



Leicester  
City Council

**WARDS AFFECTED**  
**All Wards**

**FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:**

**Overview & Scrutiny Management Board**  
**Cabinet**

**6 August 2008**  
**1 September 2008**

---

**CORPORATE CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2008/09 TO 2011/12**  
**- PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS**

---

**Report of the Corporate Director, Regeneration and Culture**

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To seek Cabinet approval to implement the proposed Corporate Capital Programme funded Pedestrian Crossing Programme 2008/09 to 2011/12.

**2. Summary**

- 2.1 At its meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008 Council approved £400,000 over the next four years (2008/09 – 2011/12) for the installation of pedestrian crossings. This report details the proposed pedestrian crossings Corporate Capital Programme in Appendix 1. For information only, Appendix 1 also includes the proposed pedestrian crossing programme to be funded from the Integrated Transport Local Transport Plan Capital Programme subject to Cabinet approval later this summer.

- 2.2 A further report detailing various small capital funded highway improvement works, including the pedestrian crossing schemes for completeness, will be presented to cabinet in the autumn of this year.

**3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 OSMB is asked to comment on the report.
- 3.2 Cabinet is asked:
- a) to approve the proposed Corporate Capital Pedestrian Crossings Programme 2008/09 to 2011/12.
  - (b) to note that the programme is designated as one in which the Director is authorised to reallocate resources on grounds of operational efficiency
  - (c) agree that such reallocation shall only be carried out after consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, and reported subsequently to the Cabinet.

**4. Report**

- 4.1 In July 2002 Cabinet agreed the method for prioritising the implementation of pedestrian crossings. The proposed programme included at Appendix 1 has been prepared in accordance with that methodology and within the budget of £100,000 per year over the next four years approved by Council on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008. Paragraphs from the 2002 report are enclosed at Appendix 2 and provide a detailed description of prioritisation. Appendix 3 summarises the assessment process in a flow chart.
- 4.2 The Interim Transport Capital Programme approved on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008 by Council did not include any pedestrian crossings. The proposed pedestrian crossing programme to be funded from the Integrated Transport Local Transport Plan Capital Programme subject to Cabinet approval in the autumn, is also included at Appendix 1 for information.
- 4.3 The programme is a priority programme and as such new requests for schemes, once assessed, may result in variations to the proposed programme beyond 2008/09.

## 5. Financial and Legal Implications

- 5.1 At its meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008, Council approved £100k per annum over the next four years (2008/09 – 2011/12) for the installation of pedestrian crossings from the Corporate Capital Pedestrian Crossings Programme 2008/09 - 2010/12.
- 5.2 This scheme was within Block B of the approved Corporate Capital Programme, being schemes which can proceed subject to a further approval by Cabinet with regard to the detailed implementation of the scheme.
- 5.3 Approval is sought for the proposed installation of pedestrian crossing to be carried out in years 2008/09 and 2009/10 for the cost of £100k in each of the years to be funded from the Corporate Capital Programme (See Appendix 1).
- 5.4 The proposed pedestrian crossing programme to be funded from the Integrated Transport Local Transport Plan Capital Programme is subject to Cabinet approval later this summer, is also included at Appendix 1 for information.

*Martin Judson, Head of Resources, Regeneration and Culture, Ext 7390.*

## 5.5 Legal Implications

The Corporate Director of Regeneration and Culture has delegated powers for approval of zebra crossings to be advertised under Section 23 of the Road Traffic Act 1984.

*Jamie Guazzaroni, Solicitor, Legal Services, RAD, Ext 6350*

## 6. Other Implications

| OTHER IMPLICATIONS  | YES/NO | Paragraph references within the report |
|---------------------|--------|--|
| Equal Opportunities | No     |  |
| Policy              | No     |  |
| Sustainable and     | Yes    | The proposal forms on improving        |

|                              |    |  |
|------------------------------|----|--|
| Environmental                |    | the quality of life in both the outer areas and the City Centre. |
| Crime and Disorder           | No |  |
| Human Rights Act             | No |  |
| Elderly/People on Low Income | No |  |

## 7. Risk Assessment Matrix

|   | Risk   | Likelihood<br>L/M/H | Severity<br>Impact<br>L/M/H | Control Actions<br>(if necessary/or<br>appropriate) |
|---|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1 | If no pedestrian facilities are provided there is greater risk that a pedestrian could be involved in a road traffic accident. | M                   | M                           | Implement the pedestrian crossing programme         |

L - Low  
M - Medium  
H - High

L - Low  
M -Medium  
H - High

## 8. Background Papers

- Report to Cabinet 29/7/02 entitled 'a review of pedestrian crossing justification and prioritisation procedures'
- Report to Council 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008 entitled Capital Programme – Overall Strategy
- Report to Council on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2008 entitled "Central Leicestershire Local Transport Plan 2006 to 2011 Interim Capital Programmes 2008 to 2011"

## 9. Consultations

- Highways Management Section
- Head of Transport Strategy
- Legal Services
- Head of Finance (R&C)
- Staff in Regeneration and Culture Dept

## 10. Report Author

Sally Slade, Pedestrian Officer  
Ext 2115.

