

Report to the Chief Officer of Highways and Transportation

Date: 18 July 2017

Subject: Design & Cost Report for Off-site Highway Works Associated With Residential Development at Site Of Former Glassworks, Cardigan Road, Headingley, Leeds (Sect 106 planning ref : 12 / 03371)

Capital Scheme Number : 32793 / 000 / 000

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Hyde Park & Woodhouse | <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 The Best Council Plan 2015-20 outlines how Leeds City will achieve its ambition to become the Best City in the UK and Leeds City Council the best authority. According to the Best Council Plan, the success of the Best Council objective: will be partly measured through reduced numbers of people killed or seriously injured on the city's roads. By enhancing the local residential environments and by reducing vehicle speeds, this will provide a safer and friendly road environment for all.
- 2 Highway works are required in connection with a student residential development on the Former Glassworks Site at Cardigan Road in Headingley. Proposals for a student residential block comprising 65 cluster flats (154 bed spaces) were originally refused planning permission under application ref 09/00856/FU but subsequently allowed on Appeal in February 2011. Through the Appeal a S106 was signed (12/03371) for financial contributions to be made by the developer toward the provision and maintenance of a pelican crossing across Cardigan Road, amongst other obligations.
- 3 The developer has requested that the City Council undertakes the highway works in order to meet with the requirements of the planning permission and the S106 Agreement.
- 4 This report seeks authority to implement the highway works as set out in Section 3.2 and approve an injection of £59,760 into the City Development Capital

Programme, to be fully funded by the developer via funding secured by S106 obligation.

Recommendations

- 5 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) note the highway works as outlined in Section 3.2 and indicated on drawing TM/19/2907/CON/01
 - ii) give authority to implement the works as set out in Section 3.2;
 - iii) approve the injection of £59,760 into the capital programme funded from a section 106 private developer receipt;
 - iv) give authority to incur expenditure of £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement; and
 - v) Request permission by the City Solicitor to publish a Section 23 Notice the Roads Traffic Regulations Act 1984 in order to inform the public of the proposed crossing.

1.0 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To note the principle of the implementation of highway works associated with a student residential development off Cardigan Road, Headingley, which was granted approval through Appeal in 2011 (reference 09/00856/FU and 12 / 03371).
- 1.2 To obtain authority to inject and incur expenditure of £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement.

2 Background information

- 2.1 Planning permission for a student residential development on the former Glassworks site at Cardigan Road in Headingley was originally refused planning permission due to the impact it may have on the housing mix in the area (reference 09/00856/FU) but was subsequently granted permission on Appeal in 2011 (12/03371)
- 2.2 Minor modifications to the planning approval 09/00856/FU have been approved under applications 12/03371/FU and 15/06102/FU. The development is under construction and occupation of the building is anticipated in September 2017.
- 2.3 A Section 106 Agreement was signed through the Appeal in 2011 (12/03371) which committed the developer to paying a sum of money towards the provision and future maintenance of a pelican crossing on Cardigan Road prior to the commencement of development, the detail of the crossing is shown drawing TM/19/2907/CON/01 and is attached to this report.
- 2.4 The amounts for the provision of the crossing (£59,760) and future revenue maintenance of the crossing (£20,000) have been paid to the Council and are held in Holding Accounts.

- 2.5 The S106 Agreement requires the off-site highway works shown on the attached plan TM/19/2907/CON/01 to be carried out by the Council. Funding of the highway works has been provided from the S106 contribution and a further legal Agreement, such as a S278 Agreement, is not necessary as the funding for the highway works is already in place.
- 2.6 The developers have requested the City Council to commence the carrying out of the highway works.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The proposals within this report are concerned only with the delivery of the highway works, the principle of these works having been considered as part of the planning process.
- 3.2 The highway works are shown in outline on plan TM/19/2907/CON/01 attached and will consist of the following:-
- New pelican crossing on Cardigan Road, located between the access and egress of the petrol filling station;
 - All associated Civils works including signs, lighting, road markings and drainage;
 - Any Statutory undertakers works resulting from the works described above.
- 3.3 **Programme** – The building is due to be occupied in September 2017 and the design and construction of the works will be carried out within the current financial year 2017/18.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Ward Members: The site is located in Hyde Park & Woodhouse Ward. Members were consulted by email dated 19/5/2017; we have received one response back who is supportive of the scheme.
- 4.1.2 Emergency Services and the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA): The Emergency Services and WYCA were consulted by email dated 19/5/2017; no comments have been received to date.
- 4.1.3 The following service areas have been consulted: Finance, Traffic, Environmental Studies, Transport Policy, Road Safety, Street Lighting, Contracts, Bridges, Flood Risk Management, UTMC, Highway Design, Highway Maintenance, Highway Asset Management and Network Management.
- 4.1.4 Any substantive comments received will be taken into account as part of the detailed design process.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 The Pedestrian Crossing Review process has been subject to an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA). 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.

