

Snodland
Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool
Walking Route Audit Tool

1. ATTRACTIVENESS	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation,	2	Footways were well maintained with no litter,	
- maintenance		wegetation. Street furriture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.		street furniture or overgrowth on the footway	
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism, Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2	No evidence of vandalism. Street lighting provided and footways are along the road.	
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic volume was reasonably low, however the footway overlooks the A228 does generate some noise	
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present, - Temporary features affecting the att - Excessive use of guardrail or bollard	ues include: or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse saci is	cs).	2	None Observed	
ATTRACTIVENESS				8		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted paverent, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2	There was no noticeable level difference on the footney, with the footney being in a good condition.	
6. COMFORT - footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2	The footway was generally 2m in width.	
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without (give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for figive and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		N/A	
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	No permanent obstructions are present on the footway and no parking on the paverment observed.	
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	There is no noticeable gradient.	
10.COMFORT - other	Examples of 'other' comfort issues in: - Temporary obstructions restricting or Barriers/glabs restricting access; ar - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi - Poorly drained footways resulting in	lude: learance width for pedestrians (e.g. dr dr drb. noticeable ponding issues/slippery surt	veway gates opened into footway); laces	2	None Observed	
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2	Footways are provided along either side of the road and are therefore direct.	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2	Crossing provided before Brook Street junction with Rocfort Road allowing pedestrians to cross and follow Rocfort Road	
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	On street parking is provided on one side meaning crossing the road may take longer, athough vehicle speeds are also low and traffic limited.	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.		N/A	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.		N/A	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes briftom bus slops not accord - Stops restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre	include:		2	None Observed	
- other DIRECTNESS	Routes toffrom bus stops not accorr Steps restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians cre	include:		2	None Observed	
- other	Routes fulfrom bus stops not accord Steps restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians cre Traffic volume low, or pedestrians	include:	High halfe volume, with podestrians unable to keep heir distance from halfe.		None Observed Traffic volume is moderate due to the train station and industrial estate with raffic markly coming from Rocfort Road, however pedestrians can keep their distance	
DIRECTNESS 17. SAFETY - traffic volume 18. SAFETY - traffic speed	Routes befrom has stope or account of the control of the control of the control of the Traffic volume low, or pedestrians are an keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	include: modaled; aling severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and podestrams in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and podestrams in close proximity.	traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	Traffic volume is moderate due to the train station and due to the train station and mainly coming from Rocfort Road, however pedestrains can keep their distance Traffic speeds are low as mentioned in 13	
DIRECTNESS 17.2AFETY 18.5AFETY 18.5AFETY 19.5AFETY visibility	Routes to from bus stops not accomediate to Stops restricting access for all success for a succ	include: include: included: dating severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and pedestrans in close proximity.	traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2	Traffic volume is moderate due to the train station and due to the train station and manifecture of the station and manifecture of the station of the statio	
- other DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY - traffic volume 18.SAFETY - traffic speed	Routes british has stope not account Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Traffic volume low, or pedestrians traffic volumes. Traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends. Good visibility for all users.	include: Traffic volume moderate and predestrans in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and predestrans in close proximity. Viability could be somewhat improved but utilisely to result in collisions.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep heir distance from traffic. Proor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2	Traffic volume is moderate due to the sain station and due to the sain station and sain station sain station station sain station sain station sain station sain station sain sain sain sain sain sain sain sai	
DIRECTNESS 17.2AFETY 18.5AFETY 18.5AFETY 19.5AFETY visibility	Routes british has stope not account Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Traffic volume low, or pedestrians traffic volumes. Traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends. Good visibility for all users.	include: Traffic volume moderate and predestrans in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and predestrans in close proximity. Viability could be somewhat improved but utilisely to result in collisions.	traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	Traffic volume is moderated due to the sain station and due to the sain station and instanced state with staffic massiy coming from Ricchord can keep their distance. Traffic speeds are low as meetineed in 13 Validity may be impacted by on theret parking in places but in locations where the sis is not in locations where the sis in soil in locations where the sis is not in locations where the sis in soil in locations where the sis is not in locations where the sis in soil in loc	Review tactile provides.
DIRECTNESS 17.5AFETY traffic volume 18.5AFETY -traffic speed 19.5AFETY -viaibility SAFETY 20. COMERENCE -dropped kerbs and	Routes british has stope not account Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Confusing layoud for pedestrians are Traffic volume low, or pedestrians traffic volumes. Traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends low, or pedestrians can keep distince from moderate traffic spends. Good visibility for all users.	include: modified. Strip Severance issues for users. Traffic volume moderate and podestrains in obes proximity. Traffic speech moderate and podestrains in obes proximity. Visibility could be somewhat my commodified to the service of the servi	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep heir distance from traffic. Proor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2	Table videos is redeficialed and to the table state and table state indicated action and indicated action a	Review tactile provision.

