

**Decision Session – Executive Member for  
Transport & Planning**

15 November 2018

Report of the Corporate Director of Economy and Place

**Haxby Pedestrian Crossing Assessment Results and Proposals**

**Summary**

1. This report publishes the results of recent pedestrian crossing assessments undertaken on both York Road and Greenshaw Drive in Haxby. The report discusses potential options, based on the outcome of the assessments, to improve crossing facilities on these two roads and puts forward a course of action for each site.

**Recommendations**

2. The Executive Member is asked to:
  - 1) Option 1 - Acknowledge the outcome of the crossing assessments on the two roads and approve the proposed course of action for each site.

Reason: To understand the processes which officers have gone through to assess each site and the reasoning behind the proposed improvements. Approval of the action plans will enable further work to be undertaken where necessary to draw up a scheme for each site and to undertake consultation on the proposals.

**Background**

Greenshaw Drive

3. In July 2016, Haxby & Wigginton Ward Members put forward a scheme request, to be funded from their delegated ward highways budget, to provide a formal pedestrian crossing on Greenshaw Drive. This crossing was to be located somewhere in the vicinity of the junction with Kirkcroft. The scheme request followed requests from elderly residents in the Kirkcroft area raising concerns that they struggled to cross the road safely to gain access to the main shopping area in Haxby. Upon receipt of the scheme request, officers commissioned speed, vehicle flow and

pedestrian crossing surveys to enable an assessment to be undertaken to determine whether a crossing could be justified in this area, where one could be located and what type of crossing improvement would be the most appropriate. The surveys were undertaken in October / November 2016 and the results of the assessment reported back to the Ward Members in December 2016. The assessment report is attached as a background paper.

4. The assessment was done in accordance with the council's Crossing Request Evaluation procedures which were approved at an Executive Member Decision Session (EMDS) in August 2016. That report is also attached as a background paper for reference.
5. The assessment report does not support the provision of formal crossing facilities due to there being a combination of too few people crossing and too few vehicles travelling along Greenshaw Drive.
6. The following pedestrian crossing improvements are available to local authorities:

Formal Crossing Facilities
Puffin Crossing (formerly Pelican)
Zebra Crossing
Informal Crossing Facilities
Central Refuges
Pavement Build-outs
Dropped Kerbs

7. To determine the most appropriate type of crossing for a particular site a value is calculated which takes into consideration, pedestrian flows (including the type of pedestrian), vehicle flows (including vehicle type), traffic speed, crossing delay, casualty records, road width and proximity to pedestrian trip attractors. This value is referred to as the modified PV<sup>2</sup> value. To justify the installation of various types of formal crossing facility the modified PV<sup>2</sup> values below would typically be required.

Type of Crossing Facility	Modified PV <sup>2</sup> value
Puffin Crossing	>1 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
Zebra Crossing	>1 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
Central Refuge	>0.5 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
Kerb Build-out	>0.5 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
Dropped Kerbs	<0.5 x 10 <sup>8</sup>

8. The Greenshaw Drive site produced a modified PV<sup>2</sup> value of 0.02 x 10<sup>8</sup>. Based on these results, the proposed solution put forward was to install

of a pair of dropped kerbs. Dropping the kerbs either side of the carriageway can help people who currently struggle to cross using the existing full-height kerbs such as less mobile people who may find stepping up and down kerbs difficult, people with shopping trolleys and wheelchair or mobility scooter users.

9. Since the assessment report was produced further discussions have taken place between officers and members to discuss the assessment procedures and the reasoning behind not recommending formal crossing facilities.
10. Shortly after the last meeting officers were asked to investigate whether there may be an alternative location on Greenshaw Drive where a formal crossing could be installed. Whilst there is a location where a crossing could physically fit just east of Ruddings Close this location will also not have sufficient flows of pedestrians and vehicles to justify anything other than dropped kerbs. There are already a pair of dropped present at this location. A plan showing the original requested location and alternative is attached as Annex A.
11. The proposed course of action for this road is to install a pair of dropped kerbs in the vicinity of the pair of bus stops between the Kirkcroft and Sandyland junctions.