- 4.2.2 If a site does not meet 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.
- 4.2.3 Lack of appropriate facilities to cross a busy road may also have a greater impact on poorer and more deprived communities (and women and children in particular), as they are less likely to have access to a car and are more likely walk, thus having greater exposure to the negative effects of traffic.
- 4.2.4 The recommendations of the EIA include:
- Have regard for road safety records and analysis
 - Consultations on individual sites which do meet the criteria for provision at the detailed design stage to determine and overcome any potential negative impacts.
 - Undertake further study at more marginal locations where there is a significant proportion of vulnerable pedestrians and where difficulty of crossing/ road safety history justifies this.
 - Continue to note and give consideration to the needs of disabled people when recommending sites for the provision of a crossing.
 - Ensure transparency in the decision making process.

4.3.1 **Council policies and City Priorities**

The proposed highway works which allow the development to take place accord with the Councils Local Transport Plan and other policies in that they provide a safe means of access for all users of the highway, to and around, the development.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 The total estimated cost of the scheme is £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the contributions secured by S106 Agreement attached to planning permission 12/03371
- 4.4.2 In addition a future years revenue maintenance 'commuted sum' of £20,000 has also been received via the section 106 agreement.

4.4.3 Capital Funding and Cash Flow

4.4.4 Funding: The total cost of the scheme £59,760 will be funded from the contribution secured by the S106 Agreement, including the works costs, statutory undertakers costs and the cost of staff fees.

4.4.5 Staffing: The design and supervision of the works can be carried out within the existing staff resources.

| Funding Approval : | Capital Section Reference Number :- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Previous total Authority to Spend on this scheme | TOTAL | TO MARCH | FORECAST | | | | |
| | £000's | 2017 £000's | 2017/18 £000's | 2018/19 £000's | 2019/20 £000's | 2020/21 £000's | 2021 on £000's |
| LAND (1) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| CONSTRUCTION (3) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| FURN & EQPT (5) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| DESIGN FEES (6) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| OTHER COSTS (7) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Authority to Spend required for this Approval | TOTAL | TO MARCH | FORECAST | | | | |
| | £000's | 2017 £000's | 2017/18 £000's | 2018/19 £000's | 2019/20 £000's | 2020/21 £000's | 2021 on £000's |
| LAND (1) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| CONSTRUCTION (3) | 45.8 | | 45.8 | | | | |
| FURN & EQPT (5) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| DESIGN FEES (6) | 14.0 | | 14.0 | | | | |
| OTHER COSTS (7) | 0.0 | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | 59.8 | 0.0 | 59.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Total overall Funding (As per latest Capital Programme) | TOTAL | TO MARCH | FORECAST | | | | |
| | £000's | 2017 £000's | 2017/18 £000's | 2018/19 £000's | 2019/20 £000's | 2020/21 £000's | 2021 on £000's |
| Section 106 | 59.8 | | 59.8 | | | | |
| Total Funding | 59.8 | 0.0 | 59.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Balance / Shortfall = | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 The works are exempt from call in being a consequence of and in pursuance of a regulatory decision.

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 A maximum sum of £59,760 is available to the scheme from the contributions to the provision of the pelican crossing secured by the S106 Agreement 12/03371 attached to planning permission 09/00856/FU. The full amount of the contributions have been collected and the full amount for the total estimated cost of the scheme will be transferred from the Highways Holding Account to the Highways Capital

Scheme Account when Highway Board approval and a DDN notice can be presented to the Planning Finance officer. The balance of the actual cost will be settled on completion of the scheme with any remaining funds to be provided toward the future maintenance of the pelican crossing.

- 4.6.3 The total estimated cost of the scheme is expenditure of £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs. It is anticipated that the contributions received through the S106 would more than cover the total cost of the works.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 The scheme will facilitate safe and efficient access to the development site for users of the highway network.
- 5.2 This report seeks authority to incur expenditure of £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer via funding secured by S106 obligation.

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 The Chief Officer (Highways and Transportation) is requested to:
- i) note the highway works as outlined in Section 3.2 and indicated on drawing TM/19/2907/CON/01 attached;
 - ii) give authority to implement the works as set out in Section 3.2;
 - iii) approve the injection of £59,760 into the capital programme funded from a section 106 private developer receipt;
 - iv) give authority to incur expenditure of £59,760 being £45,760 works costs, and £14,000 staff costs, all to be fully funded by the developer from the signed S106 Agreement; and
 - v) Request permission by the City Solicitor to publish a Section 23 Notice the Roads Traffic Regulations Act 1984 in order to inform the public of the proposed crossing.