Route Name	The Brook (Rocfort Road-Train Station)
Length	120m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	10
Directness	8
Safety	5
Coherence	1
Total	32
Number of elements not applicable to the route	3
Total Points to be reduced	6
Maximum score (revised)	34
Doroontago	0.49/

Comments	
Actions	Review tactile provision.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool Walking Route Audit Tool

Walking Route Audit Tool						
Audit Categories 1. ATTRACTIVENESS	2 (Green) Footways well maintained, with no	1 (Amber)	0 (Red) Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	Score	Comments Footwars well maintained	Actions
- maintenance	significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.		Footways well maintained with low littering and no overgrown vegetation.	
2. ATTRACTIVENESS - fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).		No evidence of vandalism with street lighting provided. Surveillance is provided by the dwellings near the road.	
3. ATTRACTIVENESS - traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise		Low traffic noise and pollution away from the A228.	
4. ATTRACTIVENESS - other ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present	ues include: , or is deficient;		8	None observed	
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good	Some defects noted, typically	Large number of footway crossovers	2	Footways in good condition	
- condition	condition, with no trip hazards.	isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.		with no noticeable level difference or trip hazards.	
6. COMFORT - footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or waiting on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and Zm. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Footway generally 1.8-2m.	
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Crossings are provided along the length. Dropped kerbs are provided either end of the road which are reasonable width, with a zebra crossing half way along the road at a 2.4m width.	
8. COMFORT - footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and Zm. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to igive and take frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.		No instances of on footway parking were seen with clearance width of 1.8-2m	
9. COMFORT - gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Stopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	No noticeable gradient	
10.COMFORT - other	- Barriers/gates restricting access; an - Bus shelters restricting clearance wi	dearance width for pedestrians (e.g. de		2	None observed	
COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS - footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	11 2	Footways mainly provided along the roadside, where all footways follow desire lines.	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2	The crossings that are provided are on the desire lines.	
13.DIRECTNESS - gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings present or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	Road easy to cross on the straights with gaps in the crossing	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2	Zebra crossing is direct	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.		N/A	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes toffrom bus stops not accom - Steps restricting access for all users - Confusing layout for pedestrians cre	modated;		1	Where Rocfort Road meets Brook Street, footways are provided on both sides, where the footway on the southern side stops on a bend with no dropped kerb crossings provided to the northern side of the footway	
DIRECTNESS				9		
17.SAFETY - traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	reasonably low where pedestrians can keep their distance from traffic.	
18.SAFETY - traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.		Traffic speeds are reasonably low where pedestrians can keep their distance.	
19.SAFETY - visibility	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.		There are long straight sections where visibility is sufficient and unobstructed	
SAFETY 20. COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	6 1	Along most of the length the	Crossing of droppe
- dropped kerbs and tactile paving	paving provision.	provided, albeit not to current standards.	absent or incorrect.		provision is fine, however a crossing should be provided where Rocfort Road meets Brook Street as mentioned in 16	kerb, tactile paving nature could be provided at junction bellmouth.
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	35		

Route Name	Rocfort Road
Length	500m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	11
Directness	9
Safety	6
Coherence	1
Total	35
Number of elements not applicable to the route	1
Total Points to be reduced	2
Maximum score (revised)	38
Descentana	028/

Comments	
Actions	Crossing of dropped kerb, tactile paving nature could be provided at junction bellmouth.

