

**Decision Session - Executive Member for
Transport and Planning**

12 July 2018

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy & Place

Pedestrian Crossings – Review of requests

Summary

1. This report seeks approval to implement proposals to improve pedestrian crossing facilities at various locations throughout York.
2. The Executive Member is asked to consider the contents of the report along with the objections raised against some of the schemes (including a petition for Wetherby Road), and approve the implementation of the individual schemes.

Recommendations

3. It is recommended that the Executive Member approves the proposed schemes as shown in Appendix C for implementation.

Reason: The proposals serve to provide much needed improvements to crossing facilities at various locations within York, where requests for improvement had been made.

Background

4. For many years there was no specific allocation in the Transport Capital Programme for pedestrian crossing improvements, with any crossing improvements during previous years tending to be funded via other work programmes. As a result of the lack of a specific budget, a relatively large list of requests slowly built up.
5. In an attempt to reduce the size of the list and to more easily identify the most appropriate sites, a new methodology for assessment and means of prioritising measures was developed. This was reported to and approved by the Executive Member in August 2016.

6. The new methodology recommended a multi-phase approach to addressing the backlog of requests:
 - Phase 1 – desktop review of the list of requests to reduce it to 10-15 sites which may be feasible.
 - Phase 2 – undertake the relevant surveys on the top ranked schemes to deliver a prioritised list.
 - Phase 3 – undertake further design and consultation on the top 3 or 4 schemes and gain the necessary approvals
 - Phase 4 – deliver the schemes within the allocated budget.

7. Phase 1 identified a list of 14 sites to be further investigated at feasibility stage. These were:
 - New Lane, Huntington;
 - Hamilton Drive, near West Bank Park;
 - Haxby Road, New Earswick, near Folk Hall;
 - Walmgate, near former Post Office;
 - University Road, near Heslington Hall;
 - Heworth Green “Magic Roundabout”, Heworth Green approach;
 - Acomb Road, near West Bank Park;
 - Bishopthorpe Road, near Winning Post Pub;
 - Front Street, Acomb, near Morrison’s entrance;
 - Main Street, Copmanthorpe;
 - Huntington Road, between Lowther Street and Park Grove;
 - Wetherby Road near Danebury Drive;
 - Clifton Moorgate near Oakdale Road (north end); and
 - Shipton Road, near East Cottages.

8. Feasibility studies were undertaken during 2016/17 to investigate crossing improvements at these locations. The studies assessed the sites using appropriate survey data (vehicle flows, pedestrian counts including delays, and vehicle speeds) in order to identify a priority list of locations where improvements could be made. The primary calculation used to determine whether crossing facilities are appropriate and what type of facility is suitable uses a PV^2 value where P is the pedestrian flow and V is the vehicle flow.

9. The PV^2 values are then modified to take account of the proportion of vulnerable pedestrians crossing at the location, the type of vehicles involved, any accident records, crossing delays, road width, traffic speed and proximity to pedestrian trip attractors such as schools, shops, leisure facilities etc. PV^2 values are calculated for each hour

over the survey period (usually 7am to 7pm) and the final PV² value is then calculated by averaging the four highest values from the peak hours at each site.

10. A PV² value of 1.0x10⁸ is an indication that a formal crossing would offer a safe and appropriate facility on a single carriageway road subject to a full site assessment of factors, such as visibility. The values do not fully account for the existing provision of pedestrian refuges, these allow crossing in two stages similar to a dual carriageway crossing where the PV² value justifying a formal crossing is doubled. Instead, it is assumed that a replacement crossing would be a single stage crossing and the presence of the refuge ignored in the road width weighting.
11. The table below summarises the outcome of the initial studies. Of the 14 sites reviewed, 3 were recommending no action and were discounted on that basis (sites A, B and N). A further 5 sites (Sites D-H inclusive) recommended the introduction of simple dropped crossing arrangements and these will be addressed via the dropped crossing programme.

