**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 below  1 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.***