Email: [sally.slade@leicester.gov.uk](mailto:sally.slade@leicester.gov.uk)

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Key Decision</b>                  | Yes   |
| <b>Reason</b>                        | Is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward |
| <b>Appeared in Forward Plan</b>      | Yes   |
| <b>Executive or Council Decision</b> | Executive (Cabinet)   |

## Appendix 1

### 1. Pedestrian crossings

| 2008/2009   |  | 2009/2010                                   |  | 2010/2011                                      |  | 2011/2012                                  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| City Council 08/09  | LTP 08/09  | City Council 09/10                          | LTP 09/10  | City Council 10/11                             | LTP 10/11                                | City Council 11/12                         |
| Aikman Avenue toucan  | Goodwood Road pelican  | Liberty Road zebra/toucan                   | Evington Road pelican  | Humbstone Lane /The Roundway zebra/refuge      | Troon Way /Barkby Road toucan            | St BarnabusRoad /French Road buildouts     |
| £50,000   | £45,000  | £45,000                                     | £40,000  | £23,000  | £40,000                                  | £20,000                                    |
| Ethel Road pelican  | Hinckley/N'Boro Road pedestrian facility included as part of the signal renewals | Coleman Rd/Saltersford zebra                | Implementation of Kedlestone Road footway or other footway schemes | St Nicolas Circle/Peacock Lane pelican         | New Footways                             | Clarendon Park Rd/Avenue Primary buildouts |
| £40,000   | £30,000  | £23,000                                     | £30,000  | £50,000  | £50,000                                  | £20,000                                    |
| Lancaster Road pedestrian facilities at the junction preliminary design | Kedlestone Road footway/cycleway design and consultation                         | Finish Lancaster Road pedestrian facilities | Lutterworth Rd/Red House Rd refuge                                 | Scraptoft Lane /Brook Road pedestrian facility | Southgates/Peacock junction improvements | Downing Drive footway                      |
| £10,000   | £15,000  | £10,000                                     | £30k   | £27,000  | £20,000                                  | £20,000                                    |
|   | Halifax Drive refuge   | East Park Rd/Bradbourne Rd refuge           |  |  | Chesterfield Road /Stavely buildouts     | Coleman road buildouts                     |
|   | £10,000  | £15,000                                     |  |  | £10,000                                  | £20,000                                    |
|   |  |   |  |  |  | Heyworth Road/Evelyn Drive buildouts       |
|   |  |   |  |  |  | £20,000                                    |
| <b>£100,000</b>   | <b>£100,000</b>  | <b>£100,000</b>                             | <b>£100,000</b>  | <b>£100,000</b>                                | <b>£120,000</b>                          | <b>£100,000</b>                            |

## APPENDIX 2

### 2. EXISTING PEDESTRIAN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

- 2.1 At present, the justification of a crossing facility in Leicester is based on a long-established, numerical parameter known as “PV<sup>2</sup>” which represents:

$$\text{Pedestrian Flow} \times \text{Vehicle Flow} \times \text{Vehicle Flow}$$

(averaged over the 4 peak hours in the day)

- 2.2 Although PV<sup>2</sup> no longer features in DTLR advice, it was retained by Leicester City Council, and many other Local Authorities, as it provides an objective assessment technique which is recognised and understood by Members.
- 2.3 Typically, a PV<sup>2</sup> value of more than  $0.7 \times 10^8$  would justify a pelican or zebra crossing, although a number of site specific factors could influence the final recommendation if the assessment just failed the numerical criteria.
- 2.4 The main failing of the existing system is that it does not properly consider, reflect and promote associated LTP policy areas and initiatives.

### 3. PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

- 3.1 Recommended revisions to the assessment procedure are discussed below.