7 Background documents¹

- 7.1 Appendix 1 - Pedestrian Crossing Review Equality Impact Assessment.

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.

Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration Impact Assessment



As a public authority we need to ensure that all our strategies, policies, services, functions, and structures both current and proposed have given proper consideration to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration. In all appropriate instances we will need to carry out an equality, diversity, and cohesion and integration impact assessment.

This form:

- can be used to prompt discussion when carrying out your impact assessment
- should be completed either during the assessment process or following completion of the assessment
- should include a brief explanation where a section is not applicable

| | |
|---|--|
| Directorate: City Development | Service area: Transport Policy |
| Lead person: Kasia Speakman | Contact number: 0113 2476312 |
| Date of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment: 4/3/11 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 1. Title: The Pedestrian Crossing Review process. Equality Impact of the current process for determining the priority list for the installation of pedestrian crossings | | | | | | |
| Does this relate to: | | | | | | |
| Strategy | Policy | Service | Function | Structure | Other | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Is this: | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | New/ proposed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Already exists and is being reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is changing | |
| (Please tick one of the above) | | | | | | |

2. Members of the assessment team:

| Name | Organisation | Role on assessment team e.g. service user, manager of service, specialist |
|----------------|--|--|
| Kasia Speakman | Sustainable Transport - Leeds City Council | Assistant Transport Planner (Access & Mobility Officer) |
| Timothy Parry | Sustainable Transport – Leeds City Council | Senior Transport Planner |
| Lisa Powell | Performance & Improvement Manager | Equality Lead |

3. Summary of strategy, policy, service, function or structure that was assessed:

This EIA concerns a long established process of assessing requests for provision of pedestrian crossing facilities through an annual review. The Pedestrian Crossing Review formed part of the implementation of the priorities and actions as identified in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (WYLTP2):

S1 - Provide an appropriate road environment with facilities for each user group,

S4- Encourage the correct behaviour of all road users

It also contributed to a number of initiatives identified in the LTP2, including creation of safe routes to school, reducing road casualties and targeting specific vulnerable groups such as child pedestrians and cyclists, especially those living in disadvantaged areas and exposed to large volumes of traffic. It will continue to meet the objectives of the new LTP3 *My Journey* which contains proposals “to define, develop and manage networks and facilities to encourage walking and cycling” and “to develop a model for transport planning at a community level to enhance local accessibility”, to improve safety and security seeking to minimise transport casualties and to address barriers to travel.

The review considers requests for provision of formal crossing facilities across Leeds and recommends locations which merit such provision and what type of crossing should be provided. The aim of the review is to get approval to fund pedestrian facilities where these:

- facilitate pedestrian journeys by overcoming a barrier or severance
- link communities to facilities, such as schools, shops, transport infrastructure, community centres, surgeries etc
- enable safe journeys to school on foot
- help reduce the number of pedestrians killed or seriously injured and improve road safety

The review is conducted in accordance with the guidelines developed in 2002-08, which reflect the three key principles underpinning the evaluation and recommendations made for every site studied:

- The ease with which pedestrians can currently cross the road;
- Whether a crossing will be used regularly; and
- Is a crossing the most appropriate road safety measure or would other measures be more suitable.

4. Scope of the equality, diversity, cohesion and integration impact assessment

(complete - 4a. if you are assessing a strategy, policy or plan and 4b. if you are assessing a service, function, structure or event)

4a. Strategy, policy or plan

(please tick the appropriate box below)

The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes:

X

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| | |
| The vision and themes, objectives or outcomes and the supporting guidance | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| A specific section within the strategy, policy or plan | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>Please provide detail:</p> <p>The Vision for Leeds specifies the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase investment in other forms of transport, such as walking and cycling routes, to meet everyone's needs • Local services, including shops and healthcare, are easy to access and meet people's needs <p>The review recommends sites, assessed according to the above guidelines, which meet the criteria for an LTP investment in a new pedestrian crossing facility. The site assessment guidelines include access to local services.</p> | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <p>4b. Service, function, event please tick the appropriate box below</p> | |
| The whole service (including service provision and employment) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| A specific part of the service (including service provision or employment or a specific section of the service) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Procuring of a service (by contract or grant) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>Please provide detail:</p> <p>The Pedestrian Crossing Review aims to provide an impartial assessment of all requests received and to recommend provision of crossings at locations which meet the criteria for a particular facility in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedestrian demand, • traffic flows and • difficulty of crossing. <p>The review uses a framework approved by the Highways Board to assess each location against the three key principles outlined above. The framework has three categories of crossing facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • signal controlled crossing • zebra crossing • informal crossing facilities, such as a pedestrian refuge, | |

Sites are assessed against a set of objective criteria to determine the most appropriate facility for each site.

