

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Corporate Director of Enterprise, Tourism and
the Environment

To

**Traffic & Parking Working Party & Cabinet
Committee**

On

5th January 2011

Agenda
Item No.

Report prepared by:
Andrew Meddle (Head of Planning & Transport)

Petition Regarding the Provision of a Zebra Crossing near 1065 London Road, Leigh- on-Sea

Economic & Environment Scrutiny Committee

Executive Councillor: Councillor Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide relevant information and a recommendation based on the evidence available regarding the request to provide a zebra crossing on the London Road in Leigh-on-Sea, close to the Leigh Primary Care Centre.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee agree that no action should be taken at this time, but that officers continue to monitor the road safety situation along this section of the London Road.

3. Background

- 3.1 A petition has been submitted by Mr Arya Najdaghi, Managing Director of Derix Healthcare Pharmacy, situated at 1065 London Road, Leigh, SS9, 3JP.
- 3.2 It requests that the Council provides sufficient road safety measures in the form of a pedestrian crossing, to be installed on London Road between the Leigh Primary Car Centre and the opposite side of the road. This was formally presented and report to Full Council on 20th October 2011 and it was agreed that the matter should be considered by the Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee.
- 3.3 The reasons behind this is that the petitioners feel it has become increasingly difficult for local residents to cross this road as it has become an extremely busy route for Southend and Hadleigh bound traffic and motorists, who are often travelling at high speed, ignoring the already placed speed signs. They say they continue to face the reality of a fatality.
- 3.4 Mr Najdaghi's letter states details of the services provided within the Leigh Primary Care Centre which amongst others contains The Pall Mall Surgery (with

14,000 patients), Valkyrie Surgery (5,000 patients) and the Dentist (with 8,000 patients). The letter also states that a large number of patients using this Centre use Derix Healthcare Pharmacy too and that a high proportion of these customers are elderly, infirm, sick or disabled with many wheelchair bound. Mr Najdaghi states that these customers have to cross a busy road to get from surgery to his premises and also suggests the provision of a zebra crossing or a central island as the nearest crossing point is a fair distance away and not being used by his customers. He requests that urgent consideration is given to providing a safe and fair crossing facility.

3.5 The petition was signed by 1580 residents of various roads in Leigh-on-Sea.

4. Evidence Based Assessment of the Request

4.1 Mr Najdaghi's Pharmacy lies directly opposite the Leigh Primary Care Centre, separated from it by the A13 London Road, which is a primary route. There is an alternative pharmacy on the corner of Chalkwell Park Drive, which avoids having to cross the London Road.

4.2 Officers have examined the accident database and have found that there has been one accident on the London Road between Cliffsea Grove and the extent of the signal controlled crossing west of Cricketfield Grove. This is a 170m section either side of the Health Centre. The reported accident appears to have involved a parked car in the bay next to the signal crossing opening their car door into the path of a cyclist. There have been no recorded pedestrian accidents in this area in the past 3 years.

4.3 To the west of the health centre there is an existing signal controlled crossing approx 70m from the Health Centre. To the east there is a pedestrian crossing point with central islands approx 85m from the Health Centre. There is also a static speed enforcement camera on the east side. As such it is not believed that there is a problem with the vehicle speed. From observation officers believe that this crossing is well used and is conveniently serving key places of interest, including the Health Centre, the Iceland supermarket and the two bus stops close to this store.

4.4 If the Council were to consider provision of a zebra crossing outside the Health Centre crossing directly to the chemist, it would be approximately 100m from the existing signalled controlled junction. It would also lead to the loss of approximately five car parking spaces in an area that already experiences significant parking stress.

4.5 The provision of a crossing to the east of Marguerite Drive and the Health Centre, this would result in the loss of all of the ten on-street parking bays which are predominately used by people visiting the shops. It is unlikely that the local business in the vicinity would support such a scheme that will result in loss of these valuable parking bays.

4.6 Similarly facilitating provision of a central refuge in this section will also be extremely difficult as it would lead to the changes in road layout which would result in the removal of parking bays and possibly affect vehicular movements.

- 4.7 It should also be noted that although pedestrian crossings are provided to enable people to cross safely, such provision are now known to lead to accidents. Placing these where there is no accident problem is likely to lead to greater accident potential. Nationally it is expected that there will be a mean of 1.5 accidents per annum at pedestrian crossings, although the figure for the borough is slightly lower.
- 4.8 Also such provision would adversely affect traffic flows as there would be 2 crossings, 4 side roads (1 of which is particularly busy) and also the access to the Health Centre car park within a 125m section of the London Road.
- 4.9 To provide a zebra or signal controlled crossing in the location requested would cost in the region of approx. £30k - £60k. Based on the accident trends and provision of the existing pedestrian crossing facilities in the vicinity and the road layout constraints at this location, it is not considered a viable and cost effective option and would not represent the best use of resources.
- 4.10 It is also believed that the significant loss of parking bays resulting from the proposed change is unlikely to be supported by other businesses in the vicinity.

5. Other Options

- 5.1 The Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee could agree that no further action should be taken on this matter, given that the site does not meet the Council's policy, which prioritises the delivery of road safety improvements based on accident site data.
- 5.2 The Traffic & Parking Working Party and Cabinet Committee could agree to implement a crossing in this location. This would require a scheme to be prepared and changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders advertised and considered should there be any objections, which is considered likely. The implementation of such a scheme could not be included within the current capital programme for 2011/12 without another similar scheme dropping out.

6. Corporate Implications

6.1 Contribution to Council's Vision & Corporate Priorities

- 6.1.1 Nil

6.2 Financial Implications

- 6.2.1 The provision of a crossing will cost up to £60k and no allocation has been made for this is in the current budget, as a result of which other safety work would have to be re-prioritised.

6.3 Legal Implications

- 6.3.1 Nil

6.4 People Implications

- 6.4.1 Nil

6.5 Property Implications

- 6.5.1 Nil

6.6 Consultation

6.6.1 Nil

6.7 Equalities and Diversity Implications

6.7.1 Safe crossing points have been provided on the London Road in this area and comply with the relevant design standards so that they do not disadvantage any particular users.

6.8 Risk Assessment

6.8.1 The risks associated with crossing the road are mitigated by the provision of crossings in the vicinity of the site. It is not considered an additional crossing will improve safety, but it will impede the flow of cyclists and motor vehicles.

6.9 Value for Money

6.9.1 The provision of an additional crossing would not offer value for money, given the alternative provision in the vicinity of the site.

6.10 Community Safety Implications

6.10.1 Nil

6.11 Environmental Impact

6.11.1 Nil

7. Background Papers

Report to Full Council on 20th October 2011.

8. Appendices

8.1 Appendix 1 – Photographs of the vicinity of the site (from Google Streetview)

APPENDIX 1 - Photographs of the vicinity of the site



The London Road (taken east of the Marguerite Drive junction) looking west



The London Road (at its junction with Cricketfield Grove), looking east