#### **Safer Routes**

- 3.2 A programme of area-wide projects is underway and will take a number of years to fully implement. In the meantime, individual requests for pedestrian facilities are often submitted by parents and teachers concerned about the safety of children walking to school and crossing at particular locations.
- 3.3 At present, the site specific PV<sup>2</sup> value is an average taken over the 4 peak hours. However, at sites near schools, pedestrian activity is obviously focused around start and finish times. Outside, these times there may be no particular pedestrian problem. The 4hr average results can, therefore, be skewed by the low off-peak flows and mask the true scale of any crossing difficulties experienced by parents and children.
- 3.4 With regard to the type of facility provided, under the existing procedures a refuge would normally be recommended for a PV<sup>2</sup> value of between 0.4 and 0.7. However, pedestrian flows outside schools are concentrated over short periods and often include a high proportion of parents with pushchairs. Refuges can only accommodate a limited number of pedestrians at any one time and may not, therefore, provide the most appropriate solution. In such circumstances, zebra crossings should be considered with complementary traffic calming measures, if required. It is worth noting that the cost of a basic zebra crossing is comparable to that of a pedestrian refuge.
- 3.5 Under the Safer Routes strategy, schools are encouraged to develop travel plans to promote walking and cycling to school. A successful travel plan can increase walking by up to 20%. The proposed pedestrian assessment procedures recognise this by reducing the PV<sup>2</sup> threshold for schools that agree to develop and implement a school travel plan for the first time. For example, if a plan is predicted to increase walking by 10%, the PV<sup>2</sup> threshold would be reduced by 10%, to 0.36.
- 3.6 To summarise, bearing in mind the Safer Routes objectives, it is more appropriate to consider school-related requests on the basis of:
- The normal 4hr PV<sup>2</sup> assessment with a 0.7 justification threshold.
  - A 2 hour PV<sup>2</sup> associated with school start & finish times and a PV<sup>2</sup> threshold of  $> 0.4 \times 10^8$  for pelicans / zebras
  - A reduced 2 hour PV<sup>2</sup> threshold for schools implementing a School Travel Plan for the first time.
  - A general presumption in favour of zebra crossings, particularly when the PV<sup>2</sup> value is  $< 0.7 \times 10^8$

#### **Cycle Facilities.**

- 3.7 Occasionally, pedestrian facilities will be requested at sites which form part of an existing or proposed cycle route. Toucan crossings are normally funded from capital budgets to promote and enhance the City's cycle route network. The decision to fund and install a particular toucan crossing is based on the

strategic requirements of the cycle network. Unlike pelican crossings, they are not subject to a formal justification procedure. Therefore, when a pedestrian crossing request would clearly serve an existing or proposed cycle route, it is recommended that:

- A toucan crossing be approved, in principle,
- the site be prioritised using the pedestrian crossing ranking procedure
- the relevance to the cycling strategy be acknowledged in the ranking process.

### ***Pedestrian Level of Service***

- 3.8 The “Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy” aims to provide a pedestrian facility where major pedestrian routes cross a major road. This is related to the issue of severance, which is not considered objectively in the existing pedestrian crossing justification procedure. The current reliance on  $PV^2$  as a justification tool can again result in significant peak hour pedestrian problems being overlooked.
- 3.9 For example, on some routes in the City peak hour flows can reach levels which result in almost total severance i.e. it is almost impossible for pedestrians to cross in safety. However, the 4hr average  $PV^2$  value can be as low as  $0.1 \times 10^8$ . In such circumstances, there is a danger that the request is rejected and no further action is taken. To be consistent with the “Walking and Cycling Strategy”, it is important that the pedestrian crossing justification procedure recognises these problem sites and ensures that they are, at the very least, subjected to more rigorous scrutiny in an effort to find an appropriate solution.
- 3.10 It is therefore recommended that a site is approved, in principle, when:
- There is reason to believe that pedestrians are being seriously inconvenienced and there is **significant suppressed demand**
  - Peak hour flows on a single carriageway exceed a one-way total of 800 veh/hr or a 2-way total of 1100 veh /hr
  - Peak hour flows on a dual carriageway exceed a one-way one lane total of 800 veh /hr or a one way, multi-lane total of 1100 veh /hr.
- 3.11 The assessment of suppressed demand will remain subjective but will include issues such as:
- The existence of recognised pedestrian routes linking to the proposed crossing point
  - The distance to any adjacent pedestrian facilities and their relevance to pedestrian desire lines in the area
  - The proximity of local centres and facilities e.g. community centre, surgery etc

### ***Public Transport.***

- 3.12 Good pedestrian access to bus stops and interchanges is essential to promote the use of public transport and the LTP objective of creating an integrated transport system. As in the example of schools above, the existing  $PV^2$  based justification procedure will underestimate the peak period crossing difficulties experienced by passengers trying to join or leave bus services.
- 3.13 It is recommended that crossing requests which are directly associated with the provision of good pedestrian access to bus stops are:
- approved in principle when peak hour flows on a single carriageway exceed a one-way total of 800 veh / hr or a 2-way total of 1100 veh / hr
  - approved in principle when peak hour flows on a dual carriageway exceed a one-way single lane total of 800 veh / hr or a one way multi-lane total of 1100 veh/hr.
  - prioritised using the pedestrian crossing ranking procedure with due acknowledgement of the bus strategy benefits.
- 3.14 It is important to note that it may be necessary to consider the relocation of bus stops to obtain the optimum solution to any public transport / pedestrian crossing related problem. Local residents would, of course, be consulted on this issue.

### Appendix 3



