

Report

6

Report to:	Road Safety Forum
Date of Meeting:	3 February 2010
Report by:	Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

Subject:	Revised Criteria for Assessing Potential Locations for Pedestrian Crossings
----------	--

1. Purpose of Report

1.1. The purpose of the report is to:-

- ◆ advise the Forum of revised criteria for assessing requests for pedestrian crossings.

2. Recommendation(s)

2.1. The Forum is asked to note the following recommendation(s):-

- (1) that the Council adopts new criteria for assessing potential pedestrian crossings locations.

3. Background

3.1. The current criteria for assessing locations for pedestrian crossings (zebras; pelican/puffin crossings and pedestrian islands) are based on the traditional PV^2 value (where P is the number of pedestrians and V the number of vehicles). Where PV^2 met a predetermined value a crossing was deemed justified. PV^2 has been in use for many years, however in 1995 revised criteria (Local Transport Note 1/95) was issued by the central government. The main change recommended by Local Transport Note 1/95 was that the difficulty in crossing the road is established by taking into account the time to cross the road safely and the available gaps in traffic. Although these revised criteria have been in existence since 1995 no other local authority appears to use them.

3.2. Need for change to criteria

The PV^2 has worked well in the past however sites are now falling well short of the criteria. PV^2 was developed to decide if a crossing was justified (i.e. give a YES or NO answer), however we are now using it to prioritise sites. Almost all of the crossings that we have installed in recent years would not necessarily have been justified on strict PV^2 criteria, however they have in general proven effective and popular with the public and local members. An example of where the current criteria is not working would be a road that is extremely difficult to cross, for instance to get to a bus stop, however, because of the relatively small number of pedestrians, the PV^2 value is small and the site has a low priority when compared with roads which are relatively easy to cross, but have higher pedestrian numbers.

3.3. **Proposed criteria**

In order to address the deficiencies in the existing assessment process the Road Safety Section has developed the following procedure.

For each site to be investigated we would:-

- Establish the time to safely cross the road depending on the carriageway width, based on a walking speed of 0.9 metres per second. This gives us the appropriate gap required.
- During the peak times identify each 5 minute period where there are less than 5 safe gaps. Record the total delay for pedestrians crossing the road during these 5 minute periods where there are insufficient gaps.
- Summate the delays during the busiest periods for adults, children, disabled pedestrians and elderly pedestrians. A weighting would be applied to children, disabled pedestrians and elderly pedestrians. This summation of delays (in seconds) is the figure used in the "Gap acceptance" column in Appendix A.
- Environmental factors would also be taken into account, such as schools, post offices etc. as is done at present, to give the final priority table.

N.B. A minimum number of pedestrians, 5 per hour, should be crossing the road at the busiest period so that drivers do not become complacent, anticipating that there will be no pedestrians.

3.4. The above assessment criteria have been trialled at the four locations that had the highest priority using PV², and the results of both evaluation methods are shown in the table in Appendix A.

3.5. Appendix A demonstrates that by using the new gap acceptance method the introduction of a crossing at Calderwood Road, East Kilbride would receive a high priority. The other three locations would be low priority at this stage.

4. **Employee Implications**

4.1. None

5. **Financial Implications**

5.1. None

6. **Other Implications**

6.1. None

7. **Equality Impact Assessment and Consultation Arrangements**

7.1. This report does not introduce a new policy, function or strategy or recommend a change to an existing policy, function or strategy and therefore, no impact assessment is required.

7.2. There was also no requirement to undertake any consultation in terms of the information contained in this report.

Colin McDowall
Executive Director (Enterprise Resources)

25 January 2010

Link(s) to Council Objectives/Values

- Improve Community safety
- Improve lives of vulnerable children, young people and adults
- People focused

Previous References

None

List of Background Papers

None

Contact for Further Information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Mick Halligan

Ext: 3605 (Tel: 01698 453605)

E-mail: michael.halligan@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

Appendix A

Comparison of potential pedestrian crossing locations using “PV²” and “Gap Acceptance” method

Location	PV ²	“Gap acceptance”
Calderwood Road at Raeburn Avenue, East Kilbride	33	1329
Dukes Road at Hawthorn Walk, Cambuslang	33	130
Maxwellton Road at Baillie Drive, East Kilbride	29	95
Bellshill Road at Wilkie Road, Uddingston	31	0