

WIRRAL COUNCIL

HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC REPRESENTATIONS PANEL

13th JUNE 2013

SUBJECT:	OBJECTIONS: LOCAL SAFETY SCHEME: PROPOSED KERBLINE BUILDOUT AND EXISTING PEDESTRIAN REFUGE UPGRADE, TORRINGTON ROAD / MARLOWE ROAD, WALLASEY
WARD/S AFFECTED:	LISCARD WARD
REPORT OF:	MARK SMITH, HEAD OF ENVIRONMENT & REGULATION
KEY DECISION?	NO

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This report considers an objection submitted against the proposal to introduce a Kerblin 'build-out' and upgrade of the existing pedestrian refuge island on Torrington Road, Liscard near to its junction with Marlowe Road.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND KEY ISSUES

2.1 On 15th March 2012 Cabinet considered and approved a scheme funded from the 2012/13 Local Transport Capital Programme ('Improving Road Safety' block allocation) at the junction of Torrington Road/Marlowe Road, Liscard.

2.2 Following detailed design, letters were delivered to residents of properties in the vicinity of the proposed scheme detailing the scheme proposals. Party Spokespersons and Ward Members were informed of the proposal.

2.3 During this consultation period one objection was received. The content of the objection from a resident of Marlowe Road adjacent to the proposed scheme, along with detailed responses are as follows:-

2.3.1 "No Public Notices would appear to have been displayed on lamp posts and other convenient posting points giving adequate notification of the proposed changes to residents and other persons frequenting the area."

Whilst there is no statutory obligation for Councils to undertake formal consultation for this type of scheme, widespread consultation has been undertaken with emergency services, bus operators and freight transport groups, as well as local residents affording them an opportunity to comment on the proposals.

2.3.2 "I am unaware of any statutory Notice for these proposals being published in the local newspapers including the Wirral News and Wirral Globe."

As detailed above, Statutory Notices are not required for a scheme of this nature. The Council has consulted local residents via individual letters to nearby properties.

2.3.3 "Department of Transport publication "Guidance on the Use of Tactile Paving Surfaces" (5 June 2007) states that "*Before installing a flush dropped kerb and tactile surface at an uncontrolled crossing point ...it is important to consider whether the particular site is the most suitable for vulnerable road users*". It is my belief that Wirral Council have not given due consideration to this site as being "*the most suitable*" and that an uncontrolled crossing further along Marlowe Road towards Mill Lane would be more suitable, this being closer to the often used Post Office postbox at the junction of Marlowe Road and Cliff Road and the bus stop close to the entrance to Thorncliffe Road."

The proposed works, shown in Appendix 1, Drawing No DR&E/2/13/a form part of a Local Safety Scheme to improve road safety (including for pedestrians) in this area. In developing the proposed scheme, road safety records have been taken into account, together with traffic and pedestrian movements and an assessment of the suitability of the location.

2.3.4 "The same DoT publication states that "*The Disabled Persons Act 1981 requires highway authorities to 'have regard to the needs of disabled persons when considering the desirability of providing ramps at appropriate places between the carriageways and footways'. It is recognised that the absence of an upstand...is potentially hazardous to visually impaired pedestrians who rely on a kerb upstand as a warning that they have reached the edge of the footway*" It is my belief that the lowering of the kerb as per your proposals would introduce a hazard to visually impaired pedestrians (such as may be resident at the nearby Aynsley Nursing Home on Marlowe Road) and in particular those using a 'white cane' in order to follow the kerb line."

The Council develops such schemes in accordance with current national guidance, buff tactile pavements at crossing points are specifically designed to assist the visually impaired. Their 'raised' profile informs the visually impaired that they are at a crossing point. Maintaining a full kerb face at a crossing point could cause trips for the disabled or elderly and prove difficult for wheelchair or mobilised scooter users to navigate.

2.3.5 "DoT publication "The Design Manual for Road and Bridges" (Volume 8, Section 5, Part 1, TA68/96 "The Assessment and Design of Pedestrian Crossings, Local Transport Notes 1/95 and 2/95" para. 2.2) states that "*Particular attention should be paid to the existence of established or popular pedestrian routes*". A short period of observation will clearly demonstrate existence of two or three popular pedestrian routes which entirely circumvent the existing crossing at Marlowe Road.

It is my belief that the existing crossing at Marlowe Road and Torrington Road should be replaced with an uncontrolled crossing further down Marlowe Road close to the intersection with Thorncliffe Road.”