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool Walking Route Audit Tool

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.		Footways well maintained with no litter observed and no	Actions
maintenance	significant issues noted.	vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.		with no litter observed and no overgrown vegetation.	
2. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2	No evidence of vandalism. Street lighting provided at consistent points with cctv by the shops by Rocfort Road.	
3. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic noise and pollution was seen as low. Traffic volumes were low and speeds were low.	
I. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present - Temporary features affecting the att - Excessive use of guardrail or bollan	, or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sacks	s).	2	None observed	
ATTRACTIVENESS				8		
5. COMFORT - condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulfing in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2	Footway is level and in good condition.	
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2	Footway widths vary throughout the route, starting at 3m on one side and 1.8m on the other, gradually narrowing to 1.4m, 550m along the road.	
7. COMFORT - width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or waiting on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for rigive and take 'between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.	2	Crossings to the south by the school are 2.4m wide.	
3. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk or roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	No instances observed of on footway parking. All parking on-street	
o. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Stopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	Gradient reasonably level.	
10.COMFORT - other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; ar Bus shelters restricting clearance w 	learance width for pedestrians (e.g. di d		2	None observed	
COMFORT				12		
11.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be	Footways are not provided to cater	2	Footways provided along the	
footway provision	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	for pedestrian desire lines.		edge of carriageway following the desire lines	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS	Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossing of road direct, but	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect,		Crossing points are generally provided where required Crossing of road is easy due	
or specified in specified and controlled crossings present or if likely to cross butside of controlled crossing)	crossing of load easy, criect, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	corasportated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	crossing or road is easy due to low levels of traffic and show speeds due to road width, traffic calming and parked vehicles.	
14.DIRECTNESS - impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2	Crossings are single phased (zebra and signal controlled near school)	
15. DIRECTNESS - green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2	Green man is sufficient for pedestrians to cross	
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of other directness issues Routes to/from bus stops not accorr Steps restricting access for all users Confusing layout for pedestrians cre	modated:		2	None observed	
DIRECTNESS				12		
17.SAFETY	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	During the site visit the traffic levels were low.	
17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY	can keep distance from moderate		unable to keep their distance from	2	Speeds were low due to parked vehicles and road width	
17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from	2	Speeds were low due to parked vehicles and road	
DIRECTNESS 17.SAFETY traffic volume traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility SAFETY	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can leeped low, or pedestrians can leeped box or moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Don's sibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 1	levels were low. Speeds were low due to parked vehicles and road width. Visibility is good as the road is straight however parked vehicles are located on either whether the control of	
17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in	unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in	2 1	levels were low. Speeds were low due to parked vehicles and road width. Visibility is good as the road is straight however parked vehicles are located on either whether the control of	
17.SAFETY traffic volume 18.SAFETY traffic speed 19.SAFETY visibility SAFETY 20.COHERENCE dropped kerbs and tactile	can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can leeped low, or pedestrians can leeped box or moderate traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Validity could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions. Dispoped seeks and succilie pushing proposed, all the counter of the counter	unable to keep their distance from traffic. Heigh traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tacille pawing	2 2 1	levels were low. Speeds were low due to parked vehicles and road width. Visibility is good as the road is straight however parked vehicles are located on either side of the carriageway which carrested vehicles. But the carriageway which creasing locations asset this. Dropped kerbs and tactile pawing are provided in the	

Route Name	Malling Road South
Length	600m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance acores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	12
Directness	12
Safety	5
Coherence	2
Total	39
Number of elements not applicable to the route	0
Total Points to be reduced	0
Maximum score (revised)	40
Percentage	98%

Comments	
Actions	

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool Walking Route Audit Tool

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation,	2	Footways are well maintained where no issues were seen	
maintenance	Significant issues noted.	into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.		during the visit.	
. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).		No evidence of vandalism noted. Street lighting provided consistently	
. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic noise is low as volume is low	
. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not presen - Temporary features affecting the at - Excessive use of guardrail or bollar	t, or is deficient; tractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sac	ks).	2	None observed	
TTRACTIVENESS				8		
s. COMFORT condition	Footways level and in good condition, with no trip hazards.	Some defects noted, typically isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	Large number of footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	2	Footway levels in good condition with no trip hazards observed	
s. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Footways are provided on either side of the road, where one side if varies between 2- 3m and the other is 0.9m	
/. COMFORT width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Crossing widths were 2m.	
B. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowling/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	No instances of vehicles parking on the footways, where footway widths are generally unobstructed	
). COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	Gradients are relatively level.	
IO.COMFORT other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; a Bus shelters restricting clearance v 	clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. on nd		2	None observed	
COMFORT				11		
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision	Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines.	2	Footways are provided along the edge of the carriageway	
2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.		Crossings are provided where necessary	
3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings oresent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	Road is easy to cross due to the low movements observed and straight alignment of the road	
14.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	2	Zebra crossing near the High Street provided	
5. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.		N/A	
6.DIRECTNESS other	Examples of 'other' directness issue - Routes to/from bus stops not accor - Steps restricting access for all user - Confusing layout for pedestrians or	nmodated; 's;		2	None observed	
DIRECTNESS				10		
7.SAFETY traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	-		
8.SAFETY traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.		Traffics speeds are reasonably low	
9.SAFETY visibility	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	6	Visibility is good due to the straight alignment of the carriageway	
0. COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving		Dropped kerbs and tactile	
20. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and actile paving COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile paving provision.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving provided, albeit not to current standards.	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving absent or incorrect.	2	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving are provided at the relevant locations	
			7-4-10-			
			Total Score	37		

