#### READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

#### REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE: 10 MARCH 2016 AGENDA ITEM: 7

TITLE: PETITION FOR SAFE CROSSING PLACES FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN ON

**ROTHERFIELD WAY - UPDATE** 

LEAD TONY PAGE PORTFOLIO: STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT,

COUNCILLOR: PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

SERVICE: TRANSPORTATION WARDS: THAMES AND PEPPARD

& STREETCARE

LEAD OFFICER: SIMON BEASLEY TEL: 0118 937 2228

JOB TITLE: NETWORK & E-MAIL: <u>simon.beasley@reading.gov.uk</u>

PARKING SERVICES

MANAGER

#### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 To report to the Sub-Committee an initial response to a petition submitted to January meeting asking for the Council to implement a crossing place for school children on Rotherfield Way.

## 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That officers consider the options again in view of the petition and reconsider the proposal suggested by CADRA and report back their findings to a future meeting of the Sub-committee.
- 2.3 That the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

# 3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 The provision of pedestrian crossing facilities and associated criteria is specified within existing Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

#### 4. THE PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Following a petition received by the Sub-committee in January 2016 this report explains the work carried out previously to introduce a pedestrian crossing facility at the junction of Rotherfield Way and Surley Row.
- 4.2 There has been a desire to improve the junction of Rotherfield Way and Surley Row for some time. Following agreement by Traffic Management Advisory Panel (TMAP) officers designed a scheme to introduce pedestrian islands. Localised consultation was carried out in spring 2014, and whilst everyone agreed that something should be done there was not universal acceptance of our proposal. We considered the feedback received and a final scheme was promoted as shown on the drawing (appendix 1).
- 4.3 However, when we tested the design through a series of experiments using temporary traffic management the proposal would not fit the current road layout. Due to the number of private driveways we were unable to find a location for the islands without causing an obstruction to one of the properties. The areas that could accommodate the scheme were well beyond any pedestrian desire line and consequently would not be helpful for those crossing at the junction.
- 4.4 An alternative scheme has been suggested by CADRA. This consists of a modest local narrowing of the carriageway with a raised table in a contrasting coloured material. The gradients on both sides of the tables should be no greater than 1:15 (as recommended by Transport for London for bus routes) and clear visibility ensured by white arrow heads. The claim by CADRA is that this arrangement would have the effect of slowing traffic and providing a safer crossing place for all pedestrians without obstructing through traffic and private driveways. Our response is that whilst this proposal may slow vehicle speed it does not directly offer any direct additional assistance to pedestrians.
- 4.5 The topography of the junction does not help. There is a significant level difference to the south side of the junction between the Rotherfield Way footway and carriageway with a further complication of a large BT chamber in the verge. This renders any form of facility on the south side of the junction unrealistic due to the levelling that would be required over a significant distance of the road. The bell mouth of the junction is relatively wide, which encourages higher turning speeds. Although it was a feature of our design to decrease the radius of the junction there is a number of chambers in the road

that would need to be lifted. This also applies to any raised table thus increasing the value of the works required.

4.5 In conclusion, whilst there is a desire to improve this junction for pedestrians, agreeing a solution that meets the expectation and concern expressed within the petition remains a challenge. Officers will consider the options again in view of the petition and reconsider the proposal suggested by CADRA.

#### 5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

- 5.1 This proposal supports the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan and contributes to the Council's strategic aims, as set out below:
  - Keeping the town clean, green and active.
  - Providing infrastructure to support the economy.
  - Remaining financially sustainable to deliver these service priorities.

## 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

6.1 The lead petitioner will be informed of the findings of the Sub-Committee.

#### 7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 None arising from this report.

## 8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 In addition to the Human Rights Act 1998 the Council is required to comply with the Equalities Act 2010. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to:-
  - eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
  - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
  - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

8.2 The Council will carry out an equality impact assessment scoping exercise prior to submitting the update report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee.

# 9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 None arising from this report.

# 10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 January 2016 TM Sub-committee report.