	Site	Modified PV ²	12 hour vehicle count	12 hour pedestrian count	Recommendation	Estimated works cost
A	A19 Shipton Road	0.7x10 ⁸	10412	223	Do nothing – existing refuges in vicinity	£0
B	Acomb Road	0.3x10 ⁸	7289	268	Do nothing – existing refuge in situ	£0
C	B1224 Wetherby Road	0.5x10 ⁸	7611	472	Improve existing refuge, improve adjacent crossings, relocate bus stop	£10,000
D	Bishopthorpe Road	0.1x10 ⁸	8152	87	Install two simple dropped crossings	£3000
E	Clifton Moorgate	0.3x10 ⁸	12412	65	Install one simple dropped crossing	£1500
F	Front Street	0.6x10 ⁸	9093	594	Install two simple dropped crossings – one at existing roundabout splitter island	£5000
G	Hamilton Drive	0.1x10 ⁸	3562	295	Improve existing simple dropped	£2000

					crossing and provide a simple dropped crossing near bus stops	
H	Haxby Road, New Earswick	0.5x10 ⁸	9516	255	Improve existing simple dropped crossing	£2000
I	Heworth Green	Min 2.6x10 ⁸	18046	310	Install Puffin or Toucan crossing	£35,000
J	Huntington Road	0.7x10 ⁸	9013	327	Install build out and simple dropped crossing	£5000
K	Main Street, Copmanthorpe	0.2x10 ⁸	4980	343	Investigate provision of footway along frontage of pub	??
L	New Lane, Huntington	0.2x10 ⁸	8927	175	Install flush kerbs and tactiles at splitter island, investigate refuge at existing dropped crossing location	£12,000
M	University Road	0.3x10 ⁸	3573 one way	1303	Correct tactile paving and consider moving bus stop	£500+
N	Walmgate	0.2x10 ⁸	4657	1195	Do nothing	£0

12. Appendix A includes a summary of the initial feasibility studies for each of the sites.
13. The remaining 6 sites (A1036 Heworth Green, Huntington Road, B1224 Wetherby Road, Main Street Copmanthorpe, New Lane and University Road) have been developed further during 2017/18, with designs being drawn up for each to verify that the proposals are suitable and viable, and to identify the probable implementation costs.
14. At the decision session meeting on 17th May 2018, the Executive Member considered a petition requesting the Council to investigate provision of a pedestrian crossing at York Road, Haxby. The Executive Member gave approval to Officers to investigate whether a crossing is justified and identify suitable locations. This investigation is to be carried out as part of the 2018/19 programme and results are to be reported back to Executive Member for further approvals as appropriate in due course.

Consultation

15. A two stage consultation was undertaken for each of the six sites. Annex B includes existing and proposed layouts for each of the six sites.
16. The initial consultation included relevant council officers and ward members and the final consultation was widened to include Parish Councils (where appropriate), external stakeholders, residents and businesses. A summary of the consultation responses is provided below on a scheme-by-scheme basis.

A1036 Heworth Green

17. No objections were raised through the consultation. The only responses received were positive - Councillor Funnell and a resident offered support to the proposals.

Huntington Road.

18. No responses were received to the consultation.

B1224 Wetherby Road.

19. Objections were received from a number of sources:
 - 2 emails from representatives of the Sun Inn, raising the following concerns –
 - the stop will be positioned close to the front seating area and would create additional noise and fumes affecting pub users;
 - the bus stop would impact on the pub car park access;
 - buses stopped at the stop would restrict views for vehicles exiting the car park, increasing the possibility of accidents; and
 - the bus stop would impact upon/prevent dray deliveries to the pub.

The Sun Inn repeated these concerns and added that –

- the bus stop will prevent disabled parking or dropping off outside the pub; and
- bus passengers would have unrestricted views into the private accommodation area of the pub.

Petition

A petition was submitted after consultation had been completed, by Councillor Barnes on behalf of the Sun Inn. It is headed *“Do you want to enjoy a relaxing drink outside without inhaling bus fumes? Do you enjoy the view of the Green? Do you use our car park (entrance being blocked)? Would you like a bus stop outside your home? We have a proposed bus stop being paced outside the Sun Inn”*.

It asks residents to sign the petition to stop placement of the bus stop outside the Sun Inn. It is signed by 115 people. A copy of the petition is included in Annex D

Resident #1

- concerned that the bus stop will become a layover for other services;
- considers that many vehicles travel in excess of the speed limit and suggested traffic calming should be considered;
- relocation of the bus stop would displace parking outside the pub and other premises to more unsuitable locations;
- it will be positioned close to the front seating area and would create additional noise and fumes affecting pub users.

Resident #2

- Concerned that the relocation of the bus stop would create additional noise and fumes to which they would be exposed when using their front garden.
- Similarly it would impact on the use of the pub's beer garden due to increased noise and fumes.

Resident #3

- Positioning the bus stop outside the pub would hinder the views of the Green.

Officer response:

The bus stop is being relocated to a suitable position away from its current position at the pedestrian crossing, where it sometimes obstructs the free flow of traffic and prevents pedestrians from crossing. The buses which currently operate at this stop are No5 and

412.

The No5 is being relocated on to Danebury Drive and, as this is a frequent service (every 15 minutes during daytime Monday – Saturday, and every 30 minutes otherwise), this would take much pressure off the Wetherby Road stop.

The 412 is to be relocated to the proposed stop in question. This service operates on a 2-hour frequency Monday – Saturday, although the buses are more frequent during peak times (07:17, 08:10, 09:50 then every two hours until 15:50, 16:50 and 18:11). No buses operate after 18:11.

The bus would only be present at the stop for a limited time to collect or drop off passengers therefore the impact on the public house would be minimal. The bus stop would not prevent access to the rear car park (only a bus stop pole is to be provided and this would be positioned so that the bus would be away from the access. Neither would it prevent vehicles from exiting the car park.

As the kerbs here are flush with carriageway, the footway and kerbs will need to be raised slightly to afford easier boarding and alighting.

It would have minimal affect on deliveries (barrels are apparently dropped off near the car park entrance and taken to the rear of the pub).

The bus stop would not hinder views of the Green due to the fact that buses would only be present for very short periods. Parking currently occurs outside the pub and this hinders the views more as it occurs over a longer period of time. Some on-street parking would still be permitted.

No traffic calming is proposed on Wetherby Road.

Main Street, Copmanthorpe.

20. Resident #1 commented that the pub and café offer an amenity used by many people and that provision of a footway would reduce this amenity considerably. Pedestrians currently pass through the amenity without hindrance. Alternative pedestrian routes are available and pedestrians would be forced to cross two busy junctions if the new

path was installed. The new path would offer little benefit and perhaps increased danger to pedestrians.

Officer response: the amenity is placed on adopted highway without authorisation. The new path would offer pedestrians a more direct and safer route linking two existing crossings. The pub landlord, Parish Council and a further resident have offered support to the proposal.

New Lane, Huntington.

21. Resident #1 objects to the proposals on the basis of poor visibility / sightlines at each crossing and considers the southern crossing to be inherently unsafe due to its location. Also considers the northern crossing to be safe already and doesn't need improvement.

Officer response: the improvements to the northern crossing are to provide a safer means of crossing by installing a refuge to break the crossing into two stages. This will primarily benefit people with reduced mobility. Parking near the crossing hinders visibility and the measures aim to reduce this parking making crossing safer. The only alterations being made at the southern crossing are to bring it in line with current standards by introducing tactile paving for the benefit of blind and partially sighted pedestrians.

22. One resident offered support for the proposals.

University Road.

23. As the proposals are very minor, only a limited external consultation was undertaken. No comments were received.

Road Safety Audit

24. Combined stage 1-2 road safety audits were carried out for the schemes at A1036 Heworth Green, Huntington Road, B1224 Wetherby Road, Main Street, and New Lane. The main areas of concern are described below with officer response.

A1036 Heworth Green.

25. There are concerns that inadequate skidding resistance will be provided. The audit recommends that suitable surfacing be undertaken to ensure that the correct skid resistance is achieved and that

markings are applied without partially removed lines remaining visible.

Officer response: resurfacing is proposed on the approaches to the crossing. The appropriate level of skid resistance will be provided. The green surfacing within the cycle lanes will be reinstated as necessary.

26. The crossing width is shown as 10m, which could lead to drivers not seeing pedestrians on the offside and could lead to strike collisions. The recommendation is that the crossing width should be reduced.

Officer response: There is little scope due to the proximity of junctions and vehicular accesses to provide a 2-stage crossing so the proposal will include for localised build-outs at each side to reduce the crossing to an acceptable width and to improve visibility of the crossing on the approaches. The cycle lanes will be deflected around the new build-outs.

27. The crossing may lead to queuing back to the roundabout at busy times and could lead to shunt type accidents as vehicles enter Heworth Green. The situation should be monitored and advanced signage provided advising drivers of the crossing.

Officer response: Originally a puffin was proposed but this option was considered more likely to cause backing up to the roundabout. With a zebra, queuing is still possible but is likely to be less due to how the zebra would operate. Pedestrian demand is low. Warning signs to diagram 544 will be provided on the main approaches.

28. There are concerns that the adjacent street lighting may not be adequate to light the crossing. Nearby street lighting levels should be reviewed.

Officer response: Adjacent lighting has been upgraded to LED so is unlikely to be insufficient. The lighting team will be asked to review the street lighting.

