

REPORT: Environment & Urban Renewal Policy & Performance Board

DATE: 15 November 2017

REPORTING OFFICER: Strategic Director, Enterprise, Community & Resources

PORTFOLIO: Transportation

SUBJECT: Petition Requesting zebra Crossing Facilities and 20 mph speed limit on Beechwood Avenue, Runcorn

WARDS: Beechwood

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To report on a petition comprising 82 individuals requesting the installation of zebra crossing facilities near Beechwood and Hillview Schools (the latter also mentions the new park) and a 20 mph speed limit on Beechwood Avenue (like Palace Fields, Brookvale, Murdishaw they are all 20 mph why should Beechwood be different).

2.0 RECOMMENDATION: That the petitioners are informed as follows:

- that pedestrian/traffic surveys have been carried out and zebra crossing facilities are not justified and
- that a 20 mph speed limit has been considered previously and not progressed due to objections

3.0 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

3.1 A petition comprising 82 individuals has been received requesting the installation of zebra crossing facilities and a 20 mph speed limit on Beechwood Avenue. It should be noted that 10 signatories are from outside of Runcorn.

3.2 There are no Pelican, Puffin or zebra crossings in the area of the schools at the present time. However there are School Crossing Patrols outside Beechwood and Hillview Primary Schools, although the site outside Beechwood Primary School is currently vacant due to the previous patrol leaving and the post will be advertised shortly.

3.3 Due to the design of the Beechwood estate, pedestrians and vehicles are segregated with limited crossing points of Beechwood Avenue. A few years ago pedestrian refuges were provided at several locations to assist pedestrians crossing the road and to encourage drivers to drive slower.

3.4 The Department for Transport criteria recommends that a controlled crossing

may be considered at points where the level of traffic/pedestrian crossing conflict expressed as PV^2 (where P is the number of pedestrians per hour and V the number of vehicles per hour) reaches a value of 10^8 for the four busiest hours in a day. Pedestrian vehicle surveys have recently been carried out as part of the annual review of School Crossing Patrols and using the data from these surveys, the criteria for controlled crossings is not met for the peak periods and therefore they cannot be justified.

- 3.5 In addition, experience has shown that where controlled crossings have been installed where they are generally only required for very specific and short times of the day, they can become dangerous as drivers become accustomed to passing along the road without stopping and hence they may either fail to stop when they need to or stop suddenly.
- 3.6 For these reasons, the installation of a controlled pedestrian crossing adjacent to the school entrances is therefore not recommended.
- 3.7 In 2015 a proposal to make the whole of Beechwood including Beechwood Avenue a 20 mph zone was advertised. A number of objections were received and following consideration by this Board in June 2015 and subsequently the Executive Board in September 2015, the Traffic Regulation Order was made to make the whole of Beechwood a 20 mph zone excluding Beechwood Avenue. Given that the process only took place two years ago it is not the best use of resources to rerun it again as the same outcome is likely.
- 3.8 There have been five reported road traffic collisions involving personal injury in the area of Beechwood between 2011 and 2016 inclusive (2016 being the latest full period for which accident records are available). Three occurred in 2014 and two in 2016, unusually all the collisions in 2014 occurred in July, so they may have been related to traffic finding alternative routes, when the Mersey Gateway works commenced at M56 Junction 12.

4.0 POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no other direct social inclusion, sustainability, value for money, legal or crime and disorder implications resulting from this report

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 There are currently no financial implications.

6.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL'S PRIORITIES.

6.1 Children & Young People in Halton

The provision of controlled crossings outside of the school entrance cannot be recommended.

6.2 Employment, Learning & Skills in Halton

There are no direct implications on the Council's 'Employment, Learning & Skills in Halton' priority.

6.3 A Healthy Halton

There are no direct implications on the Council's 'A Healthy Halton' priority.

6.4 A Safer Halton

There are no direct implications on the Council's 'A Safer Halton' priority.

6.5 Halton's Urban Renewal

There are no direct implications on the Council's 'Halton's Urban Renewal'.

7.0 RISK ANALYSIS

7.1 No full risk assessment is required.

8.0 EQUALITY & DIVERSITY ISSUES

8.1 There are no direct equality and diversity issues associated with this report.

9.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS UNDER SECTION 100D OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

9.1 Report to Environment & Urban Renewal Policy & Performance Board on 24th June 2015;
Report to Executive Board on 3rd September 2015.