| PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ASSESSMENT CRITERIA MATRIX | ASSESSOR: Jonathan Waters |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SITE: Long Causeway, Adel (By St. Helen's Lane) | DAY/DAY/TIME: 4/12/2024 |
| | WEATHER & ROAD CONDITIONS: Sun and clouds – slightly damp - Cold |
| | |

Section 1: Site Assessment

| SCORE | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Total |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Benefit for locality * | | A worsening of condition in both i. Access to frontage property ii. Restrictions on waiting | A worsening of conditions in either: i. Access to frontage property ii. Restrictions on waiting | 10 properties or less benefiting | Whole Street of up to 50 properties benefiting | Local neighbourhood of up to 200 properties benefiting | A whole town, village or district benefiting | 2 |
| Crossing impact on the Locality * | A worsening of conditions in ALL of: i) Access to premises made more difficult ii) Passing trade removed iii) Restrictions on waiting iv) Noise/Visual Pollution | A worsening of conditions in any TWO of: i) Access to premises made more difficult ii) Passing trade removed iii) Restrictions on waiting iv) Noise/Visual Pollution | A worsening of conditions in ONE of: i) Access to premises made more difficult ii) Passing trade removed iii) Restrictions on waiting iv) Noise/Visual Pollution | No real impact but maybe a couple of properties benefiting at most (commercial/ industrial) | A parade of 15 shops or business properties benefiting | A small town or village benefiting | A major town centre benefiting | 0 |
| Public Interest | | | | First request in 3 years | Two independent requests in last 12 months | Regular complaint OR Petition | Regular complaint AND petition | 2 |
| Traffic Speed Assessment | | | | Mean speeds within prescribed limit | Reduction of mean speeds up to 10% of prescribed limit | Reduction of mean speeds up to 20% of prescribed limit | Reduction of mean speeds up to 30% of prescribed limit | 1 |
| Highway | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Assessment | Use Section 2 – Highway | Assessment score | | | | | | |
| Road Safety | | | | | | | | 0 |
| History | Use Section 3 – Road Safe | ety History score | | | | | | |
| Traffic/ Pedestrian | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Surveys | Use Section 4 – Traffic/Pe | destrian score | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | TOTAL SCORE | 7 |

^{*}Note – scores on first two items to be halved when residential area is 250m+ away from road

Section 2: Highway Assessment

| Road character: | Type of Road | Road Classification | Direction of flow (2 way) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Two way single carriageway, Dual Carriageway, 2 way S/C etc | 2 way S/C | Unclassiifed | North to South |
| Carriageway width: | Overall Width | Lane 1*. | Lane 2*. |
| *Between islands or central reserve for dual carriageways | 6.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Other road features (presence of alternative crossings, refuges islands, traffic calming, TROs etc):- | ative crossings, refuges island | s, traffic calming, TROs etc):- | |
| Speed cushions to northern extent of surveyed area | nt of surveyed area | | |

Other road factors (adjacent junctions, accesses etc):-Junction with St. Helen's Lane

| Frontage (✓ any) | Shops | Residential | School |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------|--------|
| | | < | _ < |
| Other (hospital, day centre etc.):- | | | |

Bus services/stops proximity:- Northbound bus stop (flag) in survey area. Southbound bus stop (shelter) 30 metres to south.

Visual check of crossing opportunities (circle one):

0) Very easy - no difficulty within a few seconds

) Easy - short wait up to 30 seconds

-) Moderate difficulty wait of up to one minute
- 2 Difficult - more than a one minute wait
- ယ Very difficult - long wait of two minutes or more
-) Impossible after waiting several minutes for an opportunity

Judgement should be based on normal walking pace WITHOUT having to walk fast or run to cross in safety

Section 3: Road safety history

| Some accident savings possible | Risk potential reduced | No effect on safety | Risk potential increased |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| | | | |
| | | | Other factors:- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | Others |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | Child pedestrian |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | Adult pedestrian |
| fatal | serious | slight | Severity |
| 04/12/2024 | 5 year period from 01/01/2019 to 04/12/2024 | 5 year perio | Accidents: |

Note: Recorded for 50 metres either side of study site.

Section 4: Traffic/Pedestrian Surveys

| | 22 | 26 | 20 |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| | Average (mean) | 85 percentile | Speed Limit |
| | | | |
| | | | Other details:- $PV^2 = 0.19$ |
| | | | Other relevant groups 1. 2. |
| 4 | 8 | 29 | Elderly people |
| 19 | 16 | 55 | Child pedestrians |
| 45 | 57 | 223 | Adult pedestrians (all) |
| 541 | 731 | 4419 | All vehicles |
| 1430 to 1530 | 0800 to 0900 | 0700 to 1900 | Flow:- |
| Second busiest hour | Busiest hour | 12 hours | Traffic/Ped surveys: |

Pedestrian volumes per hour at busiest hours:

$$25 - 50 = 1$$
 point, $50 - 75 = 2$ points, $>75 = 3$ points.

High volume of child/ elderly pedestrians + 1 point

Conclusions/ recommendations: 7 Points

The location does not qualify for a formal controlled pedestrian crossing under the criteria set out above. The location would benefit from informal measures, however the narrow nature of the carriageway in this area does not support the introduction of a traffic island. A speed plateau could be considered to provide at-level crossing opportunities and also to assist in lowering the speed of through traffic and this can be considered as funding allows.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING CRITERIA FLOW CHART

