PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ASSESSMENT CRITERIA MATRIX

ASSESSOR J. Waters

SI	IE: A660) Bramr	ıope – l	vear	Hall	Kise

DAY/DAY/TIME 9 November 2021

.....

WEATHER & ROAD CONDITIONS Overcast

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 (residential)	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	0
Highway Assessment	Use Section 2 – Highway	Assessment score —					→	0
Road Safety History	Use Section 3 – Road Safety History score							0
Traffic/ Pedestrian Surveys	Use Section 4 – Traffic/Pe	destrian score					-	0
							TOTAL SCORE	4

Section 2: Highway Assessment

Road character: Strategic route – Two way, single carriageway	Type of Road	Road Classification	Direction of flow
	Major	A660	SE - NW
Carriageway width: *Between islands or central reserve for dual carriageways	Overall Width	Lane 1*.	Lane 2*.
	9.4m	3.0m	3.0m
Other road features (presence of alternative crossings refuges islands traffic calming TROs etc.):-	rnative crossings refuges island	s traffic calming TROs etc):-	

Traffic island present, but only 1.0m wide.

Other road factors (adjacent junctions, accesses etc):-

Junction with Hall Rise (residential) nearby

Residential	School
	Residential

Other (hospital, day centre etc.):-

Bus services/stops proximity:-. Bus stops in close proximity, both sides

Visual check of crossing opportunities (circle one):

- (0) Very easy no difficulty within a few seconds
- (0) Easy short wait up to 30 seconds
- (1) Moderate difficulty wait of up to one minute
- (2) Difficult more than a one minute wait
- 3) 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	-
			Other factors:-
0	1	0	Others
0	0	0	Child pedestrian
0	0	0	Adult pedestrian
fatal	serious	slight	Severity
29/10/2021	5 year period from 01/01/16 to 29/10/2021	5 year per	Accidents:

Note: Recorded for 50 metres either side of study site

Section 4: Traffic/Pedestrian Surveys

	33.2	37.8	40
	Average (mean)	85 percentile	Speed Limit
			Other details:-
			Other relevant groups 1. 2.
0	0	ယ	Elderly people
5	2	12	Child pedestrians
8	7	52	Adult pedestrians (all)
1387	1595	14819	All vehicles
0700-0800	1700-1800	0700-1900	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:

formal facility, which will need to be a signal controlled facility on a 40mph A-classified route. The low volume of pedestrians crossing in this area cannot support the introduction of a

traffic flow, but not to an extent where wait times are lengthy. opportunities to cross the inbound lane, with the outbound lane being more consistent with The wait time is typically short and the tidal nature of traffic from Dyneley Arms presents

these islands to a more suitable size to safely accommodate pushchairs or similar and to take due to the stepped access from the north side of the road. It would be supported to widen single pedestrian and do not support the use of these facilities by those with pushchairs, also pushed for as part of the Bramhope Primary School expansion scheme, should this proceed. out the stepped access and re-grade the footway to make these level access. This will be The existing traffic islands are 1.0m wide, which are substandard for anything more than a

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING CRITERIA FLOW CHART

