### READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

TO: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE: 13 SEPTEMBER 2017 AGENDA ITEM: 9

TITLE: REQUESTS FOR NEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

LEAD TONY PAGE PORTFOLIO: STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT,

COUNCILLOR: PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

SERVICE: TRANSPORTATION WARDS: BOROUGHWIDE

& STREETCARE

LEAD OFFICER: JAMES PENMAN TEL: 0118 937 2202

JOB TITLE: ASSISTANT E-MAIL: <u>JAMES.PENMAN@READING.GOV.UK</u>

**NETWORK MANAGER** 

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report informs the Sub-Committee of requests for new traffic management measures that have been raised by members of the public, other organisations/representatives and Members of the Borough Council. These are measures that have either been previously reported, or those that would not typically be addressed in other programmes, where funding is yet to be identified.
- 1.2 Appendix 1 provides the list of schemes/proposals, with Officer comments.

## 2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee notes the report.
- 2.2 That the Sub-Committee may wish to identify a number of schemes that they consider to be priorities for progression/development.

# 3. POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 Any proposals would need to be considered in line with the Borough Council's Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

### 4. BACKGROUND AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The Council receives many requests for new traffic management measures across the borough and has a number of programmes in which they may be addressed. Such programmes include the Waiting Restriction Review, Resident Permit Parking and Road Safety Review. However, with continued central government transport funding cuts, monies for addressing general traffic management issues is harder to secure.
- 4.2 This report does not affect major strategic transport and cycling schemes that are funded as a part of any major scheme project award from central Government and/or the Local Enterprise Partnership.
- 4.3 Appendix 1 provides the current list of outstanding schemes and requests for measures, which is currently held by Officers.
- 4.4 It had been the intension of Officers to develop a scoring process for each scheme, however, in developing this process, Officers felt that this would not provide sufficient information and context to Members. Therefore, the list contains some categorised commentary around each scheme/request, providing some contextual background information such as casualty data and indicative costs.
- 4.5 Until a scheme is fully investigated, designed and quotes have been received from appropriate contractors, it is not possible to provide detailed costs. Appendix 1 provides an estimation of likely costs, ranging from 'Low', which will be hundreds-of-pounds to 'Very High', which will be many tens-of-thousands-of-pounds.
- 4.6 It is recommended that the Sub-Committee considers the recommendations for each scheme and may wish to identify a number of schemes/requests that it considers to be priorities for delivery. Officers have summarised their recommendations as follows:
  - 4.6.1 Recommend Works These items will remain on the list for further investigation and progression, subject to technical feasibility and funding availability.
  - 4.6.2 Forward to [Scheme/Programme] These items will be noted, for information, in a separate section of the list. They will, however, be moved for consideration as part of a different scheme or programme, such as an Area Study.
  - 4.6.3 Remove To remove an item from the list.

- 4.7 As the programme develops, it is intended that officers provide details about funding that may be available generally, or for specific measures, through local contributions such as CIL or Section 106. If specific items become funded through these contributions, the Sub-Committee will be informed and the scheme can be progressed.
- 4.8 It is the desire of Officers to investigate and design schemes that the Sub-Committee has agreed to progress, prioritising those that have been identified by the Sub-Committee as priorities for development. However, this work will need to be balanced with the need to progress other works programmes, with the limited staffing resources that are available.

#### 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 the infrastructure to support the economy.
  - Remaining financially sustainable to deliver these service priorities.

#### 6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 Requests received from members of the public, or their representatives, can be added to the list of issues.
- 6.2 Requests that are progressed into active schemes may require statutory consultation or public notification.

# 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 An Equality Impact scoping exercise will be conducted as part of the detailed scheme design, prior to implementation.

# 9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 None arising from this report.
- 9.2 Funding will need to be identified prior to the progression and development of requests/schemes.
- 9.3 Funding availability for maintenance/running costs of schemes will need to be considered.

# 10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Requests for New Traffic Management Measures (Traffic Management Sub-Committee - June 2017).

