

NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL

**HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING
CABINET MEMBER**

REVISED PRIORITISATION CRITERIA FOR NEW FOOTWAY REQUESTS

1. OBJECT AND KEY POINTS IN THIS REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Cabinet Member of the revised prioritisation criteria for new footway requests and to seek approval of the new criteria.
- 1.2 The key points in this report are:
- The revised criteria will replace the existing criteria.
 - All outstanding and new requests for footways will be scored using the revised criteria and then prioritised according to the score.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 The previous prioritisation criteria were approved in 1998. This now needs updating to reflect recent changes in national policy, for example Local Transport Plans, Sustainable Travel to School and the environmental agenda.
- 2.2 There are currently a large number of requests for new footways and a methodology is required to achieve a priority listing to ensure that resources are targeted at the schemes, which will offer the greatest benefit.
- 2.3 The proposed system will assess each scheme against the revised criteria, to give an overall score. The schemes will then be ranked according to this score.
- 2.4 The revised criteria considers: policy context, location, social inclusion/accessibility, safety and the anticipated modal shift of the request. A copy of the criteria is attached to this report at Appendix A.
- 2.5 All outstanding requests will be re-assessed and prioritised. All new requests will be assessed and added to the prioritisation list.

- 2.6 The development of the revised criteria and the provision of new footways, contributes to the aims of the Highways and Planning Service, particularly Aim 1 (Safer Roads), Aim 2 (Travel Choice) and Aim 3 (Better Routes).

3. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3.1 The Cabinet Member has two options: to approve the revised criteria or not.

4. ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS

- 4.1 Approving the criteria demonstrates the council's commitment to providing new footways and encouraging people to walk.
- 4.2 Not approving the criteria, will make it more difficult to accurately assess the need for footways, that reflects the recent changes in national policy.

5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCIAL, STAFFING, PROPERTY, IT)

Financial

- 5.1 Funding for new footways will be from existing budgets, for example Local Transport Plan funding.

6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS (STATUTORY, ENVIRONMENTAL, DIVERSITY, SECTION 17 - CRIME AND DISORDER, RISK AND OTHER)

Environmental

- 6.1 Walking is an environmentally friendly mode of travel. Providing pedestrian facilities will encourage more people to walk, rather than using the car for shorter journeys, which will reduce vehicle emissions.

Diversity

- 6.2 A Stage 1 Diversity Impact Assessment has been completed. A copy of the assessment is available from the Transport Planning Team.

Section 17 – Crime and Disorder

- 6.3 The provision of new facilities can improve the pedestrian environment and improve people's perception of personal safety.
- 6.4 New footways remove the potentially hazardous situation where pedestrians have to walk in the road.

7. OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The revised criteria have been submitted to key staff within Highways and Planning. The criteria have been revised to reflect the comments received.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 That the Cabinet Member approves the revised prioritisation criteria for new footway requests.
- 8.2 That all outstanding requests are re-assessed using the revised prioritisation criteria.
- 8.3 That prioritisation criteria be disseminated to Town and Parish Councils.

SERVICE DIRECTOR HIGHWAYS AND PLANNING

Church Square House
P O Box 42
Scunthorpe
DN15 6XQ
Author: Louisa Simpson
Date: 20th October 2009

Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

None

APPENDIX A – REVISED PRIORITISATION CRITERIA FOR NEW FOOTWAY SCHEMES

PRIORITISATION CRITERIA FOR NEW FOOTWAY SCHEMES

Scheme
Requested by

Ref
Date

INITIAL QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED (Depending on the answers, the scheme may not be pursued)		EXPLANATORY NOTES
Does a viable alternative option exist? (Yes/No)		
Is there sufficient space to engineer a solution? (Yes/No)		
Any other issues that are likely to prevent the scheme being built? (Yes/No)		
POLICY CONTEXT	SCORE	EXPLANATORY NOTES
LTP objectives met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > 5 objectives (10 points) 3 - 5 objectives (5 points) < 3 objectives (0 points) 		
LOCATION		
In commercial areas (town or village centres) (10 points)		
In built up areas, adj to main road (8 points)		
In built up area, adj to secondary road (inc estate roads) (6 points)		
In built up areas, adj minor road (4 points)		
Linking path - regular use (2 points)		
Linking path - amenity use (0 points)		
SOCIAL INCLUSION		
The scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a walking route where one didn't exist (10 points) Improves a walking route to provide better access (5 points) Links to the existing PROW network (5 points) 		
SITUATION		
The scheme provides/improves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link to public transport facilities (5 points) Link to a major employment site (5 points) Link to shops (5 points) Link to schools, with need identified by the travel plan or sustainable travel audit (10 points) There is evidence of a desire line (5 points) 		
ROAD SAFETY		
Is there an existing accident problem? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes (5 points) No (0 points) 		
Is there an existing pedestrian accident problem? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes (5 points) No (0 points) 		
Assessment of potential risk to users of not constructing it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High (5 points) Medium (2.5 points) Low (0 points) 		

ENVIRONMENTAL		
Is it in a conservation area? (Yes/No)		
Will it have an adverse impact upon sites of nature conservation interest? (-5points)		
Will it result in the significant loss of hedgerow/trees or similar? (-5 points)		
MODAL SHIFT		
Likely number of potential users to be attracted (daily):		
> 50 pedestrians (10 points)		
25 - 49 pedestrians (5 points)		
11 - 24 pedestrians (2.5 points)		
< 10 pedestrians (0 points)		
OTHER		
Could a shared footway/cycleway be provided? (5 points)		
TOTAL		0
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		