

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Petition – Zebra crossing, Bridge Street Hungerford
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	21 March 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID 2557

Purpose of Report: To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council requesting a zebra crossing on Bridge Street in Hungerford.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Planning, Transport Policy, Property, Highways & Transport (Operational) resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 4 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: To provide a response to the petitioners.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation: The Petition,
Traffic and pedestrian surveys

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Keith Chopping - (0118) 983 2057
E-mail Address:	kchopping@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Andrew Garratt
Job Title:	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

Policy:	None arising from this report.
Financial:	None arising from this report as the introduction of a zebra crossing is not recommended.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report.
Environmental:	None arising from this report.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.
Equalities Impact Assessment:	EIA Stage 1 attached as Appendix A.

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council:	Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman:	Councillor Brian Bedwell has no comments.
Ward Members:	Councillor David Holtby commented that walking has become increasingly popular since the introduction of the Jubilee Footbridge and the addition of a safe crossing on Bridge Street would be a welcome enhancement. However he appreciates there are difficulties in this location due to the War Memorial and impact on local residents so would support further investigations for a more suitable crossing in the vicinity of the Methodist Church in the form of a narrowing rather than a full crossing, if this was viable. Councillor Paul Hower supported the views of Councillor Holtby.
Opposition Spokesperson:	Councillor Keith Woodhams supports the officer's recommendations.
Local Stakeholders:	N/A
Officers Consulted:	Mark Edwards, Mark Cole
Trade Union:	N/A

Is this item subject to call-in.	Yes: <input checked="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
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position
Considered or reviewed by O&SMC or associated Task Groups within preceding
six months
Item is Urgent Key Decision

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 Two petitions have been submitted to the Council on the same subject. First an e-petition containing 33 signatures was submitted followed by a 107 signature petition, which was presented by Councillor David Holtby at the full Council meeting on 5th March 2013. Both petitions state:

'We, the undersigned, petition the Council to provide a zebra crossing on Bridge Street in Hungerford

The completion of the new footbridge in Hungerford is a boon to road safety in the town. However, there is no provision for any residents living to the north and east of the bridge to access it. This includes all the residents of Eddington and a large proportion of the residents of Hungerford. If the creation of this crossing were to be made a part of the resurfacing work scheduled for September, savings could be made in cost and disruption.'

- 1.2 The requested location of the crossing is on Bridge Street in the vicinity of the war memorial. At this location the carriageway is approximately 5.5 metres wide with footway widths of approximately 1.4 metres.
- 1.3 Within the latest ten year period, to the end of October 2012, there have been no recorded injury accidents in the vicinity of the proposed crossing.
- 1.4 To determine the number of pedestrian movements across Bridge Street a pedestrian and vehicle survey was undertaken on Saturday 21st April 2012 and Thursday 26 April 2012 between 07:00 and 19:00. The length of the crossing survey was between its junctions with the A4 Bath Road and Canal Walk as it can be assumed that any person crossing within this section of road is likely to use a crossing facility by the war memorial.
- 1.5 The justification for a crossing facility is based on a formula known as PV^2 where P is the average number of pedestrian movements during the busiest 4 hours and V is the average volume of vehicles during the same period.

2. Results of Survey

- 2.1 The highest number of pedestrian movements was recorded on Saturday 21st April 2012. From this survey the section with the highest number of recorded pedestrian movements was in the vicinity of the Church with a total of 78 pedestrian movements being recorded in the busiest 4 hours, giving an average of 19.5 movements per hour. However a crossing facility in this location would remove much of the on street parking which is something the Town Council does not want.
- 2.2 The total number of pedestrian movements recorded in the vicinity of the war memorial was 30 during the busiest 4 hours, giving an average of 7.5 movements per hour.

- 2.3 The total number of pedestrian movements recorded within the whole length of the survey during the busiest 4 hours was 236, giving an average of 59 movements per hour.
- 2.4 A traffic survey undertaken at the same time as the pedestrian survey showed that during the survey period on Saturday 21st April 2012 a two way total of 9,150 vehicles was recorded. During the survey period on Thursday 26 April 2012 a two way total of 11,968 vehicles were recorded.
- 2.5 The busiest 4 hours give a PV^2 value of 0.149×10^8 , which is well below the minimum value normally recommended for a crossing facility of 1×10^8 . Using the survey statistics alone a pedestrian crossing could not be justified.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The footway at the war memorial site, which has a number of underground services, has insufficient width to install the poles for the belisha beacons. Given the road width at this location and that it is an 'A' classified road there is no opportunity to widen the footways to accommodate the belisha beacon poles.
- 3.2 The placement of the crossing is difficult to locate due to the properties on Bridge Street having large windows, building overhangs, awnings and hanging baskets.
- 3.3 The results of the survey show that a formal crossing facility is not justified due to the number of pedestrian movements and that there are no further special circumstances to justify a formal crossing facility at any location in Bridge Street.
- 3.4 Experience has shown that the introduction of a crossing facility that does not meet the criteria is detrimental to road safety. Where formal crossing facilities cannot be justified other measures can be investigated. However, due to the constraints of the public highway in Bridge Street other measures such as narrowings, build outs or a pedestrian refuge are not feasible in the vicinity of the war memorial.
- 3.5 Other measures could be introduced on Bridge Street in the vicinity of the Church, although this would remove much of the on street parking, which would be a concern to the Town Council and local business.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 The request and reasons for a crossing facility on Bridge Street is appreciated by officers and every effort has been made to find a suitable location. However, as a facility cannot be located near the war memorial and the pedestrian crossing criteria is not met for any location in Bridge Street, the introduction of a crossing facility cannot regrettably be recommended.
- 4.2 It is recommended that no other measures are investigated given the concern previously expressed by the Town Council about the loss of any on street parking on Bridge Street.
- 4.3 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

Appendices

Appendix A – EIA Stage 1

APPENDIX A

Equality Impact Assessment – Stage One

Name of item being assessed:	Petition – Zebra crossing, Bridge Street Hungerford
Version and release date of item (if applicable):	11 February 2013
Owner of item being assessed:	Andrew Garratt – Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Name of assessor:	Andrew Garratt
Date of assessment:	11 February 2013

1. What are the main aims of the item?
The main aim of this item is to respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council.

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, Race, Religion or Belief and Sexual Orientation.)		
Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this.
Local Residents	See note below.	
Elderly Pedestrians	See note below.	
Persons with less mobility	See note below.	
Child pedestrians	See note below.	
Further comments relating to the item: Whilst a crossing facility would assist pedestrians to cross the road, due to the constraints of the site near the war memorial a crossing cannot be installed. Given that the criteria for a crossing is not met at any location on Bridge Street the recommendation in the report will mean that the crossing situation will remain unchanged.		

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
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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: Andrew Garratt

Date: 11 February 2013