# APPENDIX 1 - REQUESTS FOR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT MEASURES

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE (SEPTEMBER 2017)

Line No.	Ward	Type of Request / Proposal	Street	Location	Details	Officer Comments
1	Abbey	Signing	Abbey Square	Entire road	Complaint from resident. Cars coming out the back of the Forbury Hotel often turn left out of the driveway and go the wrong way.	<ul> <li>General: A signing review could be conducted to investigate signing/lining that could discourage this (and similar) movement.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents in the latest 3 year period of data (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Likely improvement in compliance/reduction in confusion.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Low - High, depending on signing and illumination requirements.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
2	Abbey	Road Marking	Bridge Street	The 'Oracle' roundabout with Southampton Street	Design and implement 'spiral markings' on the roundabout to assist with lane discipline and reduce safety risks. Reported to March 2014 TMSC.	<ul> <li>Casualty Data: During the latest 3 year period of data (up to June 2017) there have been a number of incidents involving injury, however, 3 of these slight incidents can be attributed to lane-changing.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Anticipated reduction in lane-switching on the roundabout and reduced risk of collisions as a result.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Medium (traffic management costs will be relatively high).</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
3	Abbey	Pedestrian Crossing	George Street (B3345)	North of the roundabout with Vastern Road and Napier Road	Businesses have requested the installation of an assisted pedestrian crossing to the north of this roundabout. A report to June 2017 TMSC referred to this request and an indicated funding contribution by the business community.	<ul> <li>General: Project will need to consider feasibility of implementing a crossing (bridge structure, forward visibility), traffic impact when considering options, the inclusion of cycle facilities and cycle casualties on the roundabout.</li> <li>Casualty Data: 1 slight injury in latest 3 year period (up to June 2017) involving pedestrian crossing the road between stationary traffic.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, but any assisted/controlled crossing will have a detrimental effect on traffic flow.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: High to very high, depending on the solution.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

4	Abbey	Road Marking	Vastern Road	Roundabout with George Street and Napier Road	Design and implement 'spiral markings' on the roundabout to assist with lane discipline and reduce safety risks. Reported to March 2014 TMSC.	<ul> <li>General: It is intended that this be included with the necessary measures to implement the pedestrian crossing on George Street. If this scheme is not taken forward, the spiral marking scheme will remain as a standalone proposal.</li> <li>Casualty Data: Over the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017), 12 incidents involving injury on the northern side of the roundabout. Of these, 11 (4 serious, 7 slight) involved cyclists and 8 of these involved a failure by vehicles to give way at the roundabout. The southern side is less consistent, with 7 incidents (1 serious, 6 slight), of which 4 involved a failure to give way and 1 involved poor manoeuvre.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Anticipated reduction in lane-switching on the roundabout and reduced risk of collisions as a result.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Medium (traffic management costs will be relatively high).</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation. Recommended that failures to give way are investigated as part of the Council's Road Safety programme and in the context of the requested pedestrian crossing facility on George Street.</li> </ul>
5	Abbey	Traffic signal refresh	Vastern Road	jcn De Montford Road	Councillor has requested the refreshment of the traffic signal equipment at this junction.	<ul> <li>General: Traffic signals are currently updated on a priority basis, depending on condition/safety of equipment, strategic importance and funding availability.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents in the latest 3 year period of data (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Lower energy consumption and reduced maintenance costs.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: High</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
6	Abbey	Junction improvement (pedestrians)	Watlington Street/Kings Road	Crossings at the meeting of Watlington Street/Forbury Road and Kings Road	Area Neighbourhood Officer has raised concerns regarding the inconsistency of tactile paving at the sites of the older traffic signal controlled pedestrian crossings.	<ul> <li>General: This work will likely require footway improvement works around the junction, in addition to the installation of tactile paving.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving pedestrian casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: This work would improve accessibility around the junction and enhance the street scene.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Medium, depending on extent of works.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