#### York Road

12. A 1052 signature petition was submitted to the Council by Haxby residents in March 2018. The petition requested improved crossing facilities for pedestrians on the section of York Road between Holly Tree Lane and South Lane. This petition was reported to an EMDS in May 2018. The report is attached as a background paper. The petition requested the provision of a formal crossing on the grounds that there was currently no crossing facility anywhere between the roundabout at the junction with The Village and the mini-roundabout at the Eastfield Avenue junction. Residents felt a crossing was needed due to the fact that many people, including children and older people, need to cross the road to gain access to various facilities either side of York Road including schools, shops, leisure facilities and bus stops.
13. The recommendation of the Executive Member was that officers should undertake an investigation to determine whether crossing improvements were justified, where they could be located and what type of improvements may be appropriate.
14. Officers commissioned the appropriate surveys and undertook an assessment of this section of York Road to calculate the modified  $PV^2$  value and thus determine whether crossing improvements were justified and where.

15. It is unusual to undertake a pedestrian crossing assessment over such a long stretch of road therefore the assessment was broken down into distinct zones as detailed below, this better represents how far users would realistically divert off their desire line to cross a road if a facility were provided:

- a) Just south of Holly Tree Lane to just north of southern city-bound bus stop
- b) Just north of southern city-bound bus stop to just south of northern Haxby-bound bus stop
- c) Just south of northern Haxby-bound stop to just north of Calf Close
- d) Just north of Calf Close to South Lane

A plan showing the stretch of road and location of the zones is attached as Annex B.

16. The absolute number of pedestrians observed crossing in each of the zones during the 12 hour survey are listed below.

Zone	East to West	West to East	Total
A	33	52	85
B	7	5	12
C	13	50	63
D	50	47	97
Grand Total	103	154	257

17. Factoring the pedestrian flows up to take into consideration the potential vulnerability of those pedestrians this gives revised figures as below.

Zone	East to West	West to East	Total
A	110	160	270
B	13	9	22
C	29	155	184
D	125	139	264
Grand Total	277	463	740

18. Although, when taking into consideration absolute numbers, there were a slightly larger number of pedestrians crossing in zone D than zone A, this switches round when taking into consideration the vulnerability of those who were crossing and zone A becomes the highest scoring sector. Within zone A the highest proportion of pedestrians crossed between the Holly Tree Lane junction and the southern city-bound bus stop.

19. Using the same assessment criteria as used for Greenshaw Drive the modified PV<sup>2</sup> values were calculated for each of the above zones, these are listed below.

Zone	Modified PV <sup>2</sup> value
A	0.343 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
B	0.028 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
C	0.142 x 10 <sup>8</sup>
D	0.447 x 10 <sup>8</sup>

20. There are clear distinctions between zones A and D in terms of the peak hourly periods which were used to calculate the PV<sup>2</sup> value. Sector A had three peak hours which correspond to school start and finish times (8am to 9am and 3pm to 4pm) and the 5pm to 6pm evening rush hour. Sector D had its three peak hours running consecutively from 4pm to 7pm so would appear to be more related to homeward, leisure or shopping journeys.
21. Clearly there are two zones where crossing facilities of some form may be justifiable, however, these are still below the threshold mentioned previously in paragraph 7.
22. Given the huge level of support for provision of a crossing it is proposed to undertake more detailed feasibility work to assess whether a crossing could physically be accommodated in the area with the highest factored flow and whether such a crossing can be supported given the below-threshold modified PV<sup>2</sup> value. The outcome of the feasibility work will be brought back to a future decision session where a proposed solution will be put forward and the relevant permissions will be sought if any parking restrictions are required to accommodate the proposed measures.

### **Consultation**

23. Ward members, party Transport spokespeople and relevant council officers were sent a copy of the report for them to provide any comments. To date no responses have been received.

### **Options**

24. There are two options available to the Executive Member:

Option 1 : Acknowledge the results of the assessments and approve the proposed course of action for each of the sites.

Option 2 : Acknowledge the results of the assessments but reject the proposed course of action for each site.