Based on the existing road safety records together with site observations it is considered that upgrading the pedestrian refuge, with a new footway ‘build-out’, will encourage more people to cross at this location safely and not risk crossing at locations with comparatively poor visibility (including between parked cars) further along Torrington Road.

Surveys of pedestrian movements in this area confirm that the majority of pedestrians (including children) choose to cross at the existing refuge island. It is considered likely that more pedestrians would use this facility if they perceived it to be safer.

- 2.3.6 “DoT Local Transport Note 2/95 "The Design of Pedestrian Crossings" (para 2.1.1.1 "Approach to a Side Road") states "*Crossing should be located away from conflicts point at uncontrolled junctions.*"Your own drawing indicates that the proposed Refuge Island and Build Out lies directly in the middle of a dangerous double-junction between Torrington Road, upper and lower Marlowe Road and Cliff Road. Proof of the existence of this ‘conflict point’ at the junction of these roads and therefore its complete unsuitability for an upgraded pedestrian crossing, was evident as a result of the recent Road Traffic Accident at this precise location which occurred on Monday 17th December 2012 (approx. 4pm) in which a motorcyclist was ‘T-boned’ by a vehicle emerging from upper Marlowe Road onto Torrington Road and catapulted across the carriage-way resulting in a serious injury requiring emergency treatment at the roadside. Due to the potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicular traffic converging from upper & lower Marlowe Road, Torrington Road and Cliff Road at this location, it is my belief that the existing crossing on lower Marlowe Road should be decommissioned and relocated further down lower Marlowe Road beyond the junction with Cliff Road. This would provide safe passage for pedestrians across lower Marlowe Road and would facilitate the safe access to the commonly used Post Office postbox located on Cliff Road.”

This scheme is part of the Local Safety Scheme programme and is based on data from the existing road safety records provided by the police. There have been 5 recorded injury collisions at this location during the study period. 2 incidents involved pedestrians and 3 involved turning vehicles. The design is based upon current advice and design criteria from the DfT. It is not considered that the proposed scheme would increase the likelihood of crashes similar to the one which occurred on December 17th involving the motorcyclist. It is considered that the improved refuge with a ‘build-out’ will provide better visibility for pedestrians and will encourage drivers to drive with more caution on approach to the refuge thus allowing traffic emerging from Marlowe Road to do so in a safer and more timely manner.

- 2.3.7 “As per "The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984" it is a requirement that there be "*consultation with the police, public notice and written notification to the Secretary of State are necessary before a crossing is... altered*". It is my belief

that Wirral Council have failed in this regard by not adequately posting notifications in the immediate area affected by these proposals.”

All emergency services have been consulted, as have Wirral based pedestrian and cycling groups. All local residents within the vicinity of the scheme have been notified of these works by means of a letter together with a plan detailing our proposals. No adverse comments have been received from emergency services, bus operators or freight transport groups, etc. The Council is not required to consult with the Secretary of State on such matters.

- 2.3.8 “The Cycling England "Design Portfolio" (B.02 Road Crossings –Side Roads) states that "*Build-outs should not compromise the safety of cyclists on the main road by making it too narrow.*" It is my belief that your proposals for a ‘build-out’ and upgraded ‘pedestrian refuge’ on Marlowe Road will make the road, which is a major bus route, too narrow and therefore will compromise the safety of cyclists.”

Upon construction of the refuge and ‘build-out’ the remaining lane width will be in excess of 4.5m. This is in line with current design guidelines and allows ample room for vehicles and cyclists when driving with due care and attention. Cycle Groups were consulted regarding the proposals and no adverse comments were received.

- 2.3.9 “The Victoria Central Hospital and the Wallasey Community Fire Station on Mill Lane at the end of Marlowe Road, are both major operators of First Response emergency services. As such, a significantly higher than average number of emergency vehicles use Marlowe Road with ‘blue lights’ and sirens employed. Given that many of these vehicles are very large (eg. fire engines) and travel in excess of the designated speed limits along Marlowe Road this, in particular, puts cyclists who would be forced further into the road given your proposed ‘build out’, at serious risk of injury.”

As indicated in 2.3.7 above, the emergency services have all been consulted about the proposals and have not raised any concerns over the proposed scheme. The design meets current design standards and is similar to those implemented successfully at other locations across Wirral.

- 2.3.10 “Wirral Council operate a controlled ‘Resident Parking Zone’ on both Torrington Road and Marlowe Road requiring residents of these streets to apply to the Council for a parking Permit. Your proposals would bisect the approved Residents Parking Zone on Marlowe Road and remove between one and two of the available parking spaces which are already limited in number. If Wirral Council were to consider a pedestrian crossing on Cliff Road instead of Marlowe Road (where it would be better utilised by pedestrians) then this would not add to the congested parking on Marlowe Road yet would not impact parking on Cliff Road where there is adequate provision for residents.”

We accept that the proposals will result in 1 full parking place being removed due to the construction of the proposed ‘build out’ adjacent to

the objector's property. Site surveys indicate that the presence of parked vehicles adjacent to the existing refuge effectively mask pedestrians from the clear view of traffic. The 'build-out' will afford a safer viewpoint with improved visibility for pedestrians.

2.3.11 "A recent study in the USA, "Pedestrian Safety Impacts of Curb Extensions: A Case Study" (SPR 304-321) conducted by the Oregon State University, shows that 'build outs' actually encourage pedestrians to take more risks and in some cases can result in an increase in the occurrences of individuals 'running out' across the carriageway in the short gaps between passing cars. On a busy road such as Marlowe Road I would suggest that this is a potential issue worsened by the fact that your proposal positions the planned 'build out' immediately between the intersections of Marlowe Road (upper and lower sections), Torrington Road and Cliff Road. I object to the location of the planned 'build out' on this basis and would propose that the existing crossing be withdrawn and relocated to Cliff Road.

The same study provides clear evidence that a 'build out', such as that detailed in your proposal, would actually encourage drivers to 'yield' to pedestrians waiting on the 'build out' to cross the road. The result of this is that the number of incidents whereby vehicles stop, unobstructed but still in the middle of the carriageway, will increase. The consequence of this will be that congestion will build up on Marlowe Road and this, in turn, will have the outcome of increasing the risk to pedestrians and drivers using Marlowe Road. For this reason I must object to your proposals and request that you consider relocating the crossing to a more suitable area such as Cliff Road or Torrington Road both of which are less busy and less congested than the lower section of Marlowe Road.

With the evidence described above that a 'build out', such as that proposed for the busy lower section of Marlowe Road, is likely to result in an increase in congestion, this also implies that there would be an expected increase in vehicle emissions such as CO, CO₂ and NO₂. With this part of Wallasey already being a designated 'Smoke Control Area', an increase in harmful emissions from vehicles would be counter to this aim."

This study includes a road layout in Oregon, U.S.A, at a cross roads which is different in nature to the proposed scheme. The American layout also includes transverse carriageway markings which may have been a significant factor in the resulting road crashes. We note that the 'report' reflected only the views of the author and were not endorsed by the State of Oregon or the United States Department of Transport.

Pedestrian refuge schemes and footway 'build-outs' are present at a number of locations throughout the Borough. There is no body of evidence that suggest such schemes encourage drivers to stop on the main route to give precedence to pedestrians.

It is not considered that the scheme will result in an increase in vehicle emissions. This scheme will encourage walking through providing better environments where it is safe and attractive to do so.

- 2.3.12 “The proposed ‘build out’ and use of tactile surfaces, will result in an increase in noise generated both from vehicles slowing and queuing on the lower section of Marlowe Road and from pedestrians wheeling child-buggies and wheeled baggage across the surfaces. I object to the proposed plans on the basis that the increase in noise levels will be unacceptable to local residents.”

The existing surface is made from concrete flag pavements. The proposed construction will utilise bitumen macadam and will be rolled into a smooth surface. To assist people in the community with visual impairment tactile paving will be used to indicate the crossing point. Such tactile paving is only for pedestrian use and is not intended to be over-run by traffic. Noise levels will not be significantly raised through use of these materials when used by pedestrians and people using prams, etc.

The proposed scheme is a remodelling of the existing layout with minor kerblines modifications, together with a ‘build-out’. It is unlikely that the proposals will significantly affect traffic flow, or therefore CO₂ emissions.

- 2.3.13 “The plan and accompanying letter provided by Wirral Council detailing the proposals to upgrade the pedestrian crossing on Marlowe Road, provide no information whatsoever relating to the ‘lighting’ of the crossing. Therefore, I must assume that no lighting of the crossing is intended and that the existing ‘belisha beacon’ is to be removed should the plan be implemented.”

There is always a balance in providing the right level of detail for schemes to interested parties. The existing refuge is to be upgraded as indicated on the plan. As currently exists, the high level beacon will be reinstated with new solar powered keep left bollards.

- 2.3.14 The precise location identified for the proposed ‘build out’ on Marlowe Road encompasses a Telegraph Pole the maintenance and position of which are governed by the Telecommunication Act 1984. It is my belief that the proposed changes to the existing crossing have not given adequate consideration to any impingements they may have on the existing telecommunications infrastructure in the immediate vicinity.

The position of the telegraph pole will not be affected.

- 2.3.15 “The street-side area on the lower section of Marlowe Road, where the proposed ‘build out’ is located in your plan, does not currently encompass sufficient drainage points. The nearest drain is located further along Torrington Road where it would be ineffective in draining rain water from the proposed ‘build out’ location. I object to the siting of the proposed ‘build out’ on the basis that it would result in localised flooding on the lower section of Marlowe Road opposite the entrance to Cliff Road.”

The proposed detailed design incorporates additional drainage to prevent unnecessary ponding of water.

- 2.3.16 “The proposed ‘build out’, which would bisect this very busy section of Marlowe Road, will act as an obstruction to vehicles introduced into the line of drivers.

Should the 'buildout' be hidden as a result of a collection of leaves or snow fall, it could form a significant hidden danger increasing the risk of road traffic accidents.

Additionally, the proposed 'build out' will prevent road 'sweeping' vehicles and snow-ploughs from clearing leaves or snow from the road side."

This section of road already forms part of a residents parking scheme, the bounds of which are marked by carriageway markings. The proposed 'build-out' will enable pedestrians to see past parked vehicles, but will not extend further out into the through carriageway than the existing parking bays.

2.3.17 "Introducing the proposed 'build out' and associated upgrading of the pedestrian refuge on Marlowe Road would, in all likelihood, result in increased signage and lighting being required. This is counter to the objectives laid out in the Department of Transport's "Traffic Advisory Leaflet 01/13 on Reducing Sign Clutter" (January 2013). I object to your proposals on the basis that they would necessitate an increase in signage and lighting posts which are counter to the DoT objectives.

In addition, your proposal drawing seems to indicate, but makes no reference to, the addition of white lines on the road surface around the proposed upgraded pedestrian refuge. I object to your proposals on the basis that the white lines alluded to, will result in a significant impairment to the visual character of the area."

No additional permanent signage will be introduced within this scheme from that which already exists. Temporary signs (1 in each direction) will be introduced informing drivers of the 'new road layout ahead' and these will normally be taken down and used elsewhere within 6 months of the scheme completion. There will be no increase in lighting as the existing refuge is already lit.

There are already white carriageway markings at this location including centre line markings, parking bay markings, access protection markings, etc. It is not considered that the proposed works will have a significant impact on the visual character of the area in general in comparison to the existing layout.

2.3.18 "The geometry of the intersections between the upper section of Marlowe Road, Torrington Road and the lower section of Marlowe Road, are such that traffic turning right from the upper section of Marlowe Road into the lower section must first cross into the path of fast moving vehicles coming from Torrington Road. The position of your proposed upgraded pedestrian refuge and 'build out' are such that they would present drivers with considerable difficulties in turning through an acute angle whilst trying to slip across traffic travelling from lower Marlowe Road and into a gap in traffic travelling from Torrington Road whilst avoiding hitting the pedestrian refuge, 'build out' and any pedestrians crossing, all at the same time. Therefore I must object to your proposals on the basis that they would significantly increase the possibilities of

an accident such as the one that occurred in this spot on the 17th December 2012.”

The existing layout has a pedestrian refuge. Traffic joining the main road should do so with due care and attention. During the design process, a range of vehicle turning movements, for a variety of vehicle types, have been simulated, showing that traffic will be able to negotiate the new design in safety.

Whilst the details of the individual crash in December 2012 are confidential, it is not considered that the proposals would make it more likely such road crashes would occur. Traffic emerging from the side road must pay due care and attention to do so without causing traffic on the main road to slow, alter direction or crash.

- 2.3.19 “I have noted from updated detailed drawings (as opposed to the original high-level consultation plans), that the proposed build-out is in fact something in the order of 6m long (this is difficult to determine as no scale has been provided). I cannot see any justification for such a large scale build-out on this part of Marlowe Road. Indeed, on my travels along the length of Marlowe and Torrington Road, as well as other main roads and similar residential streets in Wallasey, I have been unable to find any such build-outs, indicating that there is an established predisposition against such over-sized build-outs in the carriage-ways of roads similar to Marlowe/Torrington Road. I must therefore continue to object to your proposals on the basis that the proposed build-out is oversized for its proposed purpose and given the character of the area in which it is to be located.”

The build out shown on the detailed plan is the same size as the ‘build-out’ shown on the original consultation plan. It is the same design specification/sizing that has been used at other locations across the Borough and meets current design criteria. The build out is as small as it can possibly be to allow for a safe design and incorporation of all necessary features.

- 2.3.20 “Subsequent to our recent meeting, I have taken note of multiple dropped-kerb installations in and around Liscard and I am quite appalled to discover that the majority of them are, in my view, poorly finished with an area of original and uniform paving flags (some being of stone rather than concrete construction) being removed and replaced with pre-cast ‘buff tactile pavements’ surrounded by an area using “25mm thickness of close graded bitumen macadam surface course” as described in Lee’s (WBC Officer Lee Bailey) email to me of 15th February. It is my view that the typical ‘finishing’ of these dropped-curb installations (a recent example of which can be seen in Newton Road, Liscard and is shown in the photograph) is wholly inappropriate for Marlowe Road, being further detrimental to the character of the area.”

The photograph provided by the objector shows a section of highway during the construction process, prior to completion. The works have since been completed to the required standard.

Wirral Council has previously agreed a policy to replace flags with bitmac in all areas of Wirral unless the area is classified as a 'conservation area'.

2.3.21 “I note that you do not give a date for this survey – could you please indicate if this survey was taken recently and at what time of day? (Note: traffic congestion and the numbers of pedestrians in Marlowe and Torrington Road vary enormously through-out the day).

Should your figures relate to the survey which you mentioned during our meeting then I note that the figures which I believe you quoted at the time, did not actually indicate a statistically significant “majority of pedestrians” using the existing crossing. I have also consulted with my neighbours and they too have indicated that their perception is that the majority of pedestrians cross Cliff Road and upper Marlowe Road as detailed in my previous letter.

Therefore, I believe my original objection relating to pedestrians using “established or popular pedestrian routes” which would circumvent your proposed plans, is still a valid point.”

The pedestrian survey was carried out in the last 12 months and specifically in relation to this scheme. The details of the survey are as follows;

Pedestrian traffic was recorded over one day at peak times (07:30- 09:30 and 15:00-17:00).

During the survey, most pedestrians crossed on the existing pedestrian refuge with a total of 99 people (equating to 45% of the total pedestrians crossing Torrington Road) using this existing facility. Appendix 2, Drawing No. DR&E/2/13/b shows the location of the survey and pedestrian movements.

It is considered that in improving the existing layout and creating the ‘build-out’, a proportion of pedestrians who had previously crossed away from the refuge will be encouraged to cross at the new facility. It is designed to afford pedestrians better visibility and protection.

2.3.22 “The “DoT Local Transport Note 2/95” states that “Crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions”. In your response, I note that you have indicated that “The council has taken due note of the relevant design criteria”. However, your updated plans still show that the proposed crossing is very much located at a conflict point between Marlowe, Torrington and Cliff Roads. Therefore, I must continue to object to your proposals based on my belief that the proposed site is inappropriate for a pedestrian crossing as it is likely to lead to an increase in the exposure of pedestrians to speeding traffic (this being especially so in the light of the Council’s proposals to leave Marlowe/Torrington Road out of the planned 20mph zone which will be brought into effect on either side of Marlowe and Torrington Road).”

The scheme forms part of the Local Safety Programme and has been designed to improve road safety at this location. It is based on detailed

analysis of the existing road safety record provided to the Council by the Police.

- 2.3.23 “Your letter of 28th February indicates that “we accept that the proposals will result in 1 full parking place being displaced”. As both Marlowe Road and Torrington Road are recognised Wirral Council “Residents Parking Scheme” areas, I believe the displacement of this parking space will place undue difficulties on the nearby residents in terms of parking a normal vehicle within reasonable proximity to residents own homes and not blocking or monopolising available parking outside other people’s homes. I believe the Council has a duty to facilitate the preservation of established parking and access rights for residents and that the introduction of such a large build-out as indicated on your proposals will infringe on those rights.”

The removal of 1 parking space to allow for such a scheme will mean residents are still able to park within "reasonable proximity" to their property. Several properties have off street parking, whilst each property frontage is significant in size (large semi detached houses majority of frontages appear to be 8.8m wide or greater) allowing therefore in some instances enough space to park 2 cars if required.

3.0 RELEVANT RISKS

- 3.1 Failure to undertake the scheme will reduce the ability to improve pedestrian movements across Torrington Road/Marlowe Road to access the bus stops, the church, nearby schools and liscard shopping area.

4.0 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 4.1 A puffin crossing has been considered. However this would cost in the region of £75,000 and would impact significantly upon the on-street parking space available within the ‘controlled resident parking permit zone’ (approximately 41.6m of parking space would be lost on either side of the road. 83.2m of parking space lost/displaced in total). The proposed scheme is estimated to cost in the region of £25,000.

5.0 CONSULTATION

- 5.1 As part of the consultation exercise for this scheme letters were delivered to local residents in the vicinity of the scheme informing them of the proposals. In addition, consultation was undertaken with Party Spokespersons, Ward Members, the Cycle Forum, the Pedestrian Forum, Local and National Walking Groups, the Emergency Services, the Freight Transport Association, the Road Haulage Association and Merseytravel.
- 5.2 Following the submission of the objection, further discussions between the objector and Council Officers were undertaken to discuss the concerns raised. The concerns raised by the objector have been carefully considered and are detailed in 2.3.1 – 2.3.23 above.

5.3 This scheme was identified within the the 2012/13 Local Transport Capital Programme ('Improving Road Safety' block allocation) to provide a 'Local Safety Scheme' at the junction of Torrington Road/Marlowe Road, Liscard.

6.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH GROUPS

6.1 There are no specific implications under this heading arising from this report.

7.0 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: FINANCIAL; IT; STAFFING; AND ASSETS

7.1 The scheme is estimated to cost in the region of £25,000 and will be financed from the 2012/13 Local Transport Capital Programme.

7.2 Existing staff resources will be utilised in the progression of this scheme.

8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There are no implications under this heading.

9.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The proposed scheme is included within the 2012/13 Transport Capital Programme approved by Cabinet on 15th March 2012 for which an Equalities Impact assessment has already been undertaken.

10.0 CARBON REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The scheme will assist pedestrian movements and thereby support a reduction on the reliance upon the private motor vehicle and therefore assist in reducing the overall carbon footprint – key aims within the Merseyside Local Transport Plan.

11.0 PLANNING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no implications under this heading arising from the recommendation of this report.

12.0 RECOMMENDATION/S

12.1 The report recommends that the Panel note the objections, but that in the interests of road safety the proposed scheme consisting of a pedestrian refuge island with associated tactile crossing points as shown on attached Drawing No. DR&E/2/13/a be recommended to the Regeneration and Environment Policy and Performance Committee for approval and implementation.

13.0 REASON/S FOR RECOMMENDATION/S

- 13.1 This scheme was identified as part of the 2012/13 Local Transport Capital Programme ('Improving Road Safety' block allocation) to provide a 'Local Safety Scheme' at the junction of Torrington Road/Marlowe Road, Liscard.
- 13.2 Following detailed assessment and surveys by engineers it was agreed that this location and the existing environment was suitable for a pedestrian refuge upgrade with a kerbline 'build-out' and it would benefit from such a scheme.
- 13.3 The scheme reflects Wirral Council's ongoing commitment to encourage walking in the borough through providing better environments where it is safe and attractive to do so.
- 13.4 There are proven flows of pedestrians in this area visiting both the Liscard Shopping Centre, the nearby church, nearby Nursing Homes, Mill Lane Hospital, etc. School children dismount buses in this area to walk to the nearby Weatherhead School and beyond that Mosslands School.

REPORT AUTHOR: Lee Bailey

Assistant Engineer

Telephone: (0151) 606 2437

Email: leebailey@wirral.gov.uk

APPENDICES

Appendix 1, Drawing No. DR&E/2/13/a Indicating the proposal.

Appendix 2, Drawing No. DR&E/2/13/b indicating the location of the pedestrian survey

REFERENCE MATERIAL

Letters and emails from residents objecting to the scheme have been used in the preparation of this report.

SUBJECT HISTORY (last 3 years)

Council Meeting	Date