7	Borough- wide	Signing	Borough- wide	Borough-wide	Sign de-cluttering and consolidation. Following report to Sept 2013 TMSC and release of the Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions in April 2016, removal of unnecessary/non-compliant signing, consolidation of existing, including posts. Benefits will be an improvement to the street scene, improved clarity of signing, reduced maintenance costs and reduced electrical costs for illuminated signs.	<ul> <li>Casualty Data: N/A</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved street scene and clarity of important information. Removal of signs that no longer comply with regulations, increased footway width from removal of unnecessary poles, reduced maintenance and electrical costs relating to illuminated signs.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Per sign/post cost - Low.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further and ongoing investigation.</li> </ul>
8	Caversham	Pedestrian Crossing	Briants Avenue	Near to South View Avenue	Local resident requested formal crossing (e.g. zebra) to ease the crossing of Briants Avenue. There is no controlled pedestrian crossing along Briants Avenue.	<ul> <li>General: It is likely that any potential location for such a facility will be a reasonable distance away from the junction with South View Avenue (and the bend in the road) to satisfy the required forward visibility to the crossing. Surveys would need to be conducted to consider whether a crossing in such a location would be sufficiently used. Consideration could be made for introducing imprints at the informal crossings at the northern side, or raised informal crossings that could act as a speed calming feature also, in the context of the proposed 20mph zone.</li> <li>Casualty Data: Over the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017), 1 serious and 2 slight incidents involving injury, where pedestrians have been crossing the road. There are a number of causation factors, but all incidents are at the northern end of the street.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: Low - High, depending on chosen solution(s).</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

9	Caversham	Footway and Junction improvements (vehicles & pedestrians)	Gosbrook Road	Jcn Westfield Road	Resident has reported the issue with long vehicles turning left onto Westfield Road causing damage to wall of No.4, due to poor driving. Resident has asked for alteration to island or no-left-turn etc. to prevent this occurring. General concerns have been raised regarding the narrow footway width along Gosbrook Road.	<ul> <li>General: The size of the island was reduced when the traffic signals were removed from this junction. It reinforces the no-right-turn onto Gosbrook Road and houses illuminated signs. It also acts as an informal refuge island. These factors need to be taken into account if any alterations are being considered. Footway widening may be technically possible and will be of widespread benefit to pedestrians, but will be costly.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017), which can be attributed to this issue/concern.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: To be investigated. Benefits to pedestrians, particularly during school arrival/departure times, from increased footway widths. The resultant narrowing of the carriageway may assist in reducing traffic speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: High - Very High. Footway widening will involve reconstruction works, drainage and utility adjustments.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
10	Caversham	Pedestrian Crossing	Gosbrook Road	Linking Westfield Road park footpath with the Christchurch Meadows footpath, which leads to the new pedestrian/cycle bridge	A petition to install a zebra crossing on Gosbrook Road was reported to Jan 2016 TMSC. An update report went to March 2016 TM sub, with proposals reported to June 2016 TMSC. An outline zebra crossing design & results of parking consultation were reported at Sept 2016 TMSC.	<ul> <li>General: This scheme is awaiting funding to enable it to progress to detailed design and implementation. Ground investigation works will determine the deliverability of the proposal. Details of the proposals have been reported to TMSC and Officers have agreement to proceed.</li> <li>Casualty Data: Previously reported to TMSC.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Estimated £30,000 (June 2016)</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for progression, as per TMSC agreement.</li> </ul>
11	Caversham	20mph	Various	Lower Caversham and Amersham Road area	A report to Sept 2016 TMSC proposed a 20mph zone that could cover the Lower Caversham and Amersham Road estate areas. This report was the result of a number of petitions and requests for 20mph in these areas. It was agreed that there would need to be further consultation with Councillors and CADRA, but noted that there was currently no funding for the scheme.	<ul> <li>General: This scheme is awaiting funding to enable it to be fully investigated (e.g. conducting speed surveys) and to progress to detailed design and implementation.</li> <li>Casualty Data: This will be investigated, alongside surveys, as the scope of the scheme is developed.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Reduced speeds around this busy area of Caversham.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: High - Very High, but will depend on the scope of the scheme.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