Sites with high vehicular flows (over 1000 vehicles per hour) travelling at speed of over 35mph and high pedestrian demand (typically over 70 pedestrian movements in the busiest hour) would generally merit a signal controlled crossing. For less busy sites (flows typically over 700 vehicles, traffic speed <35 mph 85th percentile, over 40 pedestrians in the busiest hour) a Zebra crossing may be more appropriate. Sites which do not meet the above criteria may benefit from some informal measures to assist pedestrians in crossing the road.

Other factors weighed in favour of the potential provision include demand from particularly vulnerable pedestrians (children, elderly and disabled people) and presence of local facilities as 'attractors'.

The process is undertaken by Transport Policy section and based on data of pedestrian demand, traffic flows, site visits and accident statistics supplied by Traffic Management and other sections. It does not aim to produce detailed designs.

5. Fact finding – what do we already know

Make a note here of all information you will be using to carry out this assessment. This could include: previous consultation, involvement, research, results from perception surveys, equality monitoring, service level equality targets and customer/ staff feedback.

(priority should be given to equality, diversity, cohesion and integration related information)

Service - Background Information

The service is provided throughout the city. Customers of the service include all members of the community who need to travel on foot and cross roads, as well as:

- Residents
- Businesses
- Doctors' Surgeries
- Community Groups
- Councillors
- Local organisations e.g. – schools
- Parish Councils
- Other Council Services

The approved schemes are mainly funded through the LTP. Some schemes are linked to new developments and can be funded through Section 106 agreements as part of planning consents.

Compliments & Complaints

When a site does not justify the provision of a formal crossing facility, this sometimes prompts requests for reconsideration or justification from ward members. The delivery of development funded schemes is contingent on the development commencing which, on occasion, is sometime after the planning consent; where the measures may be of wider benefit to the community this can result in dissatisfaction with the delivery of the service.

Assessment Process

Leeds City Council has an agreed framework for the assessment of potential pedestrian crossing locations which considers the road safety history, a site assessment, current pedestrian usage of the location and the volume of traffic.

Locations which fulfil the criteria in the framework are put forward for funding and inclusion in the annual programme within the Local Transport Plan (LTP). Factors used to make the assessment include:

- Accident statistics – road safety history
- Site assessment – current features including crossing opportunities
- Traffic flows
- Usage of roads by pedestrians at different points and times during the day
- Crossing difficulties
- ‘Special considerations’ – such as the presence of a school, sheltered accommodation, high proportion of children crossing

These items are recorded and evaluated, and a recommendation on the course of action is made.

Are there any gaps in equality and diversity information

Please provide detail:

None. The service is provided throughout the City based on need. Surveys do distinguish on age i.e. adults, children, and older people.

Action required:

Have regard for road safety records and analysis.

6. Wider involvement – have you involved groups of people who are most likely to be affected or interested

Yes

No

Please provide detail:

Public consultations involved the policies which the pedestrian crossing review helps to deliver rather than the review process itself. Lack of infrastructure, safety and lack of education were identified through consultations for the LTP3 as the main the barriers to walking and cycling. The Vision for Leeds and its objectives mentioned above were developed in consultations with local residents. The guidelines upon which the review is conducted were revised in 2002 and 2008 to give a more flexible approach.

Action required:

No action required at present. Reduced budget may mean that fewer schemes will be delivered. However, this will depend on the agreed priorities year on year, which will have regard to the overall pedestrian crossing review process.

7. Who may be affected by this activity?

please tick all relevant and significant equality characteristics, stakeholders and barriers that apply to your strategy, policy, service or function

Equality characteristics**Age****Carers****Disability****Gender reassignment****Race****Religion
or Belief****Sex (male or female)****Sexual orientation****Other**

(for example – marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, social class, income, unemployment, residential location or family background, education or skills level)

Please specify:

The work undertaken by the service has a positive effect on local people and communities generally, but in particular; older and younger people, pregnant women, people with children and disabled people.