Route Name	Malling Road North
Length	600m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	11
Directness	10
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	37
Number of elements not applicable to the route	1
Total Points to be reduced	2
Maximum score (revised)	38
Percentage	97%

Comments	
Actions	

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool Walking Route Audit Tool

	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
ATTRACTIVENESS maintenance	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.	2	Footways are well maintained.	
. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).		No evidence of vandalism was observed where street lighting is provided along one side of the road	
. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic noise is low as traffic volumes and speeds are very low	
. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present - Temporary features affecting the at - Excessive use of guardrail or bollar	t, or is deficient; tractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sac	ks).	2	None observed	
TTRACTIVENESS				8		
. COMFORT	Footways level and in good	Some defects noted, typically	Large number of footway crossovers	2	Footways were level and in	
condition	condition, with no trip hazards.	isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.		good condition	
. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Footways were between 2- 3m.	
. COMFORT width on staggered rossings/ edestrian islands/refuges	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		Crossings are provided at the junctions where the widths are sufficient	
. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to give and take frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowling/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	No signs of on footway parking, where on street parking is formally provided. Trees in the footway reduce widths at some points where the width is still around 2m	
. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	Gradient is relatively level.	
0.COMFORT other		clearance width for pedestrians (e.g.	driveway gates opened into footway);	2	None observed	
	Barriers/gates restricting access; a Bus shelters restricting clearance w Poorly drained footways resulting in	nd vidth. n noticeable ponding issues/slippery s	urfaces			
OMFORT	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v	vidth.	urfaces	12		
1.DIRECTNESS	Bus shelters restricting clearance w Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for	vidth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery s	Footways are not provided to cater		Footways are provided along the edge of the carriangeway	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in	Bus shelters restricting clearance w Poorly drained footways resulting in	vidth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery s		2	Footways are provided along the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of	Bus shelters restricting clearance v Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	idth. n noticeable ponding issues/slippery s Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from	2	the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorly drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	vidth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for padestrian deser lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians easily desertines. Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect or associated with	2 2	the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross Crossing of road is easy due	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in altion to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled rossings on Jurney time 5. DIRECTNESS	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for podestrain desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5a average). Crossings are single phase	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrians.	Footways are not provided to catter for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to lourney firm. Likely to	2 2 0	the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross Crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossings impact of controlled 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled 5. DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v – Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient.	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Padestrians awould benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to defer users. Include:	Footways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Slagpered crossings add significantly to journey fine. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	2 2 0 0	the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the jurctions when pedestrians are expected to cross Crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision footway provision JUNECTNESS location of crossings in altain to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) HORECTNESS impact of controlled rossings on journey time 5. DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v – Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to from bus stops not accome - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Padestrians awould benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to defer users. Include:	Footways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Slagpered crossings add significantly to journey fine. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	2 2 0 0	the edge of the carriageway Consings are prouded at the Junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross Constigue for proad to easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in altitude to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossings impact of controlled 4.DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other 6.DIRECTNESS other	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v – Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average). Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to from bus stops not accome - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes - Routes to from bus stops not allower - Routes	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting padestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Unlikely to wait-5s in padestrian island. Padestrians awould benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to defer users. Include:	Footways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Slagpered crossings add significantly to journey fine. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 8 8	the edge of the carriageway Consings are prouded at the Junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross Constigue for proad to easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings) resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) impact of controlled rossings on journey time 5.DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other 6.DIRECTNESS OTHER 7.SAFETY traffic volume 8.SAFETY	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adlacent to road). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other directness issue - Routes to from bus stops not according access for all user - Confusing layout for pedestrians can keep distance form moderate form	inclination of the control of the co	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from deaire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 8 8 2 2	the edge of the carriageway Cossings are provided at the Junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross Crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A None observed	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings) resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) impact of controlled rossings on journey time 5.DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other DIRECTNESS 7.3.AFETY traffic volume 8.S.AFETY traffic speed	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v – Poorty drained footways resulting in Poorty drained for footways resulting in Poorty drained footways resulting in Po	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait 2-5s in pedestrian sland. Unlikely to wait 2-5s in pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users. Include: Include: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings of road associated with significant delay (>15s average). Stagpend crossings add significantly to journey sine. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Creen man time would not give varienable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 8 8 2 2 2	the edge of the carriageway Consings are prouded at the Junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross are expected to cross Consting of road te easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A None observed Traffic volume is very low	
