**SECTION A : ABOUT YOUR AUTHORITY**

**Name of Local Authority:**  **Type:** 1. Unitary

 2. Metropolitan

Leicester City Council 3. County

**SECTION B : DECISIONS ABOUT PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS**

1. Which of the following methods does your authority use to decide/prioritise/appraise the need to implement a stand-alone formal pedestrian crossing facility? Please tick one box

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Tick |
| 1 | No. of reported injury collisions |  |
| 2 | Pedestrian flow x Vehicle flow (PV2) |  |
| 3 | In-house methodology *– please also refer to Section X below* |  |
| 4 | According to elected member decision alone |  |
| 5 | Number of public requests alone |  |
| 6 | A combination of the above – please circle relevant method below1 2 3 4 5 | X |
| 0 | None of the above |  |

1. In your opinion, what are the main advantages and disadvantages of using a prioritisation methodology/tool to implement a stand-alone formal pedestrian crossing facility?

|  |
| --- |
| **Advantages:**Crossings are installed where there is a demonstrable and objective justification for one, rather than where a subjective “need” is perceived by potentially only one or two individuals. It helps to guard against money and resources being allocated on the basis of “who shouts the loudest”.It provides a logical and explainable way of prioritising crossing installations when the number of requests exceeds the limited funding available. |
| **Disadvantages:** The cost of doing the PV2 surveys. |

*please continue overleaf*

1. Does your authority currently use a prioritisation tool to **RANK** potential stand-alone pedestrian crossing facilities in order of importance?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| YES *– please go to Q7 below* | X | NO *– please go to Q8 below* |  |

1. **If your answer to Question 3 above is YES**

Can you briefly explain how your prioritisation tool works or provide a link to this information on your authority’s website?

|  |
| --- |
| We use PV-squared (# of Pedestrians x number of vehicles squared), with additional weighting for factors such as number of pedestrian-involving accidents recorded near the site, proximity to a school or school route, community centre or shopping facilities, speed of traffic, nature of carriageway, current facilities (e.g. refuge or traffic calming) etc. |

1. **If your answer to Question 3 above is NO**
	1. Can you briefly explain how your authority does decide which stand-alone pedestrian crossing facilities are implemented first, considering the answers already given in Q1 above.

|  |
| --- |
| n/a |

*please continue overleaf*

* 1. Do you think it would be beneficial to your authority to use some form of formalised prioritisation tool?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| YES |  | NO |  |

1. Below are a number of factors which could be included in a prioritisation methodology tool. Please indicate how important you consider each factor to be (where 1 indicates no importance and 5 indicates great importance.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **Importance** |
| Safety of road user groups | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Vehicle congestion & delay | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Accessibility – to local facilities/routes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Sustainability – of walking/cycling modes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Environmental factors | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Economic benefits | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Specific local needs – vulnerable road users, overcome severance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Ability to maintain – future maintenance implications | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Value for money – ratio of benefit to cost | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Policy compliance – local or national | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Deliverability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other – please specify | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Other – please specify | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. Thinking about the Localism Act 2011 and the localism agenda arising from this, how important do you consider **‘LOCAL NEEDS’** to be in any prioritisation methodology? Please indicate below how important you consider this factor to be (where 1 indicates no importance and 5 indicates great importance.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

I am not sure I understand your question, as I can find no reference to pedestrian crossings in the 2011 Localism Act. The Act has no bearing on our prioritisation methodology.

We would never install a pedestrian crossing where there is no local need, so in that sense local needs are very important.

**SECTION C : BUDGETS**

1. How much Integrated Transport Block Capital Grant did your authority receive from DfT in the last three financial years?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |
| £3,037,000 | £3,037,000 | £4,271,000 |

1. How much funding did your authority allocate for the provision of new, stand-alone pedestrian crossing facilities in each of those years?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |
| £77,000 | £1,000 | £NIL |

10. What is the average cost of a stand-lone ‘zebra’ type pedestrian crossing in your authority area?

A basic single carriageway Zebra crossing with no TRO or consultation (just a Notice) = £21,000

***Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.***