29. An existing direction sign may compromise visibility of the northern beacon for left turners from Malton Avenue. This could lead to drivers being unaware of the presence of the crossing leading to potential pedestrian strikes. The recommendation is that the sign should be relocated.

Officer response: The sign, which measures 1.15m high x 1.95m wide,

is mounted on a bracketed post at a height of 2.2m above footway level. From a driver's perspective, the crossing is likely to be clearly visible, especially with the build-outs being provided. However, this will be reviewed once the crossing is in place. If, then, the sign is proven to be obscuring visibility of the crossing, the sign will be relocated.

Huntington Road.

30. The bus stop conflicts with the mandatory cycle lane. Buses stopping north of the cycle lane could reduce the visibility for pedestrians crossing east to west. The recommendation is that a section of the cycle lane be removed to allow the buses to stop at the flag position.

Officer response: Swept path movements for the buses have been checked and the buses are able to stop at the revised position as intended. However, the cycle lane is to be shortened slightly.

31. The new crossing is only accessible from one direction on the western footpath. This could encourage pedestrians to walk in carriageway to access the crossing or to cross diagonally, creating extra conflict and increased risk of collision.

Officer response: the western side of the crossing will be made accessible from both directions.

32. The parking bay on the eastern side reduces visibility for pedestrians waiting to cross. The audit recommends reducing the parking length to provide a suitable visibility splay, and introduce parking restrictions.

Officer response: the build-outs are to extend into the carriageway to the same width as the parking bays. As such, pedestrians should be able to see approaching vehicles and be seen, and hence be able to cross safely. The proposal is an improvement on existing.

The parking bays are provided for permit holders and limited waiting. Reducing the length of the parking is not an acceptable option.

33. The build-outs do not include bollards and therefore may not be visible in poor weather or at night.

Officer response: bollards with appropriate reflectorisation are to be

provided on each build-out.

B1224 Wetherby Road

34. The carriageway surface is in poor condition, creating a potential tripping hazard. The surfacing should be renewed.

Officer response: the carriageway condition is very poor and will be reinstated as part of this scheme.

35. There is a dropped kerb outside the pub where the new stop is proposed. This may make it difficult for some passengers when boarding / alighting. The recommendation is that the kerb should be raised.

Officer response: There is insufficient fall at the proposed location to raise the kerbs to a suitable height in order to comply fully with standards, without causing backfall towards the property. However, it would be possible to locally lift the kerb where it is currently flush with the carriageway to provide up to 60mm of kerb face without seriously compromising the footway crossfall.

This suggested arrangement would be an improvement on that provided at the existing bus stop.

Main Street, Copmanthorpe.

36. To provide suitable clearance to the bollards and maintain a useable 1.8m footway, the overall width required is approximately 2.5m, leaving significantly less space than current available for the pub seating. This could lead to "A" frames and seating encroaching into the footway which could be a trip hazard. The audit recommends that a suitable seating arrangement be agreed with the businesses and monitored.

Officer response: The seating and tables are placed on the adopted highway. The provision of the footway will be defined by an appropriate delineator and any seating and tables will need to be placed behind this delineation. The arrangement will be agreed with the businesses.

37. An existing crossing on Church Street lacks tactile paving on one side and could lead to visually impaired pedestrians entering the carriageway unintentionally. Tactile paving should be installed.

Officer response: Tactile paving will be reinstated to match that on the opposite side.

38. There is a small section of tactile paving on Church Street which doesn't tie into any crossing and appears to warn of a vehicle crossing to the shop forecourt. This may cause drivers to think they have priority over the path. It is potentially confusing and should be removed.

Officer response: The panel will be removed.

39. The back-to-back kerblines arrangement may create ponding problems which could freeze creating a slip hazard in cold weather. Adequate drainage should be provided.

Officer response: Appropriate drainage will be provided.

New Lane

40. The proposals show an "H" bar marking to protect the crossing from parking. This is considered inappropriate on the northern side as there is only one vehicle crossing and may lead to the marking being ignored creating a visibility issue for pedestrians, potentially leading to pedestrian strike accidents. The audit recommends that the existing restrictions be extended on the northern side, and mirroring this treatment on the southern side.

Officer response: The extension to the existing waiting restrictions will be pursued. The existing markings will also be refreshed.

Parking in the southern side is seen as less of a concern but this will be monitored. The presence of the new island and the vehicular accesses should restrict the parking on this side.