## **Analysis**

25. Option 1 : The advantage of this option is that it puts forward a course of action for each site which is appropriate to the conditions bearing in mind nationally-adopted best practice guidelines. The proposal to undertake further feasibility on the York Road site will enable more in-depth work to be undertaken which will help the Executive Member to make a more informed decision at a future decision session. The disadvantage of this option is that it will delay any facilities being installed along York Road.
26. Option 2 : The advantage of this option is that it will have no impact on budgets other than the cost of the staff time to undertake the site assessments. The disadvantage of this option is that it will not improve crossing facilities for residents of Haxby.

## **Council Plan**

27. The recommendations of this report contribute to the 3 priorities in the Council Plan as follows:
28. A prosperous city for all
  - Efficient and affordable transport links enable residents and businesses to access key services and opportunities – the access routes to the shops, schools, park, bus stops and other services will be improved. This will encourage more people to walk which is the most affordable mode of transport.
  - Environmental Sustainability underpins everything we do – walking is the most sustainable form of transport and has the least impact on the environment.
29. A focus on frontline services
  - All York's residents live and thrive in a city which allows them to contribute fully to their communities and neighbourhoods – improved links for pedestrians, especially near schools, shops and other community facilities help residents to get the most out of the area in which they live and study and can help to reduce social isolation.
  - All children and adults are listened to, and their opinions considered – the crossing requests have been submitted primarily by residents from Haxby and Wigginton, by considering the requests and petition and by suggesting a way forward we are listening to their views.
  - Everyone has access to opportunities regardless of their background – walking is a form of transport which is accessible irrespective of one's background.

- Every child has the opportunity to get the best possible start in life – walking to school has multiple benefits to children both in terms of health and social cohesion
- Residents are encouraged and supported to live healthily – walking is the one of the healthiest forms of transport.
- Residents are protected from harm, with a low risk of crime – pedestrian crossing improvements will help children and adults reduce crossing risk and in the case of York Road may help better enforce the speed limit along this section of road.

30. A council that listens to residents

- Focus on the delivery of frontline services for residents and the protection of community facilities – the recommendations show a willingness to listen to residents' requests and help children access education safely and other residents to access shops and community facilities more easily.

## Implications

31. The implications of the measures recommended in the report are listed below:

- **Financial** – There will be costs associated with the dropped kerbs proposed for implementation on Greenshaw Drive and fees and implementation costs associated with whatever measures are ultimately proposed for York Road. Some funding may be provided from the ward's highways budget to pay for some of the measures, the remainder of the funding would need to be allocated from the council's Transport Capital Programme.
- **Human Resources (HR)** – There are no HR implications
- **One Planet Council / Equalities** – Pedestrian crossing improvements will help groups who may currently struggle to get across Greenshaw Drive and York Road. Encouragement of residents to walk will help contribute towards the council's sustainability goals.
- **Legal** – There are no legal implications other than potential future amendments to the York Road Traffic Regulation Order.
- **Crime and Disorder** – There are no Crime and Disorder implications
- **Information Technology (IT)** – There are no IT implications
- **Property** – There are no property implications

## Risk Management

32. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, no significant risks associated with the recommendations in this report have been identified.

## Contact Details

### Author:

Andy Vose  
Transport Planner  
Transport  
Tel No. 01904 551608

### Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist  
Assistant Director – Transport, Highways &  
Environment

Report Approved  Date 5 November 2018

Wards Affected: Haxby & Wigginton

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

## Background Papers:

- EMDS Report – Pedestrian Crossing Request Evaluation and Prioritisation Methodology, 11 August 2016.  
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=738&MId=9476&Ver=4>
- Pedestrian Crossing Feasibility, Greenshaw Drive, Haxby (Dec 2016)
- EMDS Report – York Road, Haxby Pedestrian Crossing Petition, 17 May 2018  
<http://democracy.york.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=738&MId=9879&Ver=4>

## Annexes

Annex A – Plan showing Greenshaw Drive crossing assessment locations

Annex B – Plan showing York Road with zones used for assessment

## Abbreviations

EMDS – Executive Member Decision Session

DfT – Department for Transport