Stakeholders**Services users****Employees****Trade Unions****Partners****Members****Suppliers****Other please specify****Potential barriers.****Built environment****Location of premises and services****Information
and communication****Customer care****Timing****Stereotypes and assumptions**

Cost

Consultation and involvement

specific barriers to the strategy, policy, services, function or structure

Please specify

8. Positive and negative impact

Think about what you are assessing (scope), the fact finding information, the potential positive and negative impact on equality characteristics, stakeholders and the effect of the barriers

8a. Positive impact:

The assessment framework considers the demand from children and elderly people and factors such as the proportion of children, enabling journeys to school and the proportion of elderly people are weighed positively in the decision making process to recommend the provision of a crossing. No specific data is gathered in terms of disability, sexual orientation or race, however, site observations/ request details do provide some indication of demand from pedestrians with a mobility impairment. Whenever possible, these are factored into the decision making process.

The review assesses the level of demand for a crossing at a particular point, ensuring that the provision of a crossing meets the existing need for a specific facility to enable pedestrians to safely cross the road. This has a positive impact on people's ability to make journeys on foot, including elderly and disabled people and children.

There is a misconception that pedestrian facilities are only provided in the aftermath of a serious accident. The review provides a clear framework for assessment of sites and helps dispel such myths.

Age:

- **Older people** often require a longer time to cross and are unable / find it difficult to cross unless there are large gaps in traffic. The review collect information about the number of elderly people crossing at the location assessed.
- **Young people** are enabled to cross the road in relative safety and formal facilities help promote independence, for example on a journey to school. Installation of new facilities on a route to school may include specific road safety training for school children on how to use the crossing.

Disabled people:

Formal crossing facilities include features which benefit disabled pedestrians such as

dropped kerbs for wheelchair users and tactile paving to assist blind and partially sighted pedestrians. Signal controlled crossings also have tactile and audible signals corresponding to the 'green man' phase. At-grade crossings are more inclusive than bridges and underpasses and are accessible to all. Blind pedestrians do not have to judge the direction and speed of traffic and can cross in greater confidence at a formal crossing point.

The annual review provides an opportunity for members of the public (including disabled people) and for other bodies (such as schools) to request pedestrian facilities at specific locations. The requests receive proper consideration and the outcomes are based on an impartial assessment of need, including any special considerations (e.g. high proportion of children or elderly people crossing). This ultimately leads to installation of facilities which otherwise would not have been provided.

Action required:

No action required.

8b. Negative impact:

General

The review framework does not have negative impacts on equality characteristics. In terms of specific outcomes, potential negative impacts may be:

Traffic flows and congestion – increase in pedestrian facilities may produce delays on some congested routes. The type of facility is carefully considered for each specific location.

Age and Disability

Parking – if a crossing facility is provided this does remove kerbside parking, which may have a negative impact, particularly on elderly and disabled people. This does, however, depend on the frontage uses and restrictions will usually be quite limited in their extent.

If a site does not meet 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. These factors are taken into consideration during site assessment, where relevant other more appropriate measures may be considered.

Action required:

General: Consultations on individual sites which do meet the criteria for provision at the detailed design stage to determine and overcome any potential negative impacts.

Age: Undertake further study at more marginal locations where there is a significant proportion of vulnerable pedestrians and where difficulty of crossing/ road safety history justifies this.

Disabled people: Continue to note and give consideration to the needs of disabled people when recommending sites for the provision of a crossing.

9. Will this activity promote strong and positive relationships between the groups/communities/teams identified?

Yes

No

Please provide detail:

The provision of crossings helps overcome physical barriers and therefore links communities where severance by a busy road occurs. However, there is potential for one community to feel that they are being put at a disadvantage compared to neighbouring communities, if they receive their schemes and others do not. The assessment process aims to ensure that rational and fair decisions are made.

Action required:

- Continue to perform feasibility assessments on proposed schemes taking into account the needs of disabled people. Seek additional support /funding as required.
- Ensure that stakeholders are made aware of the funding pressures faced by the service in an attempt to manage expectations.
- Ensure transparency in the decision making process.

10. Does this activity bring groups/communities/teams into increased contact with each other (e.g. in schools, neighbourhood, workplace)?

Yes

No

Please provide detail:

Facilitating pedestrian journeys provides greater opportunities for residents and communities to meet and interact, e.g. on a journey to school.

Action required: None

11. Could this activity be perceived as benefiting one group/community/team at the expense of another?

Yes

No

Please provide detail:

The overall reduction in available funding may mean ultimately a reduction in the number of schemes implemented. This could lead to a perception in communities that they are less important. However, the approval of the need for the facility is secured through the objective assessment and does not reflect funding constraints. In the event of restricted funding prioritised schemes would be carried forward for future funding.

Action required:

Ensure transparency in the decision making process and in how reports are published.

