

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Provide Pedestrian Crossing facilities on Greenway, Berkhamsted</b>	
	Walking	
<b>Scheme Reference</b>	43	
<b>Problem References</b>	W33	It is becoming more and more dangerous to cross Greenway everyday
<b>Links to other schemes:</b>	UTP	34, 41

### Context




Figure 1 Location Plan

Greenway is a residential street located to the south of Berkhamsted High Street, with access to a number of dwellings, in addition to St Thomas More RC Primary School and Greenway First School.

Pedestrians have to cross Greenway to access the schools during the morning and afternoon. Currently, there are no safe pedestrian crossings along the length of Greenway, with an increasing number of pupils choosing to walk or cycle to school. There is a perception that the area is currently unsafe for pupils to cross the road, especially as many vehicles park on the road.


Analysis of speed data suggests that the current 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed in both directions is less than 20mph.



Measures have therefore been considered to provide a safe crossing facility for pedestrians travelling along Northchurch High Street, and to fulfil the following overarching LTP Objectives:

- Enhance quality of life, health and the natural, built and historic environment for all residents
- Improve the safety and security of residents and other road users

Measures/Components			
Ref	Description	Assessment of Suitability	Cost
43.1	Kerb build-out for pedestrians adjacent to school entrance, with associated drop-kerb and tactile paving	<p>Kerb build outs at this location can be delivered, as it would improve the ability to cross Greenway by simply narrowing the highway.</p> <p>In addition, one of the main barriers to crossing the road at this location is vehicles parking along its length, reducing visibility. It is envisaged that providing a build out will ensure greater pedestrian priority for pupils accessing the schools. See <b>Figure 2</b> for details.</p> <p>To improve safety conditions, it is recommended that the adjacent parking bays are demonstrated clearly and bollards are provided on the build-out.</p> <p>Deliverability – 1 to 2 years <b>STANDARD</b></p>	£6,000 to £8,000
43.2	Zebra crossing	<p>The provision of a zebra crossing is proposed at this location based on the amount of pedestrians wishing to cross Greenway to access the two schools.</p> <p>Consultation with the police, public notice and written notification to the Secretary of State are necessary before the crossing is established following guidance in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>Following examination of geometry, it was found that there is insufficient space on either side of the crossing to provide for a formal crossing. In addition, the crossing is located adjacent to a private driving, increasing safety concerns for pedestrians.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	

43.3	Provide a 'Home Zone' along the stretch of Greenway between the junctions with Finch Road and Orchard Avenue	<p>"Home Zones are an attempt to strike a balance between vehicular traffic and everyone else who uses the street, the pedestrians, cyclists, business people and residents. Some see Home Zones as a way of "reclaiming" local streets from a traditional domination by cars. Home Zones work through the physical alteration of streets and roads in an area. These alterations force motorists to drive with greater care and at lower speeds. The success of a Home Zone scheme is not just dependant on effective and well thought out plans, but also requires the whole community being encouraged to get involved from the start."<sup>1</sup></p>  <p>In relation to Greenway, existing speeds are quite low due to the highway geometry and number of vehicles parked along its length. The general layout of the area fits well with the scope for a Home Zone along Greenway, with the potential for infrastructure to be implemented to improve the safety conditions for all users, creating an open space, rather than a hierarchy with cars being the priority.</p> <p>Currently, the measure would not be deliverable, as the cost to benefit ratio would be too high. However, if the local community has full support for the scheme, and conditions for pupils do not improve, there is scope to implement this in coming years. A full feasibility review and consultation process would be required to ensure deliverability.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE – Measure 43.1 Preferred in the short-term</p>	
<b>Supporting Evidence of Measures/Components</b>			

<b>Preferred Option</b>
<p>Two separate measures have been reviewed in order to improve pedestrian routing on Greenway, including a zebra crossing and build-outs on either side of the highway. However, following analysis of geometry and alignment, it was found that build outs would be the most suitable option. Therefore, only measure 43.1 is proposed for implementation within 2 years.</p>