12	Katesgrove	Signing	Elgar Road	Entrance from Pell Street	Complaint from resident stating that many HGVs come down the road, probably following a sat nav and trying to get to Elgar Road south. They then reverse the entire road and have caused damage to vehicles and obstruction of the street.	<ul> <li>General: A signing review can be conducted to investigate signing/lining that could discourage this movement.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents in the latest 3 year period of data (up to June 2017) that can be attributed to this concern.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Anticipated reduction in problematic vehicle movements and reduction in risks of traffic collisions/third-party damages.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Low - Medium.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
13	Katesgrove / Minster	Signing	London Road, Crown Street	Approaching the junction with Pell Street	Linked with the Elgar Road concerns, Officers have passed on concerns raised at NAG meetings, that HGVs are not noticing the weight limit signs for the Berkeley Avenue / A33 overbridge until they are on Pell Street.	<ul> <li>General: A signing review can be conducted to investigate signing alterations that can be used to better direct HGVs around this weight limit.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents in the latest 3 year period of data (up to June 2017) that can be attributed to this concern.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Anticipated reduction in problematic vehicle movements.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Medium - the works will likely require replacement of large strategic directional signs.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
14	Kentwood	Pedestrian Crossing	Oxford Road & Overdown Road	Oxford Road (east side of Overdown Road roundabout) & Overdown Road (near to Oxford Road roundabout)	Councillor has raised resident concerns regarding the lack of assisted (formal) pedestrian crossings at these busy locations.	<ul> <li>General: Consideration could be made for introducing imprints at the informal crossings at the northern side, or raised informal crossings that could act as a speed calming feature also, to zebra crossing.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving pedestrian casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Low - High, depending on type and number of facility/facilities chosen.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

15	Mapledur- ham	Pedestrian Crossing	Upper Woodcote Road	General	A number of requests have been made for improvements to pedestrian crossings (and increased numbers) along the street.	General: There are no controlled crossings along the street and a limited number of refuge islands. There would be benefit in considering some of the areas that attract a higher footfall and providing appropriate facilities to assist pedestrians. Facilities could range from imprinting, to assisted crossings (e.g. zebra crossings)     Casualty Data: No incidents involving pedestrian casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017).     Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.     Anticipated Costs: Low - High, depending on type and number of facility/facilities chosen.     Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.
16	Minster	20mph	Southcote Road & Westcote Road	Entire lengths	A local resident has raised concerns about the perceived speeding of motorists along these streets.	<ul> <li>General: It is likely that Southcote Road acts as a popular rat-run between Bath Road and Tilehurst Road. It would be beneficial to conduct surveys to assess vehicle speeds and appropriate measures.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017) where speeding has been considered a contributing factor.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Reduced vehicle speeds, but need to consider the impact of the required traffic calming features on emergency service vehicles and residents (potentially increased traffic noise). Could deter some of the rat-running, though need to consider whether this is an issue that also requires attention.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: Medium - High, but will depend on the scope of the scheme.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

17	Park	Movement Restriction	Wokingham Road	Near to the junction with Eastern Avenue	Councillor, on behalf of businesses, requested that the bus lane is reduced in length by 5-20m due to concerns about road safety when exiting Eastern Avenue onto Wokingham Road.	<ul> <li>General: This request was raised in the context of the Red Route consultation, but would be outside the scope of this project. Officers are uncertain as to why the reduction of this bus lane would improve the level of risk upon exiting the junction. Its current location also allows cyclists to leave the carriageway and enter the shared-use footway/cycleway ahead of the junction (and the use of the lane by general traffic).</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017), involving vehicles exiting the junction.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: It is considered that this could increase risk to cyclists and increase the difficulty in exiting the junction, as general traffic will be approaching in 2 lanes.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Medium. Works would require a statutory consultation with a new TRO, burning off existing lining and re-lining the carriageway and the movement of signing.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Remove.</li> </ul>
18	Redlands	Pedestrian Crossing	Addington Road	Between Addington/Erleig h Rd and Addington/Easter n Ave jcns	Request via NAG for a controlled crossing at this location.	<ul> <li>General: It would be beneficial to survey this vicinity to assess the footfall and any desire line for pedestrians crossing. This is within the 20mph zone and measures from imprinting to assisted crossings could be considered, if appropriate.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving pedestrian casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: Low - High, depending on type of facility chosen, if appropriate.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