COMFORT 11.DIRECTNESS footway provision 12.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 13.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings or controlled crossings or filledly to controlled crossings or filled crossings of controlled crossings in pact of controlled crossings on journey time to pack the controlled crossings on journey time to controlled crossings on journey time to pack the controlled crossings of controlled cros	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adlacent to read). Crossings foliow desire lines. Crossing for low desire lines. Crossing are single phase pelicanipuffin or zerbar crossings. Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zerbar crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes tofform bus stops not according to the composition of the composition	noticeable ponding issues/alippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings arising diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. I so the second of the second second of the second	Footways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey firme. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give valuerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 8 2 2 2 2	the edge of the carriageway Cossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross sing of road is easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A None observed Traffic volume is very low Visibility is sufficient for the standard of road, where the	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision footway provision footway provision provision footway provision footway provision footway footward	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for podestrian desire lines (e.g., adjacent to read). Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings are single phase pelican puffin or zerbar crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of other directness issues - Routes to from bus stops not according to the common support of the productions or a confortably common support of the productions or a confortably production of the productions or confortably and the productions of the productions of the productions or confortably and the productions of the production of	inclinable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for padestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings of road disect, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average). Crossings are staggered but do not offer a severage of the control of th	Footways are not provided to cater for pedestrian deare lines. Crossings deviate significantly from deare lines. Crossings drowate significantly from deare lines. Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s awerage). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to water 170s in pedestrians talland. Green man time would not give varienable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Poor visited speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 6 6 6	the edge of the carriageway Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross sing are opened to the very low traffic. Crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic. N/A N/A None observed Traffic volume is very low Visibility is sufficient for the standard of road, where the road has straight sections.	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision Cotway provision Juliation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS JOEATION THATTIC (where no ontrolled crossings in controlled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) Holliectness Impact of controlled rossings on Jurney time 5. DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other 6.DIRECTNESS 7.SAFETY traffic volume 8.SAFETY traffic volume 8.SAFETY visibility AFETY 0. COHERENCE dropped kerbs and actile paving	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v - Poorty drained footways resulting in Footways are provided to cater for pedestrian desire lines (e.g., adlacent to read). Crossings foliow desire lines. Crossing for low desire lines. Crossing are single phase pelicanipuffin or zerbar crossings. Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zerbar crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes tofform bus stops not according to the composition of the composition	noticeable ponding issues/alippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings arising diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. I so the second of the second second of the second	Footways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossing of road associated indirect or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Staggered crossings add significantly to journey firme. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give valuerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2 2 0 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	the edge of the carriageway Cossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross sing of road is easy due to the very low traffic N/A N/A None observed Traffic volume is very low Visibility is sufficient for the standard of road, where the	
1.DIRECTNESS footway provision footway provision 2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines 3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no ontrolled crossings resent or if likely to ross outside of ontrolled crossing) 4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled rossings on journey time 5.DIRECTNESS green man time 6.DIRECTNESS other 7.SAFETY traffic volume 8.SAFETY traffic volume 8.SAFETY traffic speed 9.SAFETY visibility AFETY 0. COHERENCE	- Bus shelters restricting clearance v – Poorty drained footways resulting in Poorty drained footways resulting in Poorty drained footways resulting in Poorty drained footways resulting footways represent the resulting footways represent footways. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings follow desire lines. Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zebra crossings. Crossings are single phase pelicanipuffin or zebra crossings. Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably. Examples of 'other' directness issues – Routes forform bus stops not accour. Steps restricting access for all user – Confusing layout for pedestrians cross needy distance from moderate traffic volumes. Traffic volumes. Traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	noticeable ponding issues/slippery's Footway provision could be improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings arising diverting pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. I so the second of the second pedestrians away from desire lines. Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. I so the second pedestrians away from each second processing are staggered but do not add significantly to pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unablely to deter users. Include: Include: Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity. Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions. Dropped kerbs and tactile pawing provided, albeit not to current.	Fochways are not provided to caster for pedestrian desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines. Crossings of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average). Slagpered crossings add significantly to journey firme. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island. Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably. High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic. Proc visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2 2 2 0 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 6 6 6	the edge of the carriageway Cossings are provided at the Junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross where pedestrians are expected to cross where pedestrians are expected to cross the crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic NVA NVA NVA None observed Traffic volume is very low Traffic volume is very low Traffic speeds are low Visibility is sufficient for the standard of road, where the road has straight sections. Dropped kerts and tactilia paving are provided where	

Route Name	Queen's Avenue
Length	200m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	12
Directness	8
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	36
Number of elements not applicable to the route	2
Total Points to be reduced	4
Maximum score (revised)	36
Percentage	100%

Comments	
Actions	

Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool Walking Route Audit Tool

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent.	2	Footways are well	
maintenance	•	vegetation. Street furniture falling into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	Seriously overgrown vegetation, including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.		maintained.	
. ATTRACTIVENESS fear of crime	No evidence of vandalism with appropriate natural surveillance.	Minor vandalism. Lack of active frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto street).	Major or prevalent vandalism. Evidence of crimina/lantisocial activity. Route is isolated, not subject to natural surveillance (including where sight lines are inadequate).	2	No evidence of vandalism was observed where street lighting is provided	
. ATTRACTIVENESS traffic noise and pollution	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic noise is low as traffic volumes and speeds are very low	
. ATTRACTIVENESS other	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss - Evidence that lighting is not present - Temporary features affecting the at - Excessive use of guardrail or bollar	t, or is deficient; tractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sac	ks).	2	None observed	
TTRACTIVENESS				8		
. COMFORT	Footways level and in good	Some defects noted, typically	Large number of footway crossovers	2	Footways were level and in	
condition	condition, with no trip hazards.	isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pavers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.		good condition	
. COMFORT footway width	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between	Footway widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m.	Footway widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width).	1	Footways are provided either side of the carriageway	
issuit, mai	users or walking on roads. Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	Limited footway width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		where the widths are around 1.5m.	
. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited	2	Crossings are provided at the junctions where the widths	
width on staggered crossings/ pedestrian islands/refuges	without give and take between users or walking on roads. Widths generally in excess of 2m to accommodate wheel-chair users.	and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads.	standard wheelchair width). Limited width requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		junctions where the widths are sufficient	
. COMFORT footway parking	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths generally in excess of 2m between permanent obstructions.	Clearance widths between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take' between users and walking on roads due to footway parking. Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking causes significant deviation from desire lines.	2	No signs of on footway parking, where on street parking is formally provided.	
. COMFORT gradient	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	2	Gradient is relatively level.	
0.COMFORT other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; a Bus shelters restricting clearance v 	clearance width for pedestrians (e.g. on		2	None observed	
COMFORT				11		
1.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be	Footways are not provided to cater	2	Footways are provided along	
footway provision	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).	improved to better cater for pedestrian desire lines.	for pedestrian desire lines.	-	the edge of the carriageway	
2.DIRECTNESS location of crossings in elation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2	Crossings are provided at the junctions where pedestrians are expected to cross	
3.DIRECTNESS gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings resent or if likely to cross outside of controlled crossing)	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s average).	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay (>15s average).	2	Crossing of road is easy due to the very low traffic	
4.DIRECTNESS impact of controlled crossings on journey time	Crossings are single phase pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	Crossings are staggered but do not add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	Staggered crossings add significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	0	N/A	
5. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but current time unlikely to deter users.	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to cross comfortably.		N/A	
6.DIRECTNESS other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accon - Steps restricting access for all user - Confusing layout for pedestrians on	nmodated; 's;			None observed	
DIRECTNESS				8		
7.SAFETY traffic volume	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	Traffic volume moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	Traffic volume is very low	
8.SAFETY traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	_	Traffic speeds are low	
9.SAFETY visibility	traffic speeds. Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2	Visibility is sufficient for the standard of road, where the	
SAFETY		collisions.		6	road has straight sections.	
0. COHERENCE	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	1	Dropped kerbs are provided	Tactile paving is,
dropped kerbs and actile paving	paving provision.	provided, albeit not to current standards.	absent or incorrect.		where required.	however, missing and could be provided.
COHERENCE				1		
			Total Score	34		

Route Name	Queen's Road
Length	180m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	11
Directness	8
Safety	6
Coherence	1
Total	34
Number of elements not applicable to the route	2
Total Points to be reduced	4
Maximum score (revised)	36
Percentage	94%

Comments	
Actions	Tactile paving is, however, missing and could be provided.

Walking Infrastructure Plan: Walking Route Selection Tool

Local Cycling and walking	intrastructure Plan:	waiking	Route 5	91
Walking Route Audit Tool				

Audit Categories	2 (Green)	1 (Amber)	0 (Red)	Score	Comments	Actions
1. ATTRACTIVENESS	Footways well maintained, with no significant issues noted.	Minor littering. Overgrown vegetation. Street furniture falling	Littering and/or dog mess prevalent. Seriously overgrown vegetation,	2	Footways appear to be well maintained	
- maintenance	1000	into minor disrepair (for example, peeling paint).	including low branches. Street furniture falling into major disrepair.			
2. ATTRACTIVENESS	No evidence of vandalism with	Minor vandalism. Lack of active	Major or prevalent vandalism.	2	No evidence of vandalism	
fear of crime	appropriate natural surveillance.	frontage and natural surveillance (e.g. houses set back or back onto	Evidence of criminal/antisocial activity. Route is isolated, not		where street lighting is provided along the length of	
		street).	subject to natural surveillance		the road	
			(including where sight lines are inadequate).			
3. ATTRACTIVENESS	Traffic noise and pollution do not affect the attractiveness	Levels of traffic noise and/or pollution could be improved	Severe traffic pollution and/or severe traffic noise	2	Traffic pollution is low as there is low traffic	
oollution 4. ATTRACTIVENESS	Examples of 'other' attractiveness iss	ues include:			movements. None observed	
other	Evidence that lighting is not presen Temporary features affecting the att Excessive use of guardrall or bollare	t, or is deficient; ractiveness of routes (e.g. refuse sack	s).	2	Notic observed	
ATTRACTIVENESS				8		
5. COMFORT	Footways level and in good	Some defects noted, typically	Large number of footway crossovers	2	Footways levels are good with	
condition	condition, with no trip hazards.	isolated (such as trenching or patching) or minor (such as cracked, but level pawers). Defects unlikely to result in trips or difficulty for wheelchairs, prams etc. Some footway crossovers resulting in uneven surface.	resulting in uneven surface, subsided or fretted pavement, or significant uneven patching or trenching.	-	no trip hazards observed.	
6. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users	Footway widths of between	Footway widths of less than 1.5m	1	Footways widths are around	
- footway width	without 'give and take' between users or walking on roads.	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take'	(i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited footway width requires users		3m to the west of the road by the shops, however for the	
	Footway widths generally in excess of 2m.	between users and walking on roads.	to 'give and take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in		majority of the lengths the width varies between 0.7-2m	
			crowding/delay.			
7. COMFORT	Able to accommodate all users without 'give and take' between	Widths of between approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for	Widths of less than 1.5m (i.e. standard wheelchair width). Limited	2	Footway is provided to the west and over various	
- width on staggered crossings/	users or walking on roads. Widths	'give and take' between users and	width requires users to 'give and		sidearms which are of a	
pedestrian islands/refuges	generally in excess of 2m to	walking on roads.	take' frequently, walk on roads and/or results in crowding/delay.		sufficient width and tactile paving is provided where required.	
B. COMFORT	No instances of vehicles parking on footways noted. Clearance widths	Clearance widths between	Clearance widths less than 1.5m. Footway parking requires users to	2	No instances of vehicles parked on the footways.	
footway parking	generally in excess of 2m between	approximately 1.5m and 2m. Occasional need for 'give and take'	'give and take' frequently, walk on		Some overgrown vegetation	
	permanent obstructions.	between users and walking on roads due to footway parking.	roads and/or results in crowding/delay. Footway parking		observed, although this is not a major obstruction	
