1.1 At present, consideration for new or additional pedestrian crossing facilities are initiated by the following.

(i) In response to a direct request from local residents or community groups, etc.

(ii) Where a specific problem for pedestrians has been identified, e.g. traffic accidents involving pedestrians, or difficulty in gaining access to shops, etc.

(iii) As part of a new road or highway improvement scheme.

1.2 The Department for Transport recommends the use of an assessment framework to guide consideration of the need for a pedestrian crossing. (The previous assessment methodology was based on a mathematical relationship between the vehicular and pedestrian flows taken over the 4 ‘peak’ hours during a normal weekday – the relationship that was used was \( PV^2 \)).

2 Crossing Options

The outcome from this consideration will be one of the following:

(i) No pedestrian crossing or other facilities required

(ii) No pedestrian crossing required but some improvements to lighting, signing, etc. required

(iii) Seek to manage traffic through measures such as installing traffic calming measures or narrowing the carriageway to reduce the crossing time

(iv) Provide a pedestrian refuge island to allow pedestrians to cross in stages, and only have to consider traffic approaching from direction at a time. In addition the presence of a refuge can help to constrain vehicle speeds and may prevent or deter overtaking in the vicinity of the refuge.

(v) Provide a zebra crossing – the Department of Transport in its guidelines recommends that where a crossing is thought necessary, but pedestrian flows are relatively low and traffic flows are no more than moderate, then a Zebra crossing may be suitable. Zebra crossings give Pedestrians have precedence for crossing at zebra crossings which minimises delay.

(vi) Provide a signal controlled crossing (Pelican, Puffin or Toucan) – the Department for Transport guidance indicates that signal controlled crossings are used where:

- Vehicle speeds are high, and other crossing options are thought unsuitable
- There is a greater than average proportion of elderly or disabled pedestrians in the vicinity
- Vehicle flows are very high and pedestrians have difficulty in asserting precedence
- There is a specific need for a crossing for cyclists or equestrians
- Other traffic management measures such as a contra-flow bus lane in the vicinity could confuse pedestrians
There is a need to link with adjacent signal controlled junctions or crossings
Pedestrian flows are high and delays to vehicular traffic would otherwise be excessive

(vii) Provide a pedestrian stage within an existing traffic control junction – this may take the form of an all-red phase in the signals, when all traffic is stopped, or may involve an off-set pedestrian facility that allows pedestrians to cross each arm of the junction as traffic is halted.

3 Assessment of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities

2.1 The decision on the type of crossing to be provided is influenced by the following factors:

- Location/surroundings
- Vehicle and pedestrian flows and composition
- Vehicle speeds
- Difficulty in crossing
- Accident record
- Local representation
- Community severance
- Cost (including maintenance)

2.2 As a general rule, certain types of crossing facility are likely to be more appropriate for certain types of highway use. These are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Roads and Local Distributors with flows up to 3,000 vehicles per day (vpd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Distributors with flows greater than 3,000 vpd, and District Distributor, with flows up to 6,000 vpd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Controlled Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Distributors with flows greater than 6,000 vpd, and Principal Routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Prioritising Requests

3.1 The city council receives a substantial number of requests for pedestrian crossing facilities from local residents and community groups, etc. The assessment framework is therefore used to assess and prioritise these requests for pedestrian crossing facilities.

3.2 The requests are separated into residential roads; local distributors; district distributors; and principal roads for comparative assessment, dependent upon traffic flows. The approach is a guide and is not intended to be too prescriptive and the final choice of pedestrian crossing or other measure will depend upon the individual circumstances of each location and take into account special cases, determined through the assessment framework.

3.3 An initial assessment is undertaken Requests within each group are “sieved” as part of this prioritisation process. The sieving criteria are based on a measure of the pedestrian/vehicle conflict, e.g. \( PV^2 \) (where \( P \) is the pedestrian flow and \( V \) is the vehicular flow). Those sites that satisfy the criteria from this initial sieving exercise will then be subject to a detailed assessment.
3.4 The resulting recommendations from the technical assessments will be considered by the relevant Cabinet Member(s) for a final decision on the shortlisted priority locations and the measures to be implemented.

3.5 Requests and petitions for enhanced pedestrian crossing facilities will be reported annually to the Cabinet Member(s), setting out the future year’s programme.