19	Thames	Speed Calming	Albert Road	Entire length	Councillor request to install speed calming measures along the length of Albert Road, following requests from residents. Also to consider 'pushing out' the Highmoor Road junction stop line. Report to TMSC in September 2017 provides indicative costs for speed calming measures.	<ul> <li>General: Previous reports to TMSC, relating to Highmoor Road/Albert Road jcn Highway safety, have identified traffic speeds and have made clear the causes of casualty and fatality incidents.</li> <li>Casualty Data: Latest 3 year period (up to June 2017) show no incidents involving casualties, where speeding has been considered as a contributing factor. Speed surveys in 2016 recorded average speeds at 23.1mph (northbound) and 23.7mph (southbound). Casualty data for Highmoor Road junction have previously been reported at TMSC.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Depending on options considered, traffic speeds could be reduced by speed calming. This could have a negative impact for public transport and emergency service vehicles and create additional traffic noise for residents. The movement of the Highmoor Road stop line could improve visibility when exiting the road.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: High. Traffic calming costs will depend on the chosen feature. Movement of the stop line will likely require planing and resurfacing of the junction to remove the existing lining and faded red surfacing.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended that scheme remains on this list.</li> </ul>
20	Thames	Pedestrian Crossing	Rotherfield Way	South-west of its junction with Surley Row	A petition to install 'safe crossing places' on Rotherfield Way was reported to Jan 2016 TMSC. An update report went to March 2016 TMSC. A further update report (with an outline zebra crossing design) was reported to June 2016 TMSC.	<ul> <li>General: This scheme is awaiting funding to enable it to progress to detailed design and implementation. Ground investigation works will determine the deliverability of the proposal.</li> <li>Casualty Data: Previously reported to TMSC.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Estimated £20,000 (June 2016)</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for progression, as per TMSC agreement.</li> </ul>
21	Tilehurst	20mph zone & One-way plug	Recreation Road	Entire length, considering Blundells Road also.	A petition to September 2014 TMSC requested measures to address ratrunning traffic and perceived traffic speeding issues. The petition included a request for 20mph speed limits and consideration of a oneway plug.	<ul> <li>General: It would be beneficial to conduct speed and traffic flow surveys (the traffic flow surveys should be conducted during - and outside of - school holidays) to provide the data for consideration in any proposals.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Reduced traffic volumes and reduced vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: Medium - High, depending on proposals for the scheme.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

22	Tilehurst	20mph & Pedestrian Crossing	School Road	Outside The Laurels	Concerns raised regarding perceived vehicle speeds and distance to the nearest assisted crossing point. Requested to consider lowering the speed limit and enhanced crossing facility in this location.	<ul> <li>General: Considering the proximity to the school, we would need to survey pedestrian flows and consider implementing a controlled crossing (e.g. zebra crossing).</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017) where speeding has been considered a contributing factor, or where pedestrians crossing the street have been injured.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities, particularly beneficial at school drop-off/pick-up times. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: High.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
23	Tilehurst	Lining Alteration	The Meadway	Roundabout with St Michaels Road	Request to review lining on approaches ('unnecessary' 2 lane approaches) to encourage correct use of the roundabout and reduce the number of vehicles cutting across it.	<ul> <li>General: Officers agree that reducing the number of lanes on approach to this mini roundabout could have a positive impact on driver behaviour and improve compliance.</li> <li>Casualty Data: 1 serious and 2 slight injuries in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017), where vehicles have failed to give way. However, these incidents were recorded with a number of contributing factors.</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved driver behaviour and compliance at the roundabout.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Low - Medium.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>
24	Tilehurst / Kentwood	Pedestrian Crossing	Norcot Road	o/s 101	Councillor requested that the refuge island is converted to a full pedestrian crossing, as the island is too small for push chairs. This would also be a safety benefit for school children.	<ul> <li>General: This location is a significant distance from the nearest controlled crossings and near to the linking footway between Norcot Road and Wealden Way. It will be necessary to conduct surveys to assess the footfall and desire line for pedestrians and consider an appropriate facility.</li> <li>Casualty Data: No incidents involving pedestrian casualties in the latest 3 year period (up to June 2017).</li> <li>Benefits/Impact: Improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Potential reduction in vehicle speeds.</li> <li>Anticipated Costs: Survey: Low. Implementation: High.</li> <li>Recommended Action: Recommended for further investigation.</li> </ul>

This table is arranged by Ward (A-Z), then by Street (A-Z)