		Footway parking causes some deviation from desire lines.	causes significant deviation from desire lines.		,	
9. COMFORT	There are no slopes on footway.	Slopes exist but gradients do not	Gradients exceed 8 per cent (1 in	1	Gradients are reasonably	Any ability to
gradient	' '	exceed 8 per cent (1 in 12).	12).	•	level, where the only section with noticeable levels is the	improve this are
					with noticeable levels is the public footway to the East linking to Rocfort Road which may be difficult for disabled users.	
10.COMFORT	Examples of 'other' comfort issues in	clude:		2	None observed	
- other	 Barriers/gates restricting access; ar Bus shelters restricting clearance w 	elearance width for pedestrians (e.g. dr id idth. noticeable ponding issues/slippery su				
COMFORT				10		
11.DIRECTNESS	Footways are provided to cater for	Footway provision could be	Footways are not provided to cater	2	Footways are provided along	
- footway provision	pedestrian desire lines (e.g. adjacent to road).		for pedestrian desire lines.	-	the edge of the carriageway	
12.DIRECTNESS - location of crossings in relation to desire lines	Crossings follow desire lines.	Crossings partially diverting pedestrians away from desire lines.	Crossings deviate significantly from desire lines.	2	Crossings are provided at appropriate locations	
13.DIRECTNESS	Crossing of road easy, direct, and comfortable and without delay (< 5s	Crossing of road direct, but associated with some delay (up to	Crossing of road associated indirect, or associated with significant delay	2	Crossing of road is easy due to low traffic, straight	
gaps in traffic (where no controlled crossings	average).	associated with some delay (up to 15s average).	(>15s average).		alignment and one way	
present or if likely to cross outside of controlled					working	
crossing) 14.DIRECTNESS	Crossings are single phase	Crossings are staggered but do not	Staggered crossings add	0	N/A	
impact of controlled crossings on journey time	pelican/puffin or zebra crossings.	add significantly to journey time. Unlikely to wait >5s in pedestrian island.	significantly to journey time. Likely to wait >10s in pedestrian island.	_		
15. DIRECTNESS green man time	Green man time is of sufficient length to cross comfortably.	Pedestrians would benefit from extended green man time but	Green man time would not give vulnerable users sufficient time to	0	N/A	
- green man time		current time unlikely to deter users.	cross comfortably.			
16.DIRECTNESS - other	Examples of 'other' directness issues - Routes to/from bus stops not accor - Steps restricting access for all user - Confusing layout for pedestrians cri	nmodated;		2	None observed	
DIRECTNESS	gyt on procounding the	J		8		
17.SAFETY	Traffic volume low, or pedestrians	Traffic volume moderate and	High traffic volume, with pedestrians		Traffic volume is low	
17.SAFETY - traffic volume	ramic volume low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic volumes.	pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic volume, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.	2	TOTAL POPULIE IS IOW	
18.SAFETY - traffic speed	Traffic speeds low, or pedestrians can keep distance from moderate traffic speeds.	Traffic speeds moderate and pedestrians in close proximity.	High traffic speeds, with pedestrians unable to keep their distance from traffic.		Traffic speeds are low	
19.SAFETY - visibility	Good visibility for all users.	Visibility could be somewhat improved but unlikely to result in collisions.	Poor visibility, likely to result in collisions.	2	Visibility is good due to straight alignment and one way working	
				6		
SAFETY	Adequate dropped kerb and tactile	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	Dropped kerbs and tactile paving	2	Dropped kerbs and tactile	
				_	paving are provided where	
20. COHERENCE - dropped kerbs and	paving provision.	provided, albeit not to current standards.	absent or incorrect.		appropriate	
20. COHERENCE		provided, albeit not to current	absent or incorrect. Total Score	2 34		

Route Name	High Street
Length	275m
Name of Assessor(s)	James Marsh
Date of Assessment	26th November 2020

Criterion	Performance Scores
Attractiveness	8
Comfort	10
Directness	8
Safety	6
Coherence	2
Total	34
Number of elements not applicable to the route	2
Total Points to be reduced	4
Maximum score (revised)	36
Percentage	94%

Comments	
Actions	Any ability to improve this area?