

**NCC-041196-19 Gilt Hill, Kimberley - pedestrian crossing request**

Dear Requester,

Further to your request for information, please find below and attached details pertaining to this.

The safety audit requested is, in fact, a study that NCC commission Via to undertake in order to determine the feasibility and cost of installing improved crossing facilities. It is attached.

The document is somewhat technical and hard to interpret, We have took the liberty of summarising and simplifying its contents in a response to Cllr Owen. See below, which may help with the attached.

The response to Cllr Owen also makes it clear that, although no formal crossing is feasible, we are going to investigate other means of improving the crossing experience. Since that email was sent it has been confirmed that it is not possible to add this work to our current work schedule, so it is proposed to include it in the draft programme of works for next year.

We trust this now resolves your enquiry, however should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me directly on the details below.

Nottinghamshire County Council regularly publishes previous FOIR,s and answers on its website, under Disclosure logs. (see link) <http://site.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/thecouncil/democracy/freedom-of-information/disclosure-log/>

You can use the search facility using keywords.

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to make a complaint or request a review of our decision, you should write to the Team Manager, Complaints and Information Team, County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 7QP or email [complaints@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@nottscc.gov.uk) .

Kind Regards

Complaints and Information Team  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
County Hall

**Subject:** FW: Gilt Hill, Kimberley - pedestrian crossing request

Dear Philip,

As agreed at our earlier meeting, here is a summary of the options we have considered to improve crossing and the issues that prevent us from undertaking them.

Footway (pavement) build out:

- The build out would need to extend 2m into the road. This would make it well below the minimum acceptable width
- It would be possible to maintain the existing road width by narrowing the pavement on the school side but, notwithstanding any debate about whether this would be desirable outside the school, the cost of this work would be extremely high: it has been estimated at around £120,000 plus the cost of moving statutory undertakers' equipment (a guesstimate of £100,000 has been made). This doesn't include the cost of constructing the build-out itself.

- A build out would need to be several metres long and would remove all the parking between the bus stop clearway and the corner of Digby Street
- As a result, this option is not considered feasible

#### Pedestrian refuge (central island):

- There is no place in the area where we could fit a refuge without it stopping refuse lorries, school buses or lorries from accessing the side roads and school premises.
- Even if a location had been found, a 2m-wide refuge would require us to narrow the footway on the school side by 2.4m. Notwithstanding any debate about whether this would be desirable outside the school, the cost of this work would be extremely high: it has been estimated at around £120,000 plus the cost of moving statutory undertakers' equipment (a guesstimate of £100,000 has been made). This doesn't include the cost of constructing the refuge itself
- The crash reduction team considers that a 2m-wide refuge would not be ideal here, given that the site is immediately outside a school, and that large groups of parents and children are likely to want to cross at the same time
- As a result, this option is not considered feasible

#### Zebra crossing:

- Inter-visibility (that is, the ability of motorists to see pedestrians waiting to cross, and pedestrians seeing approaching vehicles) is below the minimum required at all locations near the school.
- Given that the crossing is intended to assist very young children and there is no guarantee that an SCP will always be available, this is not considered acceptable
- The zig-zag markings required at zebra crossings will remove significant amounts of on-street parking
- Given the constraints on budgets, it is likely that replacing the SCP would not be considered a high priority if a formal pedestrian crossing was installed. Given that an SCP is considered the optimum facility, effectively replacing one with a zebra crossing in the long term is considered to be a retrograde step
- As a result, this option is not considered feasible

#### Puffin (signalled) crossing:

- Puffin crossings have to be located at least 20m from a side road. The existing SCP site is significantly less than this.
- A crossing could be installed 25m west of the current SCP site but the pavement on the south side is not wide enough to accommodate the signal poles and provide sufficient space for pedestrians to wait. This would require us to narrow the footway on the school side. Notwithstanding any debate about whether this would be desirable outside the school, the cost of this work would be extremely high: it has been estimated at around £120,000 plus the cost of moving statutory undertakers' equipment (a guesstimate of £100,000 has been made). The cost of constructing the puffin is estimated at around £70,000, making the total cost around £290,000
- The zig-zag markings required at puffin crossings will remove significant amounts of on-street parking
- Given the constraints on budgets, it is likely that replacing the SCP would not be considered a high priority if a formal pedestrian crossing was installed. Given that an SCP is considered the optimum facility, effectively replacing one with a puffin crossing in the long term is considered to be a retrograde step
- This option is far more expensive than current budgets can accommodate and is not considered to offer value for money

It should be noted that, while visibility at the School Crossing Patrol site is below the standards required to construct a formal crossing, it is considered acceptable at a SCP site because, when the SCP is not present, there is no formal crossing facility to encourage pedestrians to cross at that point.

I'm aware that there are narrower pedestrian refuges on Stannier Way and that the residual road width at these crossing points is also narrower than the minimum road widths we have applied outside Gilthill Primary. This is because Gilt Hill is a bus route and main distributor road: the design standards require wider lane widths to accommodate the larger vehicles expected to use Gilt Hill. The refuges are narrower on Stannier Way because fewer people are expected to use them and traffic volume (and vehicle size) is expected to be lower.

It should be noted that there have been no injury accidents outside the school in recent times so the present arrangement, while it may appear intimidating, appears to work safely. It is acknowledged that this might be interpreted as a complacent attitude so, in an effort to achieve some improvement, officers are proposing to improve the signing on the approaches by at least doubling the number of warning signs. We will also consider whether there are other changes to the road markings that could be made to make the crossing point more conspicuous. However, we need to be mindful of not creating a forest of signs and a bewildering array of lines that will divert driver attention away from pedestrians.

Given the relatively inexpensive nature of the improvements we are proposing, I will seek advice as to whether it is possible to add them to this year's programme of works. I will advise further when I know the answer.

Regards,