need it.
- The far side red/green men display changes to a nearside display on the pushbutton unit. This is considered to be an advantage as pedestrians do not panic when they see the red man light up, which will be of particular benefit to the people with mobility issues and the infirm, who have the potential to be more susceptible to this issue.

Negative Impacts

- None were identified

4.2.2 This is a trial, so benefits are dependent upon the findings. The effect of the changes on equality groups will be included in the review. Therefore an independent impact assessment is not required for the approval requested.

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

4.3.1 The proposal contributes to the policies in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26 as follows:

4.3.2 Proposal 4: to minimise congestion. Puffin technology has the potential to reduce red time to traffic and provide an improved facility for pedestrians.

### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

4.4.1 **Full scheme estimate:** the total cost of this proposal is £20,000 consisting of £12,000 works costs and £8,000 staff fee costs.

4.4.2 **Capital Funding and Cash Flow.** The cost will be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme. There are no Revenue financial implications as a result of this.

<b>Funding Approval :</b>	<b>Capital Section Reference Number :-</b>						
<b>Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2012</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016 on</b>
			<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	0.0						
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	0.0						
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Authority to Spend required for this Approval</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2012</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016 on</b>
			<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LAND (1)	0.0						
CONSTRUCTION (3)	12.0					12.0	
FURN & EQPT (5)	0.0						
DESIGN FEES (6)	8.0					8.0	
OTHER COSTS (7)	0.0						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TO MARCH 2012</b>	<b>FORECAST</b>				
	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2016 on</b>
			<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>	<b>£000's</b>
LCC Supported Borrowing	0.0						
Revenue Contribution	0.0						
Capital Receipt	0.0						
Insurance Receipt	0.0						
Lottery	0.0						
Gifts / Bequests / Trusts	0.0						
European Grant	0.0						
Health Authority	0.0						
School Fundraising	0.0						
Private Sector	0.0						
Section 106 / 278	0.0						
Government Grant - LTP	20.0					20.0	
SCE ( C )	0.0						
SCE ( R )	0.0						
Departmental USB	0.0						
Corporate USB	0.0						
Any Other Income ( Specify )	0.0						
<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Balance / Shortfall =</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

Parent Scheme Number : 99609

Title : LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme

4.4.3 Revenue Effects. There are no effects on revenue spend.

#### 4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 The scheme is not eligible for call in because it falls below the relevant thresholds.

#### 4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 Failure to implement this proposal means that potential benefits of pedestrian detection technology may not be realised.

### 5 Conclusions

5.1 The proposal in this report will facilitate the decision on future use of this equipment.

## **6 Recommendations**

6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:

- i) note the contents of this report;
- ii) approve the proposal at the total cost of £20,000; and
- iii) give authority to incur expenditure of £12,000 works costs and £8,000 staff costs, to be funded from the LTP Transport Policy Capital Programme.

## **7. Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

7.1 None

---

<sup>1</sup> 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/2015/Puffin Crossing Technology Trail.doc

## Appendix 1



### Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Screening

As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, service and functions, both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

A **screening** process can help judge relevance and provides a record of both the **process** and **decision**. Screening should be a short, sharp exercise that determines relevance for all new and revised strategies, policies, services and functions. Completed at the earliest opportunity it will help to determine:

- the relevance of proposals and decisions to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- whether or not equality, diversity, cohesion and integration is being/has already been considered, and
- whether or not it is necessary to carry out an impact assessment.

<b>Directorate: City Development</b>	<b>Service area: Transport Policy</b>
<b>Lead person: Gordon Robertson</b>	<b>Contact number: 2476753</b>

#### 1. Title: Puffin technology trial

Is this a:

Strategy / Policy

Service / Function

Other

If other, please specify

#### 2. Please provide a brief description of what you are screening

The screening process looks at the proposals to trial use of Puffin detection equipment at Middleton Ring Road/St George Road pedestrian crossing and change the signal operation accordingly.

### 3. Relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

All the council's strategies/policies, services/functions affect service users, employees or the wider community – city wide or more local. These will also have a greater/lesser relevance to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration.

The following questions will help you to identify how relevant your proposals are.

When considering these questions think about age, carers, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and any other relevant characteristics (for example socio-economic status, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background and education or skills levels).

Questions	Yes	No
Is there an existing or likely differential impact for the different equality characteristics?	X	
Have there been or likely to be any public concerns about the policy or proposal?		X
Could the proposal affect how our services, commissioning or procurement activities are organised, provided, located and by whom?		X
Could the proposal affect our workforce or employment practices?		X
Does the proposal involve or will it have an impact on <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Eliminating unlawful discrimination, victimisation and harassment</li><li>• Advancing equality of opportunity</li><li>• Fostering good relations</li></ul>		X

If you have answered **no** to the questions above please complete **sections 6 and 7**

If you have answered **yes** to any of the above and;

- Believe you have already considered the impact on equality, diversity; cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 4**.
- Are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration within your proposal please go to **section 5**.

### 4. Considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration

If you can demonstrate you have considered how your proposals impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you have carried out an impact assessment.

Please provide specific details for all three areas below (use the prompts for guidance).

- **How have you considered equality, diversity, cohesion and integration?** (**think about** the scope of the proposal, who is likely to be affected, equality related information, gaps in information and plans to address, consultation and engagement activities (taken place or planned) with those likely to be affected)

No consultations have taken place at this stage as the proposal is a trial. If proved a success, then liaison with Equality Hubs and other interested parties would take place before making a policy change regarding signalled pedestrian crossings

- **Key findings**  
**(think about any potential positive and negative impact on different equality characteristics, potential to promote strong and positive relationships between groups, potential to bring groups/communities into increased contact with each other, perception that the proposal could benefit one group at the expense of another)**

The equipment on trial allows safety clearance times to be increased if a person is still on the crossing.

Positive impact:

- for people with mobility issues – people with mobility issues, the infirm, elderly, wheel chair users, the blind and people with pushchairs will be given more crossing time if they need it.
- the far side red/green men display changes to a nearside display on the pushbutton unit. This is considered to be an advantage as pedestrians do not panic when they see the red man light up.

- 

- **Actions**  
**(think about how you will promote positive impact and remove/ reduce negative impact)**

The detection and timings will be adjusted to maximise the benefit and minimise the possibility of negative issues. The proposed monitoring will assess the impact and make recommendations for future work.

**5. If you are not already considering the impact on equality, diversity, cohesion and integration you will need to carry out an impact assessment.**

Date to scope and plan your impact assessment:	N/A
Date to complete your impact assessment	N/A
Lead person for your impact assessment (Include name and job title)	N/A

**6. Governance, ownership and approval**  
Please state here who has approved the actions and outcomes of the screening

Name	Job title	Date
Andrew Hall	Head of Transport Planning	2/4/15

**7. Publishing**



Though **all** key decisions are required to give due regard to equality the council **only** publishes those related to **Executive Board, Full Council, Key Delegated Decisions** or a **Significant Operational Decision**.

A copy of this equality screening should be attached as an appendix to the decision making report:

- Governance Services will publish those relating to Executive Board and Full Council.
- The appropriate directorate will publish those relating to Delegated Decisions and Significant Operational Decisions.
- A copy of all other equality screenings that are not to be published should be sent to [equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk) for record.

Complete the appropriate section below with the date the report and attached screening was sent:

For Executive Board or Full Council – sent to <b>Governance Services</b>	Date sent: 2 April 2015
For Delegated Decisions or Significant Operational Decisions – sent to appropriate <b>Directorate</b>	Date sent:
All other decisions – sent to <a href="mailto:equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk">equalityteam@leeds.gov.uk</a>	Date sent: