

# PORTFOLIO HOLDER HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

<b>DATE</b>	16 <sup>th</sup> December 2024
<b>REPORT OF</b>	Councillor Stewart Swinburn, Portfolio Holder Housing, Infrastructure and Transport.
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER</b>	Paul Evans – Assistant Director - Infrastructure
<b>SUBJECT</b>	Response to petition requesting a Pegasus crossing on the A18.
<b>STATUS</b>	Open
<b>FORWARD PLAN REF NO.</b>	PHHIT 12/24/06

## CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

The introduction of safe and appropriate crossing provision for vulnerable road users can contribute to improved road safety and consequently encourages more people to walk, cycle, scoot or ride which in turn contribute towards the Council's stronger communities and stronger economy outcomes.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out the formal response to the petition received by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport from residents requesting the introduction of a new Pegasus crossing on the A18 south of the Landmark Café (DNPH.HIT.19).

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Following consideration of the options available to address the concerns raised in the petition it is recommended to reject the request to install a formal Pegasus crossing across the A18 at this time.

## REASONS FOR DECISION

This report seeks to provide a formal response to the resident's petition (DNPH.HIT.19). The decision has been reached on the basis the PV<sup>2</sup> calculation does not result in a score where national guidance indicates a controlled crossing was necessary. In addition the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) also indicates that a standalone crossing would not be suitable for the proposed location due to the high vehicle speeds.

### 1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

- 1.1 On 17 September 2024 a petition was received by the Portfolio Holder for Housing Infrastructure and Transport from residents seeking the introduction of a Pegasus crossing across the A18 south of the Landmark Café.
- 1.2 The A18 is a high-speed single carriageway road which is crossed by two Public Bridleways (BW91 and BW138) between its junctions with the B1203 Ashby Hill and The Avenue. The area is popular with horse riders with several local stables and livery yards being located nearby.
- 1.3 Analysis of the STATS19 data supplied by Humberside Police indicate that there have been no injury collisions in the vicinity of where the crossing is requested in the last five-year period.
- 1.4 During a recent road closure of the A18, Road Safety Officers erected a pair of 'Accompanied

horses or ponies likely to be in or crossing the road ahead' signs (Ref 550.1) on the approach to either side of where the bridledways cross the road.

- 1.5 Following the September meeting a site visit was organised with the lead petitioner by Paul Thorpe (Operations Director, Equans). Information from this visit has subsequently informed this report.
- 1.6 The requested option to install a Pegasus crossing has been assessed using speed and usage data and has been considered against guidance in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
- 1.7 DMRB provides guidance on the location and installation of signal-control crossings and states that 'Stand-alone signal-controlled crossings for equestrians shall not be provided where the 85th percentile speed exceeds 50mph'. Speed data for the A18 indicates that the 85th percentile speed is 55.8mph (northbound) and 54.6mph (southbound).
- 1.8 On this basis it is not recommended to progress with a Pegasus crossing unless measures are implemented to reduce the 85th% vehicle speeds to less than 50mph. Such measures are unlikely given the function of the road and the current vehicle speeds recorded.
- 1.9 A weighted pedestrian volume (P) and weighted traffic volume (V) ( $PV^2$ ) calculation is the accepted methodology to determine whether there is justification to consider the introduction of a controlled crossing. The methodology uses the number of vehicles and the number of potential crossing users (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) with a final score of over 20 million indicating that there is merit in providing a controlled crossing. A version of the  $PV^2$  calculation is shown below. The traffic and pedestrian data used is from two different time periods but given the very low numbers of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians this is not considered to be an issue and does not affect the recommendation shown above.

Busiest four 1-hour periods:

P (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians)	9	3	2	0
V	443	432	425	419
$V^2$	196,249	186,624	180,625	175,561
<b><math>PV^2</math></b>	<b>1,766,241</b>	<b>559,872</b>	<b>361,250</b>	<b>0</b>

- 1.10 The maximum  $PV^2$  calculated figure of 1,766,241 is significantly below the threshold figure of 20 million where a controlled crossing is justified therefore it is not recommended to progress with a Pegasus crossing.
- 1.11 As both the DMRB guidance and the low  $PV^2$  score do not support the introduction of a Pegasus crossing, alternative options have been investigated.
- 1.12 An alternative is to install a pair of vehicle activated warning signs on the approaches to the crossing point has been considered. A quotation has been received from a supplier for a pair of solar powered Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) displaying the 550.1 sign face. The estimated costs is £25,000 including installation. It should be noted that due to the high-speed nature of the A18 these signs could not be installed whilst the carriageway is live to ensure the safety of the installation team and passing drivers. Therefore, if this option is to be progressed it is suggested to wait until the next planned maintenance closure to carry out the works to avoid additional installation charges.
- 1.13 Given the lack of an evidenced history of injury collisions and that the number of pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians is very low it is considered that an expenditure of around £25,000 does not offer good value for money to the Council.

- 1.14 A final 'do minimum' option has been considered. The introduction of the static 550.1 signs earlier this year provides an advanced notification to drivers that there may be a horse or pony in or crossing the carriageway ahead. To date there is no evidence to suggest that these signs do not achieve their goal and that alternative options should be considered.
- 1.15 A site visit conducted by the Road Safety team identified that visibility on both sides of where the bridleways exit onto the A18 is good but that a regular programme of hedge cutting by landowners needs to be maintained to keep clear visibility lines. To this extent it is proposed to contact the relevant landowners and ensure that a regular maintenance regime for the hedges that border the crossing point is delivered.
- 1.16 It is also proposed to share information with local riders and Ramblers groups asking them to report any near misses that occur in this location to the Road Safety team to support a follow up review after Summer 2025.

## **2 RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

- 2.1 There is minimal risk as a result of these proposals. The data collected to inform the PV<sup>2</sup> calculation (in section 1.9) shows that even at the busiest times there are very few pedestrian, cyclists and equestrian users and the risk of collision is low. The recent introduction of a pair of static signs (Ref 550.1) is intended to highlight the possible presence of people and horses crossing the carriageway and will lower the risk further.
- 2.2 Should the recommendations not be supported and there is a requirement to install a Pegasus crossing, the risk is that LTP road safety funding may be directed away from other projects with a greater evidenced road safety issue. This in turn may mean an increase in the number and severity of collisions resulting in injuries.
- 2.3 The recommended proposals provide an opportunity to gather further evidence from users of the potential crossing in order to support a further review of the site after Summer 2025. The additional evidence gained to that point will better inform any decisions made on what (if anything) is needed in the future.

## **3. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 3.1. The options considered are detailed in sections 1.6 to 1.16 above are briefly summarised below:
- Do maximum - Install a Pegasus crossing at an estimated cost of around £250,000
  - Do something - Install a pair of new solar VAS signs on the approaches to where the bridleways exit onto the carriageway at a cost of around £25,000
  - Do minimum – Ensure that visibility sight lines are maintained and monitor the impact of the recently installed 'Accompanied horses or ponies likely to be in or crossing the road ahead' signs (Ref 550.1). Seek information about 'near misses' from local riders and walking groups to inform a future review of the site.

## **4. REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS**

- 4.1 Given that this report is in response to a public petition there is the potential for there to be some negative reputational implications for the Council resulting from the decision. This response is based on traffic speed and collision data as well as pedestrian, cyclist and horse rider count carried out in Autumn 2024. It is supported by site visit carried out by the Council's Road Safety team. It is therefore considered this evidence provides a robust response to the petitioner's request.

## **5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 5.1 It is not expected that the implementation of the report's recommendations will incur any costs to the Council at this time.

## **6. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 There will be no specific implications relating to children and young people as a result of these proposals.

## **7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 There will be no impact on climate change or the environment because of this report.

## **8. CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY**

- 8.1 There has been no consultation with Scrutiny in relation to this matter.

## **9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 No financial implication to the Council is anticipated to arise from the recommendation contained within the report.

## **10. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 As it appears from the report that the request of the petition have been fully explored and there is a recommendation to take no further action, there are no legal implications.

## **11. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct HR implications arising from the contents of this report.

## **12. WARD IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 The proposals relate to issues within the Wolds Ward.

## **13. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 13.1 None

## **14. CONTACT OFFICER(S)**

- Paul Evans, Assistant Director - Infrastructure, NELC.
- Paul Thorpe, Operations Director, Equans.

**COUNCILLOR STEWART SWINBURN**

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT**