

Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 5 October 2023

Report of the Director of Highways and Transport

Part I

Electoral Division affected:
Ribble Valley North East;

Corporate Priorities:
Supporting economic growth;

Proposed Puffin Crossing and 40mph and Derestricted Speed Limit Traffic Regulation Orders, Holm Road / A59 Whalley Clitheroe Bypass, Barrow
(Appendix 'A' refers)

Contact for further information:

Phil Gibbon, Tel: (01772) 539718, Highway Design Engineer,
phil.gibbon@lancashire.gov.uk

Brief Summary

This report requests approval of proposals to install a puffin crossing and reduce the speed limit along an associated section of the A59 Whalley Clitheroe Bypass in Barrow. The proposals would be externally funded by a developer and are necessary to support a planning condition imposed on this development. The report also details objections raised to the proposed traffic regulation orders.

The works will be funded through a Section 278 Highways Act (1980) Agreement by the developer.

Recommendation

Cabinet is asked to approve the making of the proposed traffic regulation orders associated with the scheme as set out in the report.

Detail

A Puffin crossing and 40mph speed limit has been proposed to satisfy a planning condition on the Pendle View Fisheries development, Barrow, to provide a safe pedestrian crossing facility of the A59, between the development site on the east and the business and enterprise park on the west.



Appendices

Appendix 'A' is attached to this report. For clarification it is summarised below and referenced at relevant points within this report.

Appendix	Title
Appendix 'A'	General Arrangement

Consultations

In May 2023 Lancashire County Council formally advertised the proposed traffic regulation orders. The consultation period ended on 2 June 2023.

A combined objection was received on 20 June 2023 from the county councillor for Ribble Valley North East and the borough councillors for Wiswell and Barrow Ward.

Objection

The objection to the proposals cited safety concerns with the location and type of crossing, efficiency concerns relating to traffic on the A59 due to speed limit and lane reduction proposals and questioned it's need due to a perceived limited increase in the number of pedestrians crossing at this location. Requests to consider an underpass or overbridge were made.

Response

As part of the Highway Service consultation response to the original Ribble Valley Borough Council planning proposal (3/2015/0426) concern was highlighted regarding the pedestrian access arrangements across the A59 to services likely to be attractive to end users. As a result, the subsequent planning permission granted by Ribble Valley Borough Council included a condition relating to delivery of associated off-site highway works, inclusive of a pedestrian crossing facility.

Under Section 278 of the Highways Act the county council can enter into an agreement with any person, and in this instance the Developer, to design and deliver works on highway for the benefit of the public. This would be in accordance with the planning consent.

Subsequently two A59 crossing locations were considered, one at the location proposed, the other to the south of the roundabout close to the development's vehicular access point. The proposed location is deemed to be the most beneficial as it is located on the pedestrian desire line, is within close proximity to the existing Public Right of Way and negates the need to cross Holm Road.

An informal/uncontrolled surface crossing was originally proposed. Insurmountable concerns were raised in relation to this original design in the stage 2 road safety audit, regarding suitability due to vehicle speeds, volume and type of traffic, acceptable gaps in traffic, existing roundabout geometry, type of users and their ability to judge safe crossing opportunities. Safety concerns raised in the audit have been addressed by providing a traffic signal-controlled surface crossing (Puffin).

Speed surveys were undertaken at points 50m in advance of the proposed Puffin crossing, 85th percentile speeds for A59 northbound traffic were recorded at 48mph



and southbound at 44mph. As a consequence of introducing a Puffin crossing, reconfiguring lanes on the A59 northbound approach and lane reduction at the northbound exit of the roundabout, and, in consultation with Lancashire Constabulary, it was deemed appropriate to reduce the existing speed limit from the existing national speed limit (70mph) to 40mph.

Traffic flows at this location have been established and junction modelling using industry standard software Arcady has been undertaken. The results show that the roundabout will continue to operate within capacity if the nearside lane on the A59 northbound approach to the roundabout is changed to left only and the offside lane remains as ahead and right and if the northbound exit of the roundabout is reduced from two lanes to one.

The main objectives of any crossing are safety, convenience and accessibility. A formal cost benefit analysis has not been undertaken to compare the puffin crossing with an underpass or overbridge. An underpass is technically challenging at this location due to accessibility requirements, land ownership constraints and the presence of statutory undertakers' equipment. An underpass would not provide passive surveillance and could lead to users feeling unsafe and avoiding the facility. An overbridge option is also technically challenging due to restricted space and the need for vehicle restraints systems with sufficient offsets and working widths. An overbridge would also be less convenient and accessible to less able users. The cost of providing either an underpass or overbridge is significantly greater than the current proposal and would be disproportionate to the value of the development. Either option would also have more onerous long term maintenance requirements and cost implications to the developer.

The existing and future numbers of pedestrians crossing at this location is unknown. There may be a latent demand due to existing safety and accessibility concerns.

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Risk management

If the scheme is not approved there is a risk that the planning condition will not be met.

Financial

All costs for the scheme will be funded by the developer under a Section 278 Highways Act 1980 Agreement.



List of Background Papers

Paper Date Contact/Tel

None

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A