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.homezones.org/concept.html>



<b>Contribution to Objectives / Indicators</b>	UTP Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve connectivity within and between local towns through a complete network of walking and cycling facilities</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Outline Cost Analysis of Preferred Option or Options</b>		
<b>Design and Implementation</b>	<b>Indicative Cost</b>	<b>Notes</b>
43.1	£6,000 to £8,000	
<b>TOTAL COST FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>£6,000 to £8,000</b>	

<b>Maintenance Liability</b>	High Medium Low	
------------------------------	-----------------------	--

<b>Deliverability of Preferred Option</b>	Simple – ‘quick win’, could be delivered within 1 year
	Standard – could be delivered in 1 to 2 years, in line with IWP
	Complex – could not be delivered in 2 years, has some issues that require resolution before design
<b>Delivery Issues</b>	None


Other Information/Additional Notes:
-------------------------------------

# Tring, Northchurch and Berkhamsted UTP Scheme Proforma 43



**AECOM**

Last saved by: ARTISM1(2013-04-22) Last Plotted: 2013-04-22  
Filename: P:\UK\STA1\TP\PROJECTS\TRAFFIC - HCC\BIKEABILITY AUDIT - TRING AND BERKHAMSTED\11\_CAD\PROFORMA EXCERPTS\EXTRA SCHEMES APRIL 2013.DWG  
Project Management Initials: Designer: TMM Checked: MJA Approved: NS ISO A4 210mmx 297mm



Tring and Berkhamsted  
Urban Transport Plan  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Project No.: 60267074 Date: April 2013



Figure 2 - Greenway Pedestrian Crossing

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Provide improved Pedestrian Crossing facilities on Bridgewater Road, Berkhamsted</b>	
	Walking	
<b>Scheme Reference</b>	44	
<b>Problem References</b>	W7	Billet Lane/Bridgewater Rd is very busy, and deters people from walking to nearby school
	W34	Pedestrian crossing on Bridgewater Road, leading to the back entrance to the Berkhamsted Rail Station. At present this is an informal pedestrian crossing but the vehicular traffic here is very busy at peak times.
<b>Links to other schemes:</b>	<b>UTP</b>	15, 17, 21

**Context**



Figure 1 Location Plan

Bridgewater Road stretches for 1.2km between Brownlow Road to the east and Billet Lane to the west. Located parallel to Berkhamsted High Street, many vehicles use the route as a through route between residential and industrial areas to the east and western areas of Berkhamsted Town Centre.

Due to Berkhamsted Railway Station being located adjacent to the eastern end of Bridgewater Road, there have been issues in recent years with regards to commuter parking along Bridgewater Road, the requirement for pedestrian crossing points, and speeding along the route. It is envisaged that associated measures will reduce the amount of unsafe parking along Bridgewater Road. In addition, speed humps have been implemented to reduce

speeds but also to act as a preventative for vehicles travelling along Bridgewater Road as an alternative to the High Street.


During consultation with stakeholders, there was strong support to improve crossing facilities on Bridgewater Road (near to the railway station) due to the existing footfall to and from surrounding residential areas. 'The Design of Pedestrian Crossings' DfT Guidance Note 2/95<sup>1</sup> suggests the following when assessing the choice and parameters for pedestrian crossings:



Parameter	Requirement
Proximity of Junctions	Crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions. The 'safe' distance will depend on the geometry of the junction and type of side road.
School Crossing Patrols	If there is an existing school crossing within 100m then a mutually convenient site should be found to accommodate both the patrol and other pedestrians.
Visibility	Pedestrians must be able to see and be seen by approaching traffic. Visibility should not be obscured or restricted by parked vehicles, trees or street furniture.
Crossing Width	Minimum width for a Zebra, Pelican or Puffin crossing is 2.4m.
Guard Railing	Many accidents at pedestrian crossings occur on the approach to the crossing. The provision of guard railing should be considered.
Approach Surfaces	Dropped kerbs must always be provided across the crossing width, and the section of footway between the lowered kerb-line and the adjacent footway should be ramped with a gradient between 1 in 12 and 1 in 20. Tactile paving should be installed across the dropped kerb and in a strip stretching back to the building line.
Facilities for Disabled Pedestrians	The needs of disabled pedestrians should be considered when designing the layouts of crossings. If these are well provided then a better crossing will result for all users. For full details of specific facilities for each type of crossing, refer to DfT guidance note 2/95.
Lighting	An experienced lighting engineer should ensure that the level recommended in the appropriate part of BS5489 <sup>(12)</sup> is used at all crossing sites.
Signing	Where a zebra crossing is sited on a road where the speed limit or 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed is greater than 30mph, advanced warning signs are recommended.

<sup>1</sup> <http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/local-transport-notes/ltn-2-95.pdf>



	On roads where the 85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed is lower, advanced warning signs should only be erected where visibility of the crossing is impaired.	
Provision for Bus Stops	Close coordination should be maintained between the highway authority, the police and the bus operator during the planning process to ensure that stopped buses do not obscure the vision of pedestrians or drivers.	
Street Furniture	A minimum of 0.5m clearance is recommended between the kerb edge and the closest part of any street furniture.	

Measures have therefore been considered to provide a safe crossing facility for pedestrians wishing to cross Bridgewater Road, and to fulfil the following overarching LTP Objectives:

- Enhance quality of life, health and the natural, built and historic environment for all residents
- Improve the safety and security of residents and other road users

Measures/Components			
Ref	Description	Assessment of Suitability	Cost
44.1	Kerb build-out for pedestrians adjacent to school entrance, with associated drop-kerb and tactile paving	Kerb build outs at this location can be deliverable, as it would improve the ability to cross Bridgewater Road by simply narrowing the highway. However, one of the key advantages of kerb build-outs is to improve visibility near bends in the highway. As Bridgewater Road is a relatively straight route near to the junction with Brownlow Road, the main advantage is removed. Other types of crossings would be preferred to ensure safe crossing of Bridgewater Road. NOT DELIVERABLE	
44.2	Zebra crossing with associated features	The provision of a zebra crossing between Castle Hill Avenue and Brownlow Road (see <b>Figure 2</b> for full details) will provide a safe crossing adjacent to the desire line between the footpath from Berkhamsted Railway Station and Bridgewater Road. The location fits with all the criteria (set out above) in relation to the provision of zebra crossings. The proposals include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4m wide zebra crossing facility;</li> <li>• Drop kerb on each edge;</li> <li>• Tactile paving;</li> <li>• Approach road markings;</li> <li>• Approach signage in each direction.</li> </ul> Consultation with the police, public notice and	£45,000 to £50,000



		<p>written notification to the Secretary of State are necessary before the crossing is established following guidance in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the existing pedestrian refuge located adjacent to the junction with Brownlow Road remains, as this provides crossing facilities for pedestrians travelling along the western edge of Brownlow Road.</p> <p>Deliverability – 1 to 2 years <b>STANDARD</b></p>	
<b>Supporting Evidence of Measures/Components</b>			

<b>Preferred Option</b>
<p>Two separate measures have been reviewed in order to improve pedestrian routing on Bridgewater Road, including a zebra crossing and build-outs on either side of the highway. However, following analysis of geometry and alignment, it was found that a zebra crossing would be the most suitable option. Therefore, only measure 44.2 is proposed for implementation within 2 years.</p>

<b>Contribution to Objectives / Indicators</b>	UTP Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve connectivity within and between local towns through a complete network of walking and cycling facilities</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Outline Cost Analysis of Preferred Option or Options</b>		
<b>Design and Implementation</b>	<b>Indicative Cost</b>	<b>Notes</b>
43.1	£45,000 to £50,000	
<b>TOTAL COST FOR DELIVERY</b>	<b>£45,000 to £50,000</b>	

<b>Maintenance Liability</b>	High Medium Low	
------------------------------	-----------------------	--

<b>Deliverability of Preferred Option</b>	<del>Simple – ‘quick win’, could be delivered within 1 year</del>
	<b>Standard – could be delivered in 1 to 2 years, in line with IWP</b>
	<del>Complex – could not be delivered in 2 years, has some issues that require resolution before design</del>
<b>Delivery Issues</b>	None




Other Information/Additional Notes:

# Tring, Northchurch and Berkhamsted UTP Scheme Proforma 44



**AECOM**

Last saved by: ARTISM1(2013-04-22) Last Plotted: 2013-04-22  
Filename: P:\UK\STA1\TR\PROJECTS\TRAFFIC - HCC BIKEABILITY AUDIT - TRING AND BERKHAMSTED\11\_CAD\PROFORMA EXCERPTS\EXTRA SCHEMES APRIL 2013.DWG  
Project Management Initials: Designer: TMM Checked: MJA Approved: NS ISO A4 210mmx 297mm




**Tring and Berkhamsted  
Urban Transport Plan**  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Project No.: 60267074 Date: April 2013



**Figure 2 - Zebra Crossing on Bridgewater Road**

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Provide improved Pedestrian Crossing facilities on Frogmore Street, Tring</b>	
	Walking	
<b>Scheme Reference</b>	45	
<b>Problem References</b>	W35	Frogmore Street crossing has far worse visibility than in other locations where change is proposed for this plan
	W36	Due to the car park there is a large number of traffic movements including HGV deliveries to the Dolphin Square shops, but the traffic coming from north have no warning of a school entrance or the risk of pedestrian crossing even though the visibility is very poor
	W37	The sightline from the Bishop Wood side of the road towards the town is very poor, and the school entrance, the junction with Friars Walk and the small car park beside the school entrance are nearby, all of which, along with the car park entrances opposite, give a large amount of car movements in a small area
<b>Links to other schemes:</b>	<b>UTP</b>	34

**Context**



*Figure 1 – Location Plan*

Frogmore Street is located in central Tring, provided a north south connection between Icknield Way and the High Street via Dundale Road, and also provides access to most central residential areas along with Bishop Wood School. Geometrically, Frogmore Street is


quite flat on approach to the High Street however, the visibility is poor due to the curvature of the road. To the north of the entrance to Bishop Wood School, Frogmore Street ascends into Dundale Road.

During consultation, issues were identified for Frogmore Street in relation to visibility and existing crossing facilities. Currently, an informal crossing point is provided adjacent to the school entrance. Following a review of Bishop Wood School Travel Plan, the majority of pupils exit and enter the school via Christchurch Road, however, there are a number that use the Bishop Wood entrance due to the availability of parking off Frogmore Street.

During consultation with stakeholders, there was strong support to improve crossing facilities on Frogmore Street, but also to reduce speeds (especially southbound as vehicles descend from Dundale Road). 'The Design of Pedestrian Crossings' DfT Guidance Note 2/95<sup>1</sup> suggests the following when assessing the choice and parameters for pedestrian crossings:

Parameter	Requirement
Proximity of Junctions	Crossings should be located away from conflict points at uncontrolled junctions. The 'safe' distance will depend on the geometry of the junction and type of side road.
School Crossing Patrols	If there is an existing school crossing within 100m then a mutually convenient site should be found to accommodate both the patrol and other pedestrians.
Visibility	Pedestrians must be able to see and be seen by approaching traffic. Visibility should not be obscured or restricted by parked vehicles, trees or street furniture.
Crossing Width	Minimum width for a Zebra, Pelican or Puffin crossing is 2.4m.
Guard Railing	Many accidents at pedestrian crossings occur on the approach to the crossing. The provision of guard railing should be considered.
Approach Surfaces	Dropped kerbs must always be provided across the crossing width, and the section of footway between the lowered kerb-line and the adjacent footway should be ramped with a gradient between 1 in 12 and 1 in 20. Tactile paving should be installed across the dropped kerb and in a strip stretching back to the building line.
Facilities for Disabled Pedestrians	The needs of disabled pedestrians should be considered when designing the layouts of crossings. If these are well provided then a better crossing will result for all users. For full details of specific facilities for each type of crossing, refer to DfT guidance note 2/95.
Lighting	An experienced lighting engineer should ensure that the level recommended in the appropriate part of BS5489 <sup>(12)</sup> is used at all crossing sites.
Signing	Where a zebra crossing is sited on a road where the speed limit


<sup>1</sup> <http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/local-transport-notes/ltn-2-95.pdf>

	<p>or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is greater than 30mph, advanced warning signs are recommended.</p> <p>On roads where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is lower, advanced warning signs should only be erected where visibility of the crossing is impaired.</p>	
Provision for Bus Stops	Close coordination should be maintained between the highway authority, the police and the bus operator during the planning process to ensure that stopped buses do not obscure the vision of pedestrians or drivers.	
Street Furniture	A minimum of 0.5m clearance is recommended between the kerb edge and the closest part of any street furniture.	

Measures have therefore been considered to provide a safe crossing facility for pedestrians wishing to cross Frogmore Street, and to fulfil the following overarching LTP Objectives:

- Enhance quality of life, health and the natural, built and historic environment for all residents
- Improve the safety and security of residents and other road users

It is envisaged that the proposals are implemented in line with those provided in Proforma 41 – ‘Speed limits around schools to be reduced to 20mph’.

Measures/Components			
Ref	Description	Assessment of Suitability	Cost
45.1	Raised crossing point at existing school patrol point	<p>Crossing Frogmore Street directly outside of Bishop Wood School can be quite hazardous, even with the provision of a school patrol to assist crossing. Due to the amount of school pupils and parents that wish to cross at this point due to the location of the town centre and car parking, and the safety concerns due to the adjacent access points, there is support for an improved crossing facility, providing greater priority for pedestrians, and improving the safety for local school children.</p> <p>In addition, Frogmore Street is located on a bus route. As a result, an informal, extended raised plateau would be the most appropriate option. The following details are included within the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach ramps to be 1 in 20;</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6m width of central plateau;</li> <li>• 9m total width.</li> </ul> <p>However, due to the proximity of access points for the school and town centre car parks, there is insufficient space for a 9m crossing point with sufficient gaps to the minor access points.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	
45.2	Kerb build-out for pedestrians adjacent to school entrance, with associated drop-kerb and tactile paving	<p>Kerb build outs at this location would improve the ability to cross Frogmore Street by simply narrowing the highway.</p> <p>However, due to the proximity of access points and potential conflict between vehicles travelling along Frogmore Street, builds out would not be a suitable measure. It is envisaged that build outs would increase the complexity of movements in an area that already has several movements, and would also increase congestion.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	
45.3	Zebra crossing with associated features	<p>The provision of a zebra crossing near the access to Bishop Wood School on Frogmore Street could provide a safe crossing adjacent to the desire line to the town centre and associated parking. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.4m wide zebra crossing facility;</li> <li>• Drop kerb on each edge;</li> <li>• Tactile paving;</li> <li>• Approach road markings;</li> <li>• Approach signage in each direction.</li> </ul> <p>Consultation with the police, public notice and written notification to the Secretary of State are necessary before the crossing is established following guidance in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>However, similarly to the kerb build-out and raised crossing options, geometry prevents the measure from deliverability. Guidance suggests a minimum 20m from any minor road. Having a banned right turn from the school would remove conflict to the north. However, parking on both sides of Frogmore Street, and visibility to the south (towards the town centre) would remain an issue.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	
<b>Supporting Evidence of Measures/Components</b>			
<b>Preferred Option</b>			



Three separate hard engineering measures have been reviewed in order to improve pedestrian routing on Frogmore Street, including a zebra crossing, raised crossing and build-outs on either side of the highway. However, following analysis of geometry and alignment, it was found that none of these options are deemed deliverable. It is therefore proposed that refreshing the road markings, as a maintenance measure, coupled with speed management, may well be the only option to improve safety for pedestrians wishing to cross Frogmore Street near to the school. In addition, it is advisable that the Bishop Wood School promotes Christchurch Road as the main entrance to the school. A further recommendation identified as a result of this assessment is to obtain valid speed measurements along Frogmore Street in order to substantiate the assumption that there is an issue related to motorist speeds.

<b>Contribution to Objectives / Indicators</b>	UTP Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve connectivity within and between local towns through a complete network of walking and cycling facilities</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Outline Cost Analysis of Preferred Option or Options		
Design and Implementation	Indicative Cost	Notes
<b>TOTAL COST FOR DELIVERY</b>	£ N/A	

<b>Maintenance Liability</b>	High Medium Low	
------------------------------	-----------------------	--

<b>Deliverability of Preferred Option</b>	Simple – ‘quick win’, could be delivered within 1 year
	Standard – could be delivered in 1 to 2 years, in line with IWP
	Complex – could not be delivered in 2 years, has some issues that require resolution before design
<b>Delivery Issues</b>	None

Other Information/Additional Notes:

<b>Scheme Name</b>	<b>Provision of Footpath along Cross Oak Road between Kingsdale Road and Oaklands</b>	
	Walking	
<b>Scheme Reference</b>	46	
<b>Problem References</b>	W39	Proper footpath pavements are needed alongside Cross Oak Rd and Kings Rd to avoid pedestrian/vehicle conflict and potential resulting accidents.
<b>Links to other schemes:</b>	<b>UTP</b>	04, 10

**Context**



*Figure 1 Location Plan*

Cross Oak Road is located to the south of Berkhamsted High Street (demonstrated in **Figure 1**), providing access to residential areas, but also a link between Shootersway and the High Street.

There are sections of Cross Oak Road that have no pedestrian facilities due to the width of the highway, resulting in a hazardous environment for those wishing to travel on foot from the local residential areas to the town centre. During consultation, the lack of facilities was highlighted as an issue, with suggestions that providing such facilities would vastly improve the area and also accessibility through the southern areas of Berkhamsted. It should be noted however, there are numerous geometrical and visibility constraints along the route suggesting that it may be difficult to implement any significant measures whilst improving safety for all transport modes.

Interventions have therefore been examined to fulfil the following overarching LTP

Objectives:

- Improve transport opportunities for all and achieve behavioural change in mode choice;
- Improve the safety and security of residents and other road users.

**Measures/Components**

Ref	Description	Assessment of Suitability	Cost
46.1	Introduce a one-way system along Cross Oak Road between Shootersway and Graemes Dyke Road	<p>In order to provide sufficient space (2m footpath width) for pedestrians who wish to walk along Cross Oak Road, whilst utilising the existing highway boundary, it is proposed to introduce a one-way route between Shootersway and Graemes Dyke Road. Visibility is poor between these two junctions due to the curvature of the road and adjacent trees. The following measures would be required to ensure a successful one-way route:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Footway along the western edge of Cross Oak Road with dropped kerbs at access to private property;</li> <li>2. One-way signage at each access point;</li> <li>3. 'No-entry' signs at beginning of one-way route for opposite direction to flow;</li> <li>4. Lining and signing on road to standard (carriageway edge/'Slow' on approach to bend/No Entry/Give Way).</li> </ol> <p>There are, however, a number of issues relating to one way routes. Most notably, vehicles are likely to travel at higher speeds if it is understood that there is no oncoming traffic, and also there would be little room for cyclists to navigate along the route once the highway is narrowed. In addition, cyclists would only be able to travel in one direction, and residents would need to use a diversion for each journey. As a result, it is anticipated that the proposal would be unsuitable for the environment, and therefore not deliverable.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	



<p>46.2</p>	<p>Provision of footpaths on edge of Cross Oak Road carriageway with associated priority movements and signage measures</p>	<p>In order to provide sufficient space (2m footpath width) for pedestrians who wish to walk along Cross Oak Road, it is proposed to introduce sections of priority routing between Kingsdale Road and Oaklands (similarly to the existing priority routing along the northern section between Oaklands and Greenway). Visibility is poor along the northern section between these two junctions due to the curvature of the road, with trees situated along the highway edge for the whole length. The following measures would be required to ensure a successful priority routing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Priority sections between Oaklands and Graemes Dyke Road, with associated footpath on the eastern edge;</li> <li>2. Extension of footpath from the end of Greystoke Close to opposite Graemes Dyke Road, thus linking to the existing footpath on Graemes Dyke Road;</li> <li>3. Drop kerbs with tactile paving at these sections;</li> <li>4. 'Traffic has priority over oncoming vehicles' and 'Priority to oncoming traffic' signs for the section between Oaklands and Graemes Dyke Road;</li> <li>5. Lining and signing on road to standard (carriageway edge/'Slow' on approach to bend/No Entry/Give Way).</li> </ol> <p>There are, similarly to one way routes, a number of issues relating to priority movements. Most notably, there are a number of areas of conflict due to the number of junctions and lack of space for queuing vehicles on approach to the priority route, and also there would be little room for cyclists to navigate along the route once the highway is narrowed. As a result, it is anticipated that the proposal would be unsuitable for the environment, and therefore not deliverable.</p> <p>NOT DELIVERABLE</p>	 
-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Supporting Evidence of Measures/Components**




Figure 2 – Accident Locations

**Preferred Option**

It is recommended that none of the aforementioned measures outlined above are progressed. Following a review of geometry, visibility, highway boundary and accident data, it is envisaged that measures would not be suitable for Cross Oak Road. It is recommended that pedestrian route signage is implemented at the southern end of Cross Oak Road as part of the measures proposed in Scheme 10, “Cycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding, Tring and Berkhamsted” to ensure the safest route is used to access key destinations in Berkhamsted. It is also envisaged that the improvements to the pedestrian facilities at the Kingshill Way/Shootersway junction will also improve provision for those that wish to walk to Berkhamsted from the southern sections of Cross Oak Road.

<b>Contribution to Objectives / Indicators</b>	UTP Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve connectivity within and between local towns through a complete network of walking and cycling facilities</li> </ul>
------------------------------------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Outline Cost Analysis of Preferred Option or Options</b>		
<b>Design and Implementation</b>	<b>Indicative Cost</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>TOTAL COST FOR DELIVERY</b>	£N/A	

<b>Maintenance Liability</b>	High	
------------------------------	------	--



	Medium Low	
--	---------------	--

<b>Deliverability of Preferred Option</b>	Simple — 'quick win', could be delivered within 1 year
	Standard — could be delivered in 1 to 2 years, in line with IWP
	Complex — could not be delivered in 2 years, has some issues that require resolution before design
<b>Delivery Issues</b>	<i>None</i>

Other Information/Additional Notes:

**Figures 3 and 4** demonstrate the existing highway boundary constraints along Cross Oak Road.

Tring, Northchurch and Berkhamsted UTP  
Scheme Proforma 46



**AECOM**




Figure 3 – Highway Boundary (Cross Oak Road south)



# Tring, Northchurch and Berkhamsted UTP Scheme Proforma 46



**AECOM**




Figure 4 – Highway Boundary (Cross Oak Road central)