



**HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND WASTE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE – 22 JANUARY 2026**

**PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ASSESSMENT AND JUSTIFICATION IN  
LEICESTERSHIRE**

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Committee with an overview of the existing Leicestershire County Council approach to pedestrian, pedal cycle and horse rider crossing assessments and justification, against revised national guidance and accepted best practice, and to outline a proposed minor modification to the assessment process.

**Policy Framework and Previous Decisions**

2. In March 2009, the existing Leicestershire County Council Quality Assurance process for the site assessment of pedestrian crossing facilities was adopted. This process was based on Department for Transport (DfT) Local Transport Notes (LTN) 1/95 and 2/95 (guidance on the assessment and design of pedestrian crossings) available at that time but a more thorough, yet flexible, approach was adopted to determining the justification for a pedestrian crossing.
3. In December 2019, the DfT published Traffic Signs Manual (TSM) Chapter 6, superseding various pieces of guidance which formed the basis of previous methodology for the assessment and prioritisation of formal crossings.
4. Following this publication, it was decided that Leicestershire's existing guidance should be reviewed against TSM Chapter 6 and alongside existing best practice.
5. Furthermore, LTN 1/20 'Cycling Infrastructure Design' was released in July 2020. This guidance provides a framework for designing pedestrian crossings that are safe, accessible and effective in meeting the needs of all users.
6. Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allows a Local Planning Authority (LPA) to enter into a legally binding agreement with a developer to secure contributions towards infrastructure and services. These agreements are used to mitigate the impact of the development on the local community and include pedestrian crossings. Alternatively, LPAs may also condition the provision of a crossing as part of the planning permission it grants for developments.
7. The references to pedestrian crossings in this report can be read to include cyclist and equestrian crossings also.

## **Background**

8. Pedestrian crossing assessments, both in Leicestershire and nationally, have historically been based on a “PV Squared” (PV2) calculation (‘P’ representing the number of pedestrians and ‘V’ the number of vehicles). The magnitude of the calculated figure would form the basis against which provision of a pedestrian crossing could be determined.
9. The use of PV2 allowed engineers to consider the demand for a crossing, in terms of pedestrian numbers, as well as to assess what kind of crossing was appropriate by using vehicle flows to determine likely pedestrian delay and difficulty in crossing alongside potential delay to vehicles. For example, where a heavy pedestrian flow is present over long periods, a signalised crossing will help to balance pedestrian and vehicle flows.
10. Whilst this methodology allows for sites to be easily assessed, ranked and prioritised, over time it was criticised for being inflexible, overlooking local highway factors and the make-up of pedestrian and vehicle flows and allowed for limited engineering judgement.
11. LTN guidance issued by the DfT at the time did not provide a set quantitative basis upon which to assess requests for new crossings but recommended an Assessment Framework be developed through which to consider requests. This acknowledged the need to consider road accidents, carriageway and footway widths, crossing times and difficulty and the composition of vehicular and pedestrian flows.
12. As a result, many local authorities have developed their own methodology and framework for assessing requests for pedestrian crossings, generally based on a modified PV2 that includes a variety of additional factors as recommended by Government guidance.
13. The Council’s existing “Pedestrian Crossing Facilities Site Assessment Form for Aspirational Schemes” was adopted in 2009 and last revised in March of that year.
14. In December 2019, the DfT published TSM Chapter 6 which brought together guidance on all three of the main crossing types, namely:
  - a) Uncontrolled or informal crossings (for example a pedestrian refuge (central island) or dropped kerb);
  - b) Zebra and Parallel crossings, where priority is given to pedestrians and cyclists over vehicles; and
  - c) Signal-controlled crossings, where drivers are required to stop at red lights and non-motorised users have a push button to register demand to the green signal.
15. As with previous guidance iterations, TSM Chapter 6 recommends an assessment that may consist of a site survey, surveys of pedestrian and traffic flows and a consideration of other factors. There is little, in terms of site and option assessments, that has fundamentally changed between this and the previous guidance.

16. Additionally, multiple key factors are considered under LTN 1/20 (Cycling Infrastructure Design), including crossing location, design, crossing type, pedestrian safety, vulnerable road users, use of technology, environmental consideration and maintenance, and longevity.

### **Supporting Research**

17. There is extensive research around the placing of crossing infrastructure on the highway network. This research, summarised in Appendix C attached to this report, along with the guidance outlined above, ultimately informs the way in which Local Highway Authorities (LHAs) across the Country assess the need for a crossing as well as determining the appropriate crossing type for the environment.

