

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	St. John's Road, Newbury Zebra Crossing and Cycle Lanes
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	26 th April 2012
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2411

Purpose of Report: To consider the responses to the consultation of the above scheme and make a decision as to how to proceed.

Recommended Action: It is recommended that:
(a) The project proceeds as shown in Appendix C.
(b) The suggestions for minor improvements received during the consultation process are implemented where appropriate.
(c) The respondents to the consultation are informed accordingly.

Reason for decision to be taken: To consider the responses to the consultation of the above scheme and make a decision as to how to proceed

Other options considered: As detailed in the report

Key background documentation: Traffic survey data.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor David Betts - Tel (0118) 942 2485
E-mail Address:	dbetts@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Neil Stacey
Job Title:	Principal Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519113
E-mail Address:	nstacey@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	None
Financial:	If implemented, the scheme will be funded from the Cycle Improvements budget as part of the approved Capital Programme.
Personnel:	None
Legal/Procurement:	None
Environmental:	None
Property:	None
Risk Management:	If implemented, the project will be managed in accordance with the Highways and Transport Service's approach to risk management.
Equalities Impact Assessment:	<p>The Zebra Crossing will be of particular benefit to elderly and disabled pedestrians, who are likely to find particular difficulty in crossing St Johns Road. Tactile paving will be included at the dropped kerbs for the benefit of pedestrians with impaired vision.</p> <p>If the scheme does not proceed, no such facilities will be provided, but conditions for disabled pedestrians will be no worse than in the current circumstances.</p>

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Graham Jones: No response received before the report publication deadline. Any comments subsequently received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell: "No comment."
Ward Members:	Councillors Hunneman: Councillor David Allen: Councillor Ieuan Tuck: Councillor Mike Johnston: No response received before the report publication deadline. Any comments subsequently received will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting. Ward Members' response to the original consultation are in Appendix B.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams: "I support the officer recommendation"

Local Stakeholders: Consulted in February 2012 via a leaflet drop and local publicity. See Appendix B for a summary of the responses.

Officers Consulted: Jon Winstanley, Mark Edwards, Andrew Garratt, Valerie Witton

Trade Union: Not applicable.

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<input type="checkbox"/>

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 A project to install cycle lanes and a Zebra Crossing on St. Johns Road, Newbury, was included in the highways capital programme for the financial year 2012/13. The consultation leaflet for the project, which includes a plan of the proposals, is available for reference in Appendix C.
- 1.2 This report summarises the responses to the consultation of the scheme.

2. Project details

- 2.1 St Johns Road is part of the A343 route between Newbury and Andover and runs between the roundabout junctions with the A339 and Andover Road/Bartholomew Street/Newtown Road. The road is approximately 350 metres long and between 7 and 9 metres wide.
- 2.2 The adjoining Andover Road and Bartholomew Street both have facilities for cyclists in the form of on- and off-carriageway cycle lanes.
- 2.3 In order to extend the cycle route towards Newbury railway station and the A339, it is proposed to implement on-carriageway cycle lanes over most of the length of St Johns Road. In places, the road is not wide enough to accommodate cycle lanes on both sides and therefore there is a "gap" in the south-eastbound lane.
- 2.4 Close to the junction with Catherine Road, there is a traffic island which acts as a pedestrian refuge. However, the island is just 1.1 metres wide, compared with the desirable width of 2 metres. In order to accommodate cycle lanes, on this section of the road, the island would have to be removed, but this would remove a useful pedestrian facility. It is therefore proposed to replace the island with a Zebra Crossing, which would improve safety for pedestrians and reduce the potential conflict between cyclists and motor vehicles.

3. Consultation responses and officer comments

- 3.1 Leaflets explaining the proposals were sent to residential properties in the area and to other local stakeholders. A total of 7 responses to the consultation were received of which two express support of the proposals, four express opposition or objection and one is neutral. Appendix B contains a summary of all the responses received. The main concerns and suggestions are summarised below, together with brief comments.

Cycle Lanes are not wide enough

- 3.2 The width of the proposed cycle lanes is 1.2 metres. It should also be noted that the remaining carriageway width for motor vehicles would in places also be as low as 2.8 metres compared to the desirable minimum of 3.0 metres. Cycle lanes should ideally be a minimum of 1.5 metres wide, but there is insufficient carriageway width to accommodate lanes of this width. It is, however, permissible to use 1.2 metre widths and it is considered that they would in this instance be sufficient due to the very low proportion heavy goods vehicles using the road (approximately 2.3 per cent compared to an average of over 8 per cent on most other A roads in the district). An Independent Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit has been carried out on the project, which did not raise this issue as a problem.

Cycle Lanes unlikely to be heavily used

- 3.3 It is accepted that the current volume of cyclists is relatively low; a two way flow of 90 cycles was observed in a survey carried out between 07:00 and 19:00 on 17th February 2011. It would be expected that this would be greater during the summer months. The introduction of cycle facilities is also intended to encourage cycling, as well as make improvements for existing cyclists, so there may well be a growth in the number of cycles over time.

Designate the footways as shared footway/cycleways instead

- 3.4 This is a valid suggestion, and could be achieved within the existing footway, which is typically 2 metres wide. However, on-carriageway lanes are generally preferred, as they enable cyclists to make more rapid progress without coming into conflict with pedestrians on the footway or having to slow down at side road junctions or private accesses. There are two side roads and four private accesses on the north side of St Johns Road; there are three side roads and ten private accesses on the south side, all of which would have to be negotiated by cyclists if using a shared footway/cycleway.

Need other minor improvements for cyclists in the area

- 3.5 Some suggestions have been made regarding the need for other minor improvements, such as dropped kerbs and improved signing. These can be accommodated as part of the project. See Appendix B for details.

4. Options for consideration

- 4.1 The following paragraphs summarise 3 options, their advantages and disadvantages:

Option 1 – Proceed with the proposals unaltered

4.2 Advantages:

- i) Cycle facilities are provided along most of St Johns Road, with no loss of priority for cyclists at side roads and private accesses;
- ii) A pedestrian crossing facility is provided.

4.3 Disadvantage:

The cycle lanes are only 1.2 metres wide, compared to the desirable 1.5 metres, therefore cyclists could be travelling closer to motor vehicles.

Option 2 – Convert the footways to shared footway cycle ways and proceed with the Zebra Crossing

4.4 Advantages:

- i) Cycle facilities are provided along most of St Johns Road;
- ii) A pedestrian crossing facility is provided.

4.5 Disadvantages:

- i) Cyclists' progress along St Johns Road would be interrupted by the frequent side junctions and private accesses and by the Zebra Crossing;
- ii) Cyclists and pedestrians would be unsegregated and may come into conflict on the shared facility.

Option 3 – Introduce no cycle facilities, but proceed with the Zebra Crossing

4.6 Advantages:

- i) A pedestrian crossing facility is provided.
- ii) This is a lower cost option than Options 1 and 2.

4.7 Disadvantages:

- i) No cycle facilities are provided.

5. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

5.1 West Berkshire Disability Alliance was consulted on the proposals but did not make any comments.

5.2 The Zebra Crossing will be of particular benefit to elderly and disabled pedestrians, who are likely to find difficulty in crossing St Johns Road at busy times. Tactile paving will be included at the dropped kerbs for the benefit of pedestrians with impaired vision.

5.3 If the scheme does not proceed, no such facilities will be provided, but conditions for disabled pedestrians will be no worse than in the current circumstances.

6. Conclusion

6.1 The consultation process resulted in a low response rate, but the responses received were relatively balanced. The comments opposing the scheme have been given due consideration, however, on balance it is officers' view that the project should proceed as planned. In addition to the works originally proposed, the suggestions made to further improve facilities for cyclists in this part of Newbury can also be implemented.

7. Recommendation

7.1 In view of the above it is recommended that:

- (a) The project proceeds as shown in Appendix C.
- (b) The suggestions for minor improvements received during the consultation process are implemented where appropriate.
- (c) The respondents to the consultation are informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A – Equality Impact Assessment – Stage 1

Appendix B – Summary of responses to consultation

Appendix C – Consultation Leaflet (including scheme plan)

APPENDIX A

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	St Johns Road, Newbury, Proposed Cycle Lanes and Zebra Crossing.
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	ID2411, 26 th April 2012
Owner of item being assessed:	Neil Stacey
Name of assessor:	Neil Stacey
Date of assessment:	27 th March 2012

1. What are the main aims of the item?
Introduction of cycle lanes and a Zebra Crossing

2. Note which groups may be affected by the item, consider how they may be affected and what sources of information have been used to determine this. (Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex; sexual orientation)

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Disabled people (people with impaired mobility)	The Zebra Crossing will be of particular benefit to elderly and disabled pedestrians, who are likely to find particular difficulty in crossing St Johns Road. If the scheme does not proceed, no such facilities will be provided, but conditions for disabled pedestrians will be no worse than in the current circumstances.	Vehicular traffic will have to give priority to pedestrians who wish to cross the road. Tactile paving will be included at the dropped kerbs for the benefit of pedestrians with impaired vision.
All other groups	No effect.	N/A

Further comments relating to the item:
None.

3. Result (please tick by double-clicking on relevant box and click on 'checked')
<input type="checkbox"/> High Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Low Relevance - This needs to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment



No Relevance - This **does not** need to undergo a Stage 2 Equality Impact Assessment

For items requiring a Stage 2 equality impact assessment, begin the planning of this now, referring to the equality impact assessment guidance and Stage 2 template.

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	
Stage Two not required:	

Name: Neil Stacey

Date: 27th March 2012