

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	A340 Aldermaston Wharf - Petition for a Pedestrian Crossing
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 th May 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2569

Purpose of Report: To respond to a petition that has been submitted to the Council requesting a pedestrian crossing on the A340 at Aldermaston Wharf.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in section 5 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

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
E-mail Address:	pbale@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 pedestrian crossing is not recommended.
Personnel:	None arising from this report.
Legal/Procurement:	None arising from this report.
Property:	None arising from this report.
Risk Management:	None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at www.westberks.gov.uk/eia		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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, having read the report concurs with the recommendations.

Ward Members: Councillors Irene Neill, Keith Chopping, Mollie Lock and Geoff Mayes - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition Spokesperson: Councillor Keith Woodhams - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Local Stakeholders:

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Jon Winstanley

Trade Union:

N/A

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 petition containing 74 signatures was submitted to West Berkshire Council on 17 January 2013. The petition states:

'We, the undersigned, residents of Fallows Road, call on West Berkshire Council to put a pedestrian crossing on the A340, Basingstoke Road, Aldermaston Wharf, opposite Fallows Road Open Space so members of the public and children can cross safely.'

- 1.2 Background information submitted with the petition indicated that children cross the road for the school bus and to access the play area. There will be an increase in movements across the road due to the opening of the new cycle path and there are no safe crossing locations on the A340 where vehicles often exceed the 30mph speed limit.
- 1.3 The A340 is the main route between the A4 and Basingstoke and passes through the village of Aldermaston and Aldermaston Wharf. The length through Aldermaston Wharf is subject to a 30mph speed limit, has a priority working system over the narrow lifting bridge, a pedestrian refuge in the vicinity of Fallows Road and two Vehicle Activated signs. The residential developments are accessed via a number of side roads. There is a new cycle path that links to Aldermaston Village.
- 1.4 Within the latest three year period to the end of February 2013 there have been three recorded injury accidents on the A340 at Aldermaston Wharf between the A4 and the start of the 30mph speed limit. All the accidents resulted in slight injuries being received and did not involve any pedestrians.
- 1.5 A two week traffic survey was carried out on the A340 during May 2010 and the results showed that the average speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 30.2mph and 34.9mph respectively. The 85th percentile speed of northbound and southbound traffic was 36.1mph and 40.9mph respectively. An average two way daily volume of 7,890 was recorded.
- 1.6 The Council also has regular meetings with the Aldermaston Wharf Area Group (AWAG) where many important highway issues are discussed and where possible addressed.

2. Measures to assist pedestrian movements

- 2.1 The introduction of a formal pedestrian crossing, such as a pelican etc on the A340 has previously been investigated. This included surveys being undertaken to determine the number of pedestrian movements across the A340 and to establish the traffic volume and speeds.
- 2.2 The results were used to determine the justification for a crossing facility as this 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.

- 2.3 The results of the survey showed that a formal crossing was not appropriate and the traffic speeds were too high for the introduction of a zebra crossing. When a crossing can not be justified by the method described above, then other special circumstances are considered. In this instance there were none to justify the introduction of a formal crossing facility so other measures to assist pedestrians to cross the road were investigated.
- 2.4 The introduction of a 2 metres wide pedestrian refuge was investigated for implementation during the summer of 2012. Two options were designed, which were:
- Option 1 – Widening into Swan Drive (estimate £62,000)**
- Widening of carriageway by 2m on the Swan Drive side to maintain 3.3m lane widths.
 - Construction of a new footway in verge in front of Swan Close.
- Option 2 – Widening into Eastern side Public open space (estimate £95,000)**
- Widening of carriageway by 2m on the eastern side to maintain 3.3m lane widths.
 - Removal of approx 12 trees along the hedge line (5 of which have tree preservation orders requiring planning permission to be removed and would be unlikely to be granted)
 - Removal of hedge line and vegetation for approximately 180m.
- 2.5 Consultations were carried out with the local parish councils, ward members and local residents. Unfortunately the scheme did not progress as consensus on the preferred option could not be reached between the consultees.
- 2.6 The scheme had been allocated Section 106 funding in the 2012/13 financial year. However, as it became clear that no consensus could be met on the form of the crossing it was agreed with the Parish Council and local ward members that this funding would instead be used to widen the footway on the approach to the A340 railway bridge. This was undertaken by Network Rail in 2012 during the bridge replacement as part of the electrification works. If a pedestrian refuge scheme were to proceed further funding would have to be identified and the project included in a future years Capital Programme.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 Whilst a formal crossing facility would assist all pedestrians to cross the road, the criterion is not met. The introduction of a pedestrian refuge would also assist vulnerable groups to cross the road, however consensus on the design could not be agreed with all those consulted.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The results of the survey show that a formal crossing facility is not justified by the number of pedestrian movements and that there are no further special circumstances to justify a formal crossing facility.
- 4.2 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 other measures such as a pedestrian refuge was programmed to be implemented during the summer of 2012, but consensus between the consultees could not be reached on the preferred design.

- 4.3 To control traffic speeds on the A340 through Aldermaston Wharf there are two Vehicle Activated signs, a priority working system over the bridge and a pedestrian refuge near its junction with Fallows Road. The pedestrian refuge assists pedestrians and cyclists when crossing the road, especially if using the newly constructed cycle path.
- 4.4 To highlight that there are likely to be children crossing the road to access the playground, children crossing warning signs could be installed with the legend 'Playground'.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 That a formal crossing is not introduced and given that the consensus could not be reached on the design of a pedestrian refuge that no further action be undertaken.
- 5.2 That children crossing warning signs be installed with the legend 'Playground'.
- 5.3 That the petition organiser be informed of the decision.

Appendices

There are no Appendices to this report