### **Current County Council Pedestrian Crossing Approach**

18. How the Council approaches the need for pedestrian crossings is dependent on the circumstances.
19. When requests to introduce a crossing within an existing environment are received, where no material changes are being made, the Council will assess the need through its Crossing Justification Assessment (CJA) process as outlined in paragraphs 22 to 28 below. This would also be the case for third-party funding approaches as outlined in paragraphs 34 and 35 below.
20. Where there is a material change to the environment/local area being made, e.g. new substantial housing and commercial developments, these would generally be considered by the Council in its role as statutory consultee in the planning process as explained in paragraphs 29 to 33.
21. Where wider walking/cycling networks are being developed and introduced through a major project, this might be to ensure route continuity or drive forward active travel through more direct routes and removal of crossing barriers.

### **Assessment of Crossing Requests Received from the Public or Other Parties**

22. The Council currently utilises a CJA modification type framework, with factors added into the assessment in order to account for needs of vulnerable road user groups, severance within communities, safety and the desire to increase sustainable transport use.
23. Justification for pedestrian crossings should balance safety data, user demand, local context and strategic priorities. Whilst the CJA provides a baseline, modern practice increasingly incorporates inclusive, proactive design standards focused on vulnerable users and sustainable travel.
24. The Council assessment factors include:
  - a) Pedestrian flow composition (including number of child, elderly, mobility and visually impaired pedestrians).
  - b) Vehicular flow composition (multipliers for high numbers of HGVs).
  - c) Accident data from the previous three years.

- d) Average crossing time and waiting delay.
  - e) Road width.
  - f) 85<sup>th</sup> percentile vehicle speeds.
  - g) Special factors to overcome latent demand or severance such as:
    - Whether the road divides a substantial community or severs an established cycle/walking network route.
    - Proximity of community centres or homes for the elderly.
    - Presence of hospitals, clinics or doctor's surgeries in the vicinity.
    - Near to a busy shopping centre or, for rural locations, substantial pedestrian movement to a post office or local shop.
    - The location being adjacent to a school, playground, where a school crossing patrol operates or on route to school as identified in a School Travel Plan.
25. An example of a pedestrian crossing assessment, undertaken using the existing Council guidance, is set out within Appendix A.
26. The CJA produces a final Crossing Justification Value (CJV) which determines the appropriate type of crossing needed:
- a) If the CJV is less than 0.4, a crossing facility is not supported and no further action is taken.
  - b) A CJV between 0.4 and 0.6 indicates that the provision of uncontrolled measures such as pedestrian dropped kerbs would be the appropriate crossing type for that location.
  - c) A CJV of 0.6 to 0.9 indicates justification for the provision of a Zebra crossing.
  - d) A CJV above 0.9 indicates a strong justification for a signal-controlled crossing.
27. A site assessment is also undertaken by an engineer as part of this process, who will consider all of the above within the context of the existing environment in order to ensure the deliverability of the type of crossing facility that is determined through the CJA.
28. This approach covers the three main objectives set out in TSM Chapter 6, specifically safety, convenience and accessibility. It goes on to state that "a crossing that does not improve on all three to some degree is unlikely to be satisfactory or justified".

### **Role as Statutory Consultee in the Planning Process and Approach to Determining and Stipulating Crossing Need for Consideration by the LPA**

29. The Council, in its role as the LHA, is a statutory consultee in the planning process, providing advice to LPAs in their determination of planning applications.
30. When assessing the impact of a proposed development, consideration is given to the requirement for active travel infrastructure, including pedestrian crossings, as outlined in the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide. Such an assessment includes the use of industry standard software to establish the level and type of trip generation expected to arise from a proposed development, including the number of pedestrian trips. This assessment provides a basis for establishing the demand for a crossing facility.

31. However, in addition to such assessment, commensurate with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), a 'decide and provide' approach is now used which includes the provision of a vision-led strategy with a view to creating well-designed and sustainable places.
32. Therefore, consideration is also given to factors such as those outlined in paragraph 24 above, to ensure that the new developments are well-connected and support the strategic vision of the latest Council Local Transport Plan 4.
33. Where it is determined as part of the LHA's assessment of a development proposal that a crossing facility is required, the Council will seek to secure provision of this either by way of planning condition or Section 106 funding.

### **Approach to Third-Party Funding Requests to Install a Crossing**

34. Occasionally, the Council is approached by a third party, e.g. a parish council, developer, community group, wishing to fully fund and introduce a crossing.
35. Such requests are dealt with and considered using the CJA approach outlined in paragraphs 22 to 28 which determines if a crossing is justified or not, this ensures parity across the County. If following the assessment the need can be justified, then the Council will either undertake the necessary consultation and installation (subject to a successful outcome of the consultation) on behalf of the third-party funder or facilitate the third-party funder to implement the crossing through a Section 278 agreement, a legal contract under the Highways Act 1980 that allows a third party to carry out permanent alterations or improvements to a public highway.