41. Guidance suggests that lane widths between kerb and refuge should be below 3.1m or greater than 3.9m to ensure cyclists are not squeezed by overtaking vehicles. The widths at the island are 3.85m and so could lead to cycle accidents.

Officer response:

The designer considers that an island of 2.0m width should be provided as proposed, and that lane widths of 3.85m are acceptable over such a short length and due to the low risk of conflict between

cyclists and vehicles. In addition, its proximity to the roundabout tends to slow vehicles down.

Options

42. Option 1: to consider the contents of the report and objections received, and approve the implementation of the crossing improvements at each location as shown in Annex C.

The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the extension of the waiting restrictions at New Lane would need to be advertised – if objections are received, this will need to be reported back to Executive Member for a decision. If no objections are received, the amendment to the TRO will be progressed.

43. Option 2: as Option 1 but with revisions as the Executive Member deems appropriate.
44. Option 3: to consider the objections raised against the proposals and not implement the improvements at Wetherby Road, Main Street or New Lane. Implementation of the crossing improvements at the other locations should be undertaken.

Analysis

45. Option 1 - Improvements at the various locations were investigated following requests from members of the public. As such, improvements to the crossings at each of the locations will achieve the objectives of the project, serving to provide improved safety for pedestrians. The amendments include for recommendations made at road safety audit.
46. Option 2 will also satisfy the objectives for the project but will allow for the Executive Member to modify the proposals as deemed appropriate.
47. Option 3 will result in some of the schemes not being implemented and a continuation of pedestrians being at risk from injury whilst using substandard crossing facilities. The objectives of the project would not be fully achieved.

Council Plan

48. The potential implications for the priorities in the Council Plan are:

A Council that listens to residents.

Requests for improvements to crossing facilities at several locations were investigated during the feasibility studies. The studies identified a number of sites deemed suitable for improvement and subsequent design work has been undertaken to develop the proposals to achieve the objective of improving the crossing facilities and making them safer for pedestrians.

Implications

Financial

49. The budget for 2017/18 was £60,000. Design work was substantially completed for each of the schemes. The majority of the £60,000 has been spent on the development of the schemes.
50. A budget of £50,000 is allocated to the project in 2018/19 to complete the detailed design and implement the schemes. The cost to undertake the works and complete the design is estimated at approximately £64,000. However, the New Lane scheme (£6,000) is to be paid from the S106 funds from developments in the area, leaving a potential shortfall of £8,000 to complete all of the schemes, although this is based on estimates. The York Road, Haxby study needs to be undertaken as part of this programme also.
51. The schemes have been ranked in terms of benefit achieved with Huntington Road at the top, followed by Wetherby Road, University Road, Heworth Green, New Lane and Main Street last. It is suggested that the schemes are implemented in this sequence, alongside the study of the York Road crossing, until the budget limit is reached. The spend across the Transport Capital Programme will be reviewed later in the year and the schemes delivered if funding is available.
52. The pedestrian crossing allocation is proposed to be on a rolling programme basis with the expectation that funding would be allocated in future capital programmes. The budget allocation would be confirmed by the Executive Member at commencement of each year.

Human Resources (HR) – None.

One Planet Council / Equalities –

53. Any highways works aimed at making improvements for pedestrians is designed to cater for more vulnerable road users including those with mobility issues or visual impairments.

Legal –

54. Advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be required if the extension to the waiting restrictions at New Lane are progressed.

Crime and Disorder – None.

Information Technology (IT) - None

Property – None.

Other – None.

Risk Management

55. In compliance with the Council’s risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified.

Authority reputation –

56. This risk is in connection with public perception of the Council if nothing is done to provide the improvements to the crossings and is scored as 12.

Risk category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Organisation reputation	3	4	12

57. This score falls into the 11-15 category and means that the risk has been assessed as being medium. This level of risk requires frequent monitoring. This is already undertaken by officers during an annual review of crossings.

Contact Details

Author:

David Mercer
Acting Transport Projects
Manager
Economy & Place
Tel No. 01904 553447

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris, Corporate Director of Economy
and Place

Report Approved Date 22/6/18

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial: Patrick Looker, Finance Officer 01904 551633

Wards Affected:

Acomb, Guildhall, Heworth, Hull Road, Huntington & New
Earswick, Westfield, and Copmanthorpe.

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

[Executive Member decision session report 11th August 2016.](#)

Annexes:

Annex A – summaries of the initial feasibility studies.
Annex B – existing layouts and consultation plans.
Annex C – proposed layouts including safety audit suggestions.
Annex D – Sun Inn petition (Wetherby Road).