

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Agenda
Item No.

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)
To
**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**
On
9th March 2017

Report prepared by:
Peter Geraghty
Director for Planning and Transport

**Petition Regarding Provision of a School Crossing Patrol and Pedestrian Crossing -
Darlinghurst Grove**
Executive Councillor: Councillor Terry
A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To advise Members of a petition received with 277 signatories which requests the provision of a School Crossing Patrol Officer and parking enforcement activity in the area of Darlinghurst School.

2. Recommendation

That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee:

- (i) Note the petition ; and,**
- (ii) Note officers comments in para 3.5 and agree to take no further action with regard to the provision of a School Crossing Patrol Officer as this site does not meet the national criterion set by Road Safety GB for provision of such facilities ; and**
- (iii) Note the officers comments in para 3.6 and agree to take no further action with regard to the provision of a pedestrian crossing facility; and,**
- (iv) Agree to advertise a proposal for the installation of loading restrictions on Darlinghurst Grove adjacent to the raised crossing point ; and,**
- (v) Agree that in the event no objections to the proposal are received, to confirm the proposal.**

3. Background

- 3.1 A petition was received requesting a School Crossing Patrol Officer and a pedestrian crossing facility to be provided in Darlinghurst Grove.
- 3.3 Darlinghurst School is adjacent to Prittlebrook Path with a raised crossing point provided in Darlinghurst Grove. The route appears to be well used by pupils. The road is subject to a speed limit of 20mph. Accident data has been investigated and no accidents resulting in personal injury have been recorded.

- 3.4 Southend Borough Council utilise guidelines provided by Road Safety GB, a road safety organisation which provides guidance, good practice information and knowledge sharing, to assess sites for School Crossing Patrols. Officers have assessed the site using these guidelines and the results fall below the recommended thresholds for the provision of a School Crossing Patrol Officer.
- 3.5 Assessments are undertaken at the peak morning and afternoon school drop off and pick up periods. The assessment involves the logging of the numbers of vehicles and the number of pedestrians which are then multiplied. This is further analysed by weighting the result considering the pedestrians average age and whether they are accompanied together with any particular geographical features (the outcomes measured in vehicle/pedestrian units). To justify the provision of a School Crossing Patrol, the final calculation should achieve 4 million vehicle/pedestrian units. The assessment result after all calculations is 2.39 million units, which falls well short of the guidance type, therefore a School Crossing Patrol is not justified for this site.
- 3.6 Pedestrian crossing assessments are undertaken in a similar manner however the assessment is generally undertaken over a 12 hour period. Where the requested location is near to a school and likely to be primarily in use during school peak hours, the assessment is focussed on these periods. The final calculation should achieve a figure of 1.0 derived from the four highest hours recorded. The result following the assessment show a final calculation for the peak periods (the two highest hours) of 0.299. The rationale for this criteria was agreed by this Committee on 12th March 2012.
- 3.7 The raised crossing area is subject to a waiting restriction prohibiting parking at any time, drivers commonly park in contravention of such restrictions for very short periods on these areas believing this to be acceptable and disabled badge holders may park for up to 3 hours. To prevent visibility being obstructed by these vehicles, it is suggested that a prohibition on loading be proposed for this location to prevent all parking.

4. Other Options

- 4.1 Other options that may be considered are to agree to the petitioners' request. However, as this report sets out, the site does not meet the accepted assessment criteria.

5. Reasons for Recommendations

- 5.1 To reflect the outcome of the investigations and ensuring best use of limited resources.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 Local Transport and Implementation Plan, Safe and Prosperous.

6.2 *Financial Implications*

- 6.2.1 If approved, any works to propose loading restrictions will be met through existing budgets and added to the existing workload unless an agreed priority is allocated at the time of its approval.

6.3 *Legal Implications*

- 6.3.1 Any changes to waiting and loading restrictions are progressed in accordance with statutory requirements.

6.4 *People Implications*

- 6.4.1 All necessary works will be undertaken by existing staff.

6.5 *Property Implications*

- 6.5.1 None.

6.6 *Consultation*

- 6.6.1 Statutory consultations are undertaken when proposing waiting or loading restrictions.

6.7 *Equalities and Diversity Implications*

- 6.7.1 The objectives of improving safety takes account of all users of the public highway including those with disabilities.

6.8 *Risk Assessment*

- 6.8.1 None.

6.9 *Value for Money*

- 6.9.1 The recommendation is considered to give the best value for money considering the Council's limited resources.

6.10 *Community Safety Implications*

- 6.10.1 The prioritisation of the Councils' Working Party's programme is on the basis of reducing accidents or improving traffic flows and takes into account the implications for community safety.

6.11 *Environmental Impact*

- 6.11.1 All schemes are designed to improve quality of local environment

7. Background Papers

- 7.1 Road Safety GB assessment of crossing facility
Requests for Pedestrian Crossing Facilities, March 2012

8. Appendices

- 8.1 None.