### **Consultations**

36. Once the need for a pedestrian crossing has been identified through any of the approaches outlined in paragraphs 22 to 35, the implementation of controlled pedestrian crossings (Zebra and parallel crossings, Puffin, Toucan and Pegasus signal-controlled crossings) would then be subject to the successful outcome of a formal public consultation process.
37. The consultation would include local residents and key stakeholders such as the emergency services, parish and district councils as well as the Local Member. The proposed crossing would also be formally advertised in the local press and through formal legal site notices in the area where the crossing is to be sited.
38. The consultation outcomes along with the officers' recommendation on how the scheme should proceed are then presented in the form of a report to the Local Member to obtain their support. Afterwards, the report is presented to the Director of Environment and Transport who, following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, will make the decision on whether to proceed with the scheme. In circumstances where the Local Member's support is not received, a decision from the Cabinet would be sought.

### **Proposed Modification to the Crossing Assessment Approach and Considerations Going Forward**

39. While the Council's current CJA approach is robust and incorporates a number of factors and criteria, it has been recognised that the assessment does only tend to focus on one specific concentrated site location with any pedestrians who cross the road outside of that specific location not being included. The Council therefore proposes to expand the CJA to cover a larger area/extent of the road.
40. Current DfT guidance provided by TSM Chapter 6, Section 2 states that a site survey should include the proposed site and a length of road approximately 50m either side. An example is shown in Appendix B.
41. To ensure pedestrian activity along the road under consideration is fully and consistently captured, the survey area will be split into multiple zones for enumeration with individual surveys carried out in each zone. As each site requested for a crossing assessment is unique, the 100m distance can be extended to encompass a larger area of interest as required. Multiple surveys will give a more accurate CJV by including all pedestrians who would use a crossing at the proposed site if it was available.
42. If the topography of the proposed crossing lends itself to only one point of access, then a single survey can still be carried out.
43. Due to the increase in initial surveys, thus leading to additional costs, officers need to consider survey locations to provide maximum coverage and value for money.
44. It is proposed to carry out surveys for standalone crossings between April and June. Data shows that more people walk during the spring/summer months, as such carrying out surveys during these months would ensure the maximum crossing demand is captured. Carrying out surveys outside of these months, including September and October, has led to complaints being received about them being carried out at 'the wrong time of year' which has resulted in the Council redoing the surveys at an extra cost.
45. The Council will continue to assess third-party funding requests using the CJA approach and encompassing this minor refinement.
46. There will be no change to how the Council approaches the requirement for crossings in the planning arena as stipulated in paragraphs 29 to 33 above or as part of any wider walking/cycling network schemes.

### **Resource Implications**

47. It is recognised that the proposed modification to the CJA approach may result in an increased number of requests being justified for the provision of new pedestrian crossing facilities. However, provision of crossings will continue to be based on a prioritised ranking basis and be governed by approved budget allocations.
48. Potential schemes will need to demonstrate that they can achieve their objectives and offer value for money against the agreed criteria. Where the

demand for a new crossing arises from the generation of additional demand from a new development or change to the existing demand or desire lines as a result of a major highway scheme or development, funding will be sought from other sources, such as developer contributions through the planning process or bids for Government funding.

49. The offer of third-party funding to expedite eligible crossings (justified sites following the CJA) can be considered. In such cases, a non-refundable upfront outlay of £10,000 would be required to cover the cost of initial design, topographical surveys and staff time, as part of which the full cost of installation would be provided to the third party for their consideration.
50. Depending upon the results of the initial design and viability assessment, zebra crossings typically cost on average £75,000 to install with signalised Puffin crossings costing upwards of £120,000.
51. The Director of Corporate Resources and the Director of Law and Governance have been consulted on the contents of this report.

### **Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure**

52. None.

### **Equality Implications**

53. Initiatives to improve road safety and reduce road casualties benefit all road users, but are particularly important for vulnerable groups such as pedestrians, motorcyclists, cyclists, the young / elderly and those with a disability.

### **Human Rights Implications**

54. There are no human rights implications arising from the content of this report.

### **Environmental Implications**

55. There are no environmental implications arising from the content of this report

### **Appendices**

- Appendix A Example Pedestrian Crossing Assessment
- Appendix B Expanded Pedestrian Crossing Assessment
- Appendix C Supporting Research

### **Officers to Contact**

Ann Carruthers  
 Director, Environment and Transport  
 Telephone: (0116) 305 7000  
 Email: [ann.carruthers@leics.gov.uk](mailto:ann.carruthers@leics.gov.uk)

Janna Walker  
 Assistant Director, Environment and Transport  
 Telephone: (0116) 305 0785  
 Email: [janna.walker@leics.gov.uk](mailto:janna.walker@leics.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank