

**To:                      Audit, Scrutiny & Petitions Board**

**On:                      28 November, 2016**

---

**Report by:            Director of Finance and Resources**

---

**Heading:              Petition: Corsebar Road, Paisley**

---

## **1.      Summary**

- 1.1.    At the meeting of the Board held on 30 November, 2015 consideration was given to a petition by Ms Dryburgh in the undernoted terms:

“As I have become visually impaired and can no longer drive I have to access buses and also have to frequently attend clinics at the RAH. Trying to cross Corsebar Road is very difficult and dangerous, even for people who are elderly or disabled. I think there is an urgent need for a pedestrian crossing or even just a central island near the entrance to the RAH driveway”.

- 1.2    The Board were advised that the Head of Amenity Services had indicated that a request had been received in 2013 for pedestrian facilities in Corsebar Road which resulted in a vehicle and pedestrian survey. Unfortunately the results of the survey did not justify any pedestrian facilities and no further action was taken. As a result of the RAH parking policy Renfrewshire Council had promoted a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict parking on Craw Road and Ricartsbar Avenue. The Council was currently looking at restrictions for Corsebar Road near to the entrance to the hospital.
- 1.3    At that meeting, it was agreed that it be recommended to the Director of Community Resources that a further vehicle and pedestrian survey be undertaken; that a site visit be arranged for those members of the Board who wished to attend; and that the outcome be reported to a future meeting of the Board at which consideration of the petition would be resumed. The site visit took place on 14 December, 2015.
- 1.4    Consideration of the petition was resumed at the meeting of the Board held on 15 February 2016 at which time the Board noted the outcome of the survey and the conclusion by the Head of Amenity Services that neither side of the hospital entrance showed an appreciable bias in terms of number of pedestrians wishing to cross.

He considered that a signalised crossing will not significantly reduce pedestrian waiting times. The site's injury record does not justify an intervention. There is no observed justification for a signalised crossing based on pedestrian waiting times.

- 1.5 The Board noted that the location, together with the likelihood that pedestrians crossing at this site were infirm and required longer than average time to cross the road, presented exceptional circumstances. It was also noted that a pedestrian crossing had been installed in Stanley Road, which had significantly less traffic or pedestrians waiting to cross. It was agreed it be recommended to the Director of Community Resources that: (a) the rationale for the installation of a pedestrian crossing at Stanley Road be examined and compared against the Corsebar Road site; (b) all factors be taken into account to make an exceptional case for a pedestrian crossing near the RAH entrance; and (c) the options identified be reported to a future meeting of the Board when consideration of this matter would be resumed.
- 1.6 The Head of Amenity Services has indicated that the pelican crossing on Stanley Road, Paisley provides a safe crossing point for pedestrians from the Glenburn area to walk to Meikleriggs and vice versa and also access to a playing field. He has indicated that Community Resources will investigate the possibility of installing a crossing near to the entrance of the hospital. However, they are currently addressing parking issues outside the cottages on Corsebar Road and this will have to be taken into consideration.
- 1.7 The principal petitioner had been invited to the meeting of the Board held on 19 September 2016 but did not attend. She has been asked to return to this meeting of the Board in order that the Board may resume consideration of her petition.
- 1.8 The role of the Board is to consider the petition, hear and ask questions of the petitioner and take the appropriate action in respect of the petition which will be one of the following:
  - (a) that no action is taken, in which case the reasons will be specified and intimated to the petitioner;
  - (b) that the petition be referred to the relevant director and/or policy board for further investigation, with or without any specific recommendation; or
  - (c) refer the petition to another organisation if the petition relates to that organisation.

---

## **2. Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Board resumes consideration of the petition.
- 

## **Implications of this report**

1. **Financial Implications** – none

2. **HR and Organisational Development Implications – none**
3. **Community Plan/Council Plan Implications – none**
4. **Legal Implications – none**
5. **Property/Assets Implications – none**
6. **Information Technology Implications – none**
7. **Equality and Human Rights Implications**
  - (a) The Recommendations contained within this report have been assessed in relation to their impact on equalities and human rights. No negative impacts on equality groups or potential for infringement of individuals' human rights have been identified arising from the recommendations contained in the report because for example it is for noting only. If required following implementation, the actual impact of the recommendations and the mitigating actions will be reviewed and monitored, and the results of the assessment will be published on the Council's website.
8. **Health and Safety Implications – none**
9. **Procurement Implications – none**
10. **Risk Implications – none**
11. **Privacy Impact – none**

---

#### **List of Background Papers – petition**

---

**Author:** Lilian Belshaw, Democratic Services Manager, 0141 618 7112