

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT – CLLR PHILIP WHITEHEAD

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE

OFFICER CONTACT: Paul Shaddock / 01722 434671 / paul.shaddock@wiltshire.gov.uk

REFERENCE: HT-17-15

**PROPOSED REMOVAL OF PELICAN CROSSING FACILITY OUTSIDE
NO. 106 NETHERHAMPTON ROAD, SALISBURY**

Purpose of Report

To:

- (i) Consider objections to the proposed removal of the Pelican crossing facility outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road, Salisbury.
- (ii) Recommend the making of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as advertised.

Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken with:

- Councillor Brian Dalton, the elected Wiltshire Council member and one of the elected Salisbury City Council members for the Salisbury Harnham ward.
- Councillor Grahame Alexander, one of the elected Salisbury City Council members for the Salisbury Harnham ward through the statutory TRO consultation process.
- Councillor John Collier, one of the elected Salisbury City Council members for the Salisbury Harnham ward through the statutory TRO consultation process.
- Salisbury City Council, the local parish council, through the statutory TRO consultation process.
- Members of the public through the statutory TRO consultation process.
- Emergency services through the statutory TRO consultation process.

Options Considered

To:

- (i) Implement the proposals as advertised.
- (ii) Abandon the proposals.

Reason for Decision

The removal of the Pelican crossing facility outside of No. 106 Netherhampton Road will make the nearby Zebra crossing outside of No. 69 Netherhampton Road safer to use.

DECISION MADE

I approve that:

- (i) The TRO be implemented as advertised;
- (ii) Objectors and supporters be informed accordingly.

This decision was published on _____ and will come into force on _____

The following supporting documents are attached:

- Appendix 1 - Location plan
- Appendix 2 - Details of the items of correspondence objecting to the proposed TRO
- Appendix 3 - Summary of objections and comments objecting to the proposed TRO and officer response

The following supporting documents are available from the officer named above:

None

Date2 October 2015.....

.....Signed.....

Cllr Philip Whitehead
Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT – CLLR PHILIP WHITEHEAD

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT SERVICE

OFFICER CONTACT: Paul Shaddock / 01722 434671 / paul.shaddock@wiltshire.gov.uk

REFERENCE: HT-17-15

**PROPOSED REMOVAL OF PELICAN CROSSING FACILITY OUTSIDE
NO. 106 NETHERHAMPTON ROAD, SALISBURY**

Purpose of Report

1. To:
 - (i) Consider objections to the proposed removal of the Pelican crossing facility outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road, Salisbury.
 - (ii) Recommend the making of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as advertised.

Relevance to the Council's Business Plan

2. The proposed TRO meets two key priorities of the Council's Business Plan. Those priorities being:
 - Outcome 2 – People in Wiltshire work together to solve problems locally and participate in decisions that affect them; and
 - Outcome 6 – People are as protected from harm as possible and feel safe.
3. Outcome 2 has been met through development of the proposal in conjunction with the local elected Wiltshire Council member for the Salisbury Harnham ward. Local residents have also been involved through the TRO consultation process.
4. If implemented, the proposals would meet Outcome 6. The proposed removal of the Pelican crossing outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road is being taking forward on safety grounds, specifically that its removal would improve the safe use of an adjacent Zebra crossing facility located outside No. 69 Netherhampton Road.

Background

5. Netherhampton Road is situated to the south-west of Salisbury City Centre in the Salisbury Harnham ward. Netherhampton Road is an 'A' class road (the A3094) and serves as a vehicular route to (amongst other locations) residential areas of West Harnham, the villages of Netherhampton and Quidhampton and a number of business premises, including the Harnham Trading Estate, Salisbury Livestock Market and a combined One Stop Shop (convenience store) and Post Office. Netherhampton Road also serves as a vehicular and pedestrian route to Harnham Infant School, Harnham Junior School and Puddleducks Community Playgroup, albeit that access to the aforementioned schools is actually via the adjoining A3094 Harnham Road and Saxon Road.

6. The Pelican crossing outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road was introduced by (at the time) Wiltshire County Council to help address pedestrian safety and community severance concerns surrounding access to the local Post Office which, until 2003, was located adjacent to the Pelican crossing at No. 110 Netherhampton Road. The Post Office located at this address closed in 2003 and relocated into the nearby One Stop Shop at No. 69 Netherhampton Road. Consequently, the Pelican crossing has become largely redundant.
7. With the Post Office relocating into the nearby One Stop Shop pedestrian crossing demand shifted to the area immediately in front of the One Stop Shop. In 2008 Wiltshire County Council introduced a Zebra crossing facility outside No. 69 Netherhampton Road to help address pedestrian safety and community severance concerns surrounding access to the One Stop Shop and Post Office.
8. Attached to this report, as **Appendix 1**, is a location plan showing the relative positions of the Pelican and Zebra crossing facilities.
9. Since the introduction of the Zebra crossing outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road there have been repeated comments made to both the Council and the Police that the crossing is unsafe to use due to vehicles failing to give way to pedestrians to allow them to cross the road at this location. In response to these comments an independent Road Safety Audit (RSA) of the Zebra crossing facility was commissioned by the Council in 2010.
10. The RSA raised no major issues with the Zebra crossing facility but the auditor did comment that the reported problem of vehicles failing to give way at the crossing was observed during the audit, The auditor also commented that when pedestrians made their intention to cross the road clear, or actually started to cross the road, motorists were observed to give way as required.
11. It should be remembered that until a pedestrian has actually moved onto a Zebra crossing, or it is clear to an approaching motorist that a pedestrian intends to move onto the crossing, motorists are not legally required to give way to them. It is the pedestrian's responsibility to ensure that vehicles have stopped or are stopping before proceeding to cross at this type of facility. More information on how to use Zebra crossings can be found in Rules 19 and 195 of the [Highway Code](#).
12. The distance between the location of the Pelican and Zebra crossing facilities in question is approximately 90 metres. The auditor also commented in the RSA that the close proximity to each other of the aforementioned crossing facilities may be a contributory factor in motorists failing to give way at the Zebra crossing. Specifically, that in a non city centre environment motorists travelling eastbound, having passed through the Pelican crossing, may not expect to have to give way to pedestrians again within such a short distance and that motorists travelling westbound may find their focus of vision attracted to the Pelican crossing and effectively look through the preceding Zebra crossing. The auditor suggested that removal of the Pelican crossing may make using the Zebra crossing safer.
13. In consideration of the above information the local elected Wiltshire Council member, Mr. Brian Dalton, requested that the Pelican crossing outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road be removed. Councillor Dalton initially made this request in 2010 but funding to allow the removal of the crossing to be taken forward was not allocated until the 2015-2016 financial year.

Summary of Proposals

14. A TRO proposing the removal of the Pelican crossing outside No. 106 Netherhampton Road was formally advertised for comment on 26 February 2015. The Council's closing date for receipt of objections or other representations to the advertised TRO, together with the grounds on which they were made, was 23 March 2015.

Summary of Responses

15. A total of two items of correspondence have been received in response to the proposal contained within the advertised TRO. Both items of correspondence received objected to the Council's proposals.
16. A summary of the correspondents who wrote in opposition to the Council's proposal is attached as **Appendix 2**. A full summary of the comments raised by objectors, together with officer comments, is attached as **Appendix 3**. The substantive issues raised by the objectors are detailed below.

The Zebra Crossing Facility Outside No. 69 Netherhampton Road Is Unsafe To Use

17. Both items of correspondence opposed the Council's proposals on the grounds of safety. Specifically that the Pelican crossing should be retained because the Zebra crossing is unsafe to use.

Council's Response to the Objections

The Zebra Crossing Facility Outside No. 69 Netherhampton Road Is Unsafe To Use

18. In line with the comments in the RSA, as outlined in paragraph 12 above, it is proposed to remove the Pelican crossing to make using the Zebra crossing safer. In addition to the comments in paragraph 12 the removal of the Pelican crossing is likely to transfer a small number of additional crossing movements to the Zebra crossing, this in itself is likely to make the crossing safer to use. As motorists see more pedestrians making use of the Zebra crossing they will begin to expect to encounter pedestrians using this facility and the likelier it will become that they will adapt their behaviour when driving in the vicinity of the crossing.
19. The One Stop Shop and Post Office are still operating at No. 69 Netherhampton Road and consequently pedestrian crossing demand at the Zebra crossing remains significantly higher than at the Pelican crossing. On this basis, it would not be sensible to retain the Pelican crossing over the Zebra crossing.
20. Despite the correspondents concerns that the Zebra crossing facility outside No. 69 Netherhampton Road is unsafe to use it actually has a good safety record. Since it became operational on 18 August 2008 there have been no recorded collisions involving the Zebra crossing.

Main Considerations for the Council

21. Consideration needs to be given to the comments received in response to the consultation on the Council's proposal and a decision made as to whether or not the Pelican crossing should be removed.

Safeguarding Considerations

22. There is no risk to the Council as a result of these proposals.

Public Health Implications

23. There are none in this scheme.

Environmental and Climate Change Considerations

24. The removal of the Pelican crossing will be beneficial to the environment in a number of ways. The Pelican crossing requires a power supply to operate. Removing the crossing would remove the associated power supply and as such reduce the Council's carbon footprint. The removal of the Pelican crossing equipment and associated road markings would also improve the visual aspect of the area.

Equalities Impact of the Proposal

25. There are none in this scheme.

Risk Assessment

26. There is no risk to the Council as a result of these proposals.

Financial Implications

27. The removal of the Pelican crossing would save the Council money in a number of ways. The Pelican crossing requires a power supply to operate. Removing the crossing would remove the associated power supply and as such reduce the Council's energy costs. The removal of the Pelican crossing equipment and associated road markings would also remove the Council's concomitant maintenance costs.
28. There is an allocation in the 2015-2016 Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport budget which allows for the progression of this scheme. Should the scheme not progress, the funding would be returned to the Council's LTP Integrated Transport budget allocation and would be available to be put towards other schemes.

Legal Implications

29. The introduction of new waiting restrictions requires the processing of a TRO. The process of introducing a TRO is governed by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated procedural regulations. Failure to adhere to the statutory processes could result in the restrictions being successfully challenged in the High Court.

Options Considered

30. To:
- (i) Implement the proposals as advertised.
 - (ii) Abandon the proposals.

Reason for Proposals

31. The removal of the Pelican crossing facility outside of No. 106 Netherhampton Road will make the nearby Zebra crossing outside of No. 69 Netherhampton Road safer to use.

Proposals

32. That:

- (i) The TRO be implemented as advertised;
 - (ii) Objectors and supporters be informed accordingly.
-

The following unpublished documents have been relied on in the preparation of this Report:

- Netherhampton Road Zebra Crossing Road Safety Audit
- Letters